

HOUSING OF BEAGLES USED FOR TESTS BY FOOD AND DRUG ADMINISTRATION

Commissioner George P. Larrick of the Food and Drug Administration has announced that officials of the agency are seeking to get authorization for a new kennel providing roomy individual runways for the beagles used in long term feeding tests. Under Commissioner Larrick's vigorous direction, a committee of administrators and scientists has made a study of architects' plans of modern laboratory kennels and has visited the kennels at the National Institutes of Health. The committee has decided that tests on the beagles can most effectively be carried out in a rural location, where there will be plenty of space available for runways and for laboratory facilities for a veterinarian and those scientists and technicians who will be working with the dogs on a day-by-day basis.

Humanitarians who have been following the developments which led up to this move on the part of the Food and Drug Administration welcome this plan. They are urging Congress to authorize the new kennel and laboratory building immediately.

Demand for this new project would have developed long since had there been a public awareness of the conditions under which the test beagles are now kept. Thirteen years ago, in 1947, the laboratories of the Food and Drug Administration in Washington were inspected by a scientist visiting the United States. He was astonished to find that beagles used for long-term feeding tests were being housed in small cages without exercise. He expressed the opinion that dogs so confined would not be physiologically normal after a period of three years, because the lack of exercise would affect their metabolism. (At the Food and Drug Administration laboratories, dogs are confined to cages 30" x 36" for periods ranging from two to seven years.) He questioned the accuracy of the tests of drugs and chemical additives which were being carried out on these dogs, because the dogs were in an abnormal condition.

His comments apparently were not appreciated by the scientists in charge; over two hundred beagles are still kept for periods of two to seven years in the sub-basement of the South Agriculture Building in 30" x 36" cages from which they are never removed for exercise. Lack of funds and lack of space might have seemed for a time to explain the makeshift nature of the kennels. However, both humanitarians and scientists were amazed when it came to light last month that Food and Drug Administration scientists had recommended that the same system of caging without exercise or daylight should be perpetuated in the proposed new \$25,000,000 building which is to house the Food and Drug Administration.

Public attention was drawn to the situation by a news-
(Continued on Page 3)

MONEY FOR COMFORTABLE ANIMAL HOUSING IN SCIENTIFIC INSTITUTIONS

Since 1956, Federal funds have been available to non-profit scientific institutions for construction, expansion and/or equipping research facilities, including quarters for laboratory animals. A sum not to exceed \$30,000,000 per year has been approved by Congress for this purpose for the years 1960, 1961 and 1962. The funds are available on a matching basis.

Comfortable quarters for the animals used in research should be regarded by all institutions as morally obligatory. All such animals should have decent space for exercise, comfortable resting places and sanitation adequate to prevent the spread of disease. The generous government provision for both construction and equipment should make possible the elimination of bad animal quarters in many Universities and other research centers wherever the will exists to give animals kind treatment.

To assist investigators and others in initiating action to improve animal quarters, a summary of the provisions of

(Continued on Page 4)

"A QUESTION OF VALUE"

Humanitarians throughout the country who have been demanding the abolition of cruel animal experiments in the teaching of high school science were heartened by the splendid article "A Question of Value" in the February *Ladies Home Journal* by Dorothy Thompson. With the kind permission of the *Ladies Home Journal*, a reprint of the article is enclosed. Readers are urged to call this to the attention of their local school principals and science teachers.

Commenting on the article, the *New York Daily News* stated editorially on February 1:

"CRUELTY TO TEEN-AGERS

"We'll second, heartily, Dorothy Thompson's motion in the current (February) *Ladies' Home Journal* that the spreading practice of experimentation on live animals in U. S. public high schools be stopped cold.

"It seems that in more and more biological classes live mice, rats, rabbits, kittens and other animals are starved, or kept lingering on unbalanced diets, or injected with cancer cells, or actually dissected while more or less under anesthetics administered by inexperienced young people.

"These experiments produce no new scientific knowledge—as do some experiments conducted by scientists who

know what they are about and what they are looking for.

"The high school vivisections are simply needless cruelties, inflicted on helpless animals under the direction of teachers who are overzealous if nothing worse.

"Further, they constitute cruelty to teen-agers themselves, in that these brutalities to animals tend to infect many a young person with a callous disregard for any living creature's suffering. A person without pity and without sympathy is not a fully developed human being. An older person who blunts or destroys a youngster's instincts of pity and sympathy comes close to committing a crime against the youngster.

"A Board of Education spokesman informs us that animal experimentation in the New York public schools is strictly limited to dissection of frogs after they have been put under anesthesia and painlessly killed.

"As we see it, that is proper and profitable biologic teaching, with sadism left out; and let's keep it that way in the New York schools."

Similar assurances have been received from officials of the public school systems in Los Angeles and Philadelphia.

However, a recent wire service dispatch from Texas brought news of highly improper science teaching methods: the demonstration of open heart operations at the University of Texas before 400 high school students at Galveston. The United Press International dispatch, dated January 30, reported that the students "watched wide-eyed" while a surgical team operated on two dogs; the demonstrations were held in observance of "Heart Career Day" sponsored by the American Heart Association. The dispatch continued: "None of the 400 students, broken up into sections of 200 each, fainted during the demonstrations." A 17-year-old boy and a 16-year-old girl assisted by "describing the operation for the onlookers."

Letters to the Animal Welfare Institute from children planning science projects give a pitiful picture of ignorance. They are being led to perform cruel and useless experiments by teachers who should know better. For example: "I am a seventh grade student studying Life Science. I want to do a project on the affect (sic) of cancer on the learning abilities of mice. . . Incidentally, do you know of any place where I can buy cancer strains? If so, could you please tell me their address?"

How shall humane principles for the instruction of the nation's youth be made effective?

U.S. MOVES TO RATIFY OIL POLLUTION CONVENTION

The International Convention for the Prevention of Pollution of the Sea by Oil is now adhered to by countries representing nearly half the world's tanker shipping, but hundreds of thousands of sea birds continue to die of starvation as a result of being soaked with the waste oil floating on the seas.

As reported in Information Report Vol. 8, No. 4, an interdepartmental committee of the State Department recommended that the United States accept the Convention. The minor reservations included in the recommenda-

tion were announced at the International Conference on Oil Pollution held in Denmark last Summer.

On February 15, the President of the United States sent the Convention to the Senate for advice and consent to acceptance, with certain reservations and recommendations which include the need expressed by the Secretary of State for implementing legislation. The matter is now pending before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, of which Senator J. W. Fulbright is Chairman. It is hoped that prompt action will be taken to enable our country to ratify this Convention whose humane effects are worldwide. Other countries are expected to follow our example, thus preventing the major proportion of existing oil pollution. Our ratification of the Convention should take place this year.

TELEVISION CODE OPPOSES CRUELTY TO ANIMALS

Persons who observe any cruelty to animals on television programs should refer the offending producer and station to two principles clearly stated in the code of the National Association of Broadcasters, to which all three major networks and 380 independent stations subscribe. These are Sections "s" and "y" of "Acceptability of Program Material", and read as follows:

"The use of horror for its own sake will be eliminated; the use of visual or aural effects which would shock or alarm the viewer, and the detailed presentation of brutality or physical agony by sight or by sound are not permissible."

"The use of animals, both in the production of television programs and as a part of television program content, shall at all times be in conformity with accepted standards of humane treatment."

CHEMICAL TEST REPLACES ONE USING ANIMALS

Another important step toward increased use of chemicals rather than live animals in testing of chemical substances has been taken by the Division of Nutrition of the Food and Drug Administration and the method has now been adopted for inclusion in U.S. Pharmacopeia XVI. Tests to determine the strength of Vitamin D preparations, which formerly used rats or chicks, are now entirely chemical; the method is applicable to all varieties of pharmaceutical preparations, to evaporated milk, and to most other foods and feeds containing added Vitamin D.

Dr. O. L. Kline, Director of the Division, states: "It will be necessary during a period of development of precision of the method to continue a comparison with those obtained by bioassay with animals. This will be of gradually lessening extent, however. We must continue to use the chick in the assay of Vitamin D for products offered for poultry feeding, because we are unable as yet to differentiate chemically between Vitamins D₂ and D₃. It is the Vitamin D₃ form to which the chick responds. With these exceptions this is the last of the major vitamins to require animal bioassay."

HUMANE METHODS OF SLAUGHTER BEING ADOPTED BY U.S. PACKERS

The National Provisioner, weekly magazine of the packing industry, on January 9th devoted an entire issue to the subject of humane slaughter. The issue was an immediate sell-out and in an attempt to fill the demand, the *Provisioner* two weeks later asked readers to return any unneeded copies. This issue provided all facts needed by packers concerning installation of every type of humane slaughtering equipment.

Statements in the January 9 issue from various industry officials included one by the President of the American Meat Institute, Mr. Homer R. Davison. Commenting on the new Federal humane slaughter law, which makes humane slaughtering compulsory after June 30, 1960 for all companies selling to the Federal Government, Mr. Davison said: "Further developments in improved methods of slaughter and further reflection on the implications of this law lead me to add that it is time that the meat industry make an asset out of what may appear to be a liability. . . . Therefore, it seems to me that with humane slaughter being a public policy of the United States Government, and with more and more states passing laws in this direction, and in spite of the major plant problems involved, we must make it a point to move rapidly to accept these laws in a way that will enhance the reputation of this industry in the eyes of the public."

Another packer, who is a member of the United States Department of Agriculture's advisory committee, T. H. Broecker, stated his belief in the same issue of the *Provisioner* that "the packing industry will emerge from this changeover a better industry through the thought and effort put into making compliance work. We will most assuredly gain the respect of the humane groups and women's clubs in America."

At a meeting of the Western State Meat Packers Association in San Francisco February 17-20, Dr. K. F. Johnson, Chief Officer for Humane Slaughter of the United States Department of Agriculture's Meat Inspection Division, explained the various methods of humane slaughter. He pointed out that the time for installation, education and shakedown is growing shorter for those slaughterers who must comply with the new Federal law by June 30. "No single piece of federal legislation has been accompanied by as great a display of public interest as that exhibited in connection with the humane slaughter law," he said. "That interest continues and can be expected to continue as the law is implemented. This is indicated by the fact that five states now have their own laws regarding humane slaughter and others are currently reviewing proposed legislation."

Four factors which Mr. Johnson said were basic requirements for any packer utilizing humane slaughter equipment are: (1) delivery of calm animals to stunning or immobilizing equipment; (2) proper functioning of all restraining and immobilizing equipment; (3) skilled and willing personnel; and (4) effective animal restraint.

Dr. Johnson made it clear that the humane slaughter regulations require humane treatment of every animal. "Crippled and downed animals", he said, "constitute a

small part of the overall slaughter, but the law applies to them, too. Facilities for handling these types of animals should be included in any layout. Some study should be given to standby or alternate equipment in case of breakdowns or malfunctions. Our identification of carcasses from humanely slaughtered animals will be based on a consistent application of humane slaughter methods."

Emphasizing the necessity of having good men on the job, he said, "A willing operator, that is, one who is sold on the job, who knows his job, and who knows why he must do it correctly will go a long way toward making your equipment work. As an incidental advantage, we have been told that employe absenteeism is reduced with the installation of humane slaughtering and handling equipment."

In conclusion, Dr. Johnson stated, "I want to compliment the industry for its acceptance of the objectives of humane slaughter law and on the dramatic progress made by its members."

HOUSING OF BEAGLES

(Continued from Page 1)

paperwoman, Ann Cottrell Free, who described the conditions in these animal quarters in the *Washington Star*. Further publicity in the *Birmingham News* and the *Scranton Times* resulted, and there were letters to the editors of the *New York Times*, the *New York Mirror*, the *Washington Post*, and others. The result of this publicity has been a large number of letters to Congress from private citizens, urging that something be done about the housing of the beagles. These letters have been characterized by an astonished indignation.

Representatives of the Animal Welfare Institute met several times with administrative officials of the Food and Drug Administration to discuss solutions for the housing problem. The Commissioner and the Deputy Commissioner expressed concern about the existing conditions, to which their attention had not been sufficiently drawn, and, as mentioned above, formed an investigation committee. This committee, after some deliberation, found that the separation of the dog quarters from the projected Federal Office Building #8 and their relocation in an area where more space was available would be more economic. The space which was allocated to dog quarters will be available for an expansion of the small animal quarters and laboratories for which officials anticipate a need by 1963.

The Animal Welfare Institute fully endorses the plan to build two new Food and Drug Administration buildings, F.O.B. #8, and the projected kennel-laboratory building.

The Food and Drug Administration is engaged in work with which the Institute is in full sympathy, so it is heartening to know that there is a prospect of the Administration's building animal quarters which the Institute could endorse. It would be a source of pride if the laboratories of the United States Government agencies could be exemplary to commercial laboratories and other research institutions throughout the nation.

MONEY FOR COMFORTABLE ANIMAL HOUSING

(Continued from Page 1)

the law are reprinted below with the permission of the Chief of the Health Research Facilities Branch, Division of Research, Division of Research Grants of the National Institutes of Health.

Summary of Title VII of the Public Health Service Act, as Amended

1. Fields in which authorized.

Research facilities in health and the sciences related to health, which include medicine, osteopathy, dentistry, public health and fundamental and applied sciences when related thereto.

2. Purpose.

To assist in the construction and/or equipping of additional facilities for the conduct of research in the sciences relating to health by providing grants-in-aid on a matching basis to public and private non-profit institutions.

3. Administration.

Applications are received and processed by the Division of Research Grants and are acted upon by the National Advisory Council on Health Research Facilities, and are subject to final approval by the Surgeon General.

4. Available to whom.

To non-Federal public and non-profit institutions competent to engage in research in the sciences related to health.

5. Applications for health research facility grants.

Must be executed by an official legally authorized by the applying institution. Each applicant will

a. Furnish in sufficient detail plans showing the arrangement of space, purpose for which space is to be used, and type of construction, together with a description of the proposed facility so as to indicate its nature and purpose.

b. Set forth the estimated total costs of construction and the basis of estimates, stating separately estimated costs of excavation, structures, equipment, and architectural and other services.

c. Furnish information on the extent and manner in which this construction will expand the institution's capacity for research in the sciences related to health.

6. Required assurances.

a. For not less than ten years after completion of construction the facility must be used for the research purposes in the sciences related to health for which it was constructed. In the event that these conditions are not met, the law provides for the recapture of federal monies based on the relative value of the facility at the time recapture is instituted as compared with the initial construction cost.

b. There must be adequate assurance of sufficient funds to meet the non-Federal share of the construction cost.

c. There must be available, when construction is completed, sufficient funds so that the facility will

be used effectively for the purpose for which it was constructed.

7. Criteria for selection of institution.

To be established by the Council. The Law provides that consideration shall be given to the relative effectiveness of the proposed facilities in expanding the capacity for research in the sciences related to health, in improving the quality of such research, and in promoting an equitable geographical distribution of such research.

8. Amount of grant.

At the discretion of the Surgeon General, but not in excess of any recommendation of the Council.

a. The amount granted may not exceed fifty percent of the amount determined to be necessary for the research facilities' portion of the construction.

9. Definitions.

The terms "construction" and "cost of construction" include (1) the construction of new buildings and the expansion, remodeling, and alteration of existing buildings, including architect's fees, but not including the cost of acquisition of land or off-site improvements, and (2) equipping new buildings and existing buildings, whether or not expanded, remodeled or altered.

The term "non-profit institution" means an institution owned and operated by one or more corporations or associations no part of the net earnings of which inures, or may lawfully inure, to the benefit of any private shareholder or individual.

The term "health research facility grant" means a grant of funds for the construction and/or equipping of health research facilities as authorized by the act.

The term "equipment" means those items that are considered depreciable and have an estimated life of not less than five years.

10. Receipt Dates.

Public Law 835 provides that applications for grants under this law shall be made not later than June 30, 1961.

Application forms, as well as additional information, will be supplied promptly upon request to the Health Research Facilities Branch, Division of Research Grants, National Institutes of Health, Public Health Service, Bethesda 14, Maryland.

CORRECTION

In the November-December Information Report, it was stated that the 86th Congress had appropriated \$2,565,000 for the study of the effects of pesticides on fish and wildlife. Unfortunately, this is the sum which Congress authorized, rather than appropriated, under Public Law 86-279. Conservationists were disappointed to learn that the President in his new budget requested no increase for this research program, even though it had been authorized by Congress. Only \$280,000, the same amount allocated for the current fiscal year, was requested for 1961.

Congress could increase the actual appropriation for this research, even though it was not included in the President's proposed budget.

Because of the serious dangers to human and animal life involved in continuing the spreading of chlorinated hydrocarbon insecticides and other highly toxic pesticides, legislation is needed to prevent mass use of these substances until definitely safe methods and amounts are established.

ANIMAL WELFARE INSTITUTE

ADVISORY COMMITTEE

Dr. Lee R. Dice

Dr. Peter Okkelberg

Dr. Joseph Wood Krutch

David Ricardo

OFFICERS

Christine Stevens,
President

Alfred R. Glancy, Jr.
Vice-President

Roger L. Stevens,
Treasurer

Estella Draper,
Executive Secretary

Mary M. Richards,
Assistant Treasurer

March-April, 1960

Vol. 9 No. 2

PHYSIOLOGICAL SOCIETY ANNOUNCES IT WILL NOT PUBLISH PAPERS INVOLVING IMPROPER USE OF EXPERIMENTAL ANIMALS

The following announcement was made on page two of *The American Journal of Physiology*, Vol. 198, No. 1, January, 1960: "Papers submitted to the *American Journal of Physiology* or the *Journal of Applied Physiology*, about which question is raised as to the proper use or care of the experimental animals, will be referred to the Committee of the Society on Use and Care of Animals. In cases where there is evidence of improper use, the papers will not be considered further for publication."

This announcement follows the Guiding Principles on the Care and Use of Animals, Approved by the Council of the American Physiological Society. Readers of the Animal Welfare Institute Information Report may recall that these were printed in the January-February 1954 issue shortly after they were drawn up by the Physiological Society. The then President-elect of the Society, Dr. Hiram Essex, said of them, "We conceived of their purpose being like the United States Constitution, broad, with details being supplied by some other means."

The American Physiological Society is to be congratulated upon the new editorial policy for its two major publications. If it is strictly observed, it will be an excellent incentive for the humane planning of experiments.

NEW TEACHING AID PROVIDED FREE TO TEACHERS

A new manual, *Humane Biology Projects*, may now be ordered by high school biology teachers who are invited to write for their free copy to the office of the Animal Welfare Institute. The 48-page, illustrated manual was designed to help teachers to give sound scientific training and develop close observation and original thinking in their students; it has sections on Animal Behavior, Bacteriology, Botany, Genetics, Physiology, and Ecology and Conservation. The avoidance of any cruel experiments on animals is stressed in the manual's brief introduction. The educational aims which brought about preparation of this collection of experiments, demonstrations and projects for Science Fairs is so well expressed in the preface contributed by Rachel Carson, the distinguished author of "The Sea Around Us", that it is reprinted below so that all who receive the Information Report may read it.

Preface to "Humane Biology Projects"

"I like to define biology as the history of the earth and all its life—past, present, and future. To understand biology is to understand that all life is linked to the earth from which it came; it is to understand the stream of life, flowing out of the dim past into the uncertain future, is in reality a unified force, though composed of an infinite number and variety of separate lives. The essence of life is lived in freedom. Any concept of biology is not only sterile and profitless, it is distorted and untrue if it puts its primary focus on unnatural conditions rather than on those vast forces not of man's making, that shape and channel the nature and direction of life.

(Continued on Page 4)

SENATOR COOPER INTRODUCES LABORATORY ANIMALS BILL

The Hon. John Sherman Cooper (R., Ky.) introduced on May 18th a bill which deserves the support of scientists and humanitarians alike. In introducing the bill, Senator Cooper said, "Mr. President, on behalf of myself and Senators Mansfield, Bartlett, Byrd of West Virginia, Kefauver, Morse, Proxmire, Randolph, Gruening, McNamara, and Clark, I introduce for appropriate reference, a bill which would provide for humane treatment of animals used in experiments by recipients of grants from the United States, and by departments and agencies of the Government.

"I am aware that there are those who have raised objection to this proposal. Yet it seems to me that the objectives of the bill are such that they are entitled to be considered by the appropriate committees of the Congress. I do not say that the language is perfect or that every approach is necessarily the proper one. Certainly, the objectives of the bill are worthwhile, and it merits earnest attention.

"I am informed that this bill would not inhibit or prevent experimental research. Nor is it my intention or that of the co-sponsors of this bill to do so. Its basic goal is to insure that in experiments requiring the use of animals, precautions will be taken and every effort will be made to conduct such experiments in a manner that is as humane as possible.

"I ask unanimous consent that the bill lie on the table for 5 days so that other Senators who wish to join in sponsoring the bill may have the opportunity to do so."

When Senator Cooper stated that there are those who have raised objection to this proposal, it should be noted that quite a number of objections have come from people who have never seen a copy of the bill but who have been told that it is bad and should be opposed. The Animal Welfare Institute relies on the fair-mindedness and humaneness of the generality of experimental biologists. We are reprinting in this Information Report the full text of S.3570, so that judgment may be made at first hand. The comments, criticisms and questions of all will be welcomed.

Legislation requiring decent care and housing for animals and humane design of experiments will help men of good will in every part of a scientific institution to obtain the best results under the best conditions.

It is regrettable that this bill should have inspired violent opposition from both the National Anti-Vivisection Society and the National Society for Medical Research whose mutual enmity does not prevent them from joining in efforts to kill the bill.

The bill would not hamper research; on the contrary, it would encourage scientific work of the highest quality and, by establishing humane standards having the force of law, would protect scientists from unwarranted attacks at the same time as it protects animals from unnecessary suffering.

The only questions which have been raised by humane research workers consulted by the Animal Welfare Institute are: Will this mean much paper work? Will it take

a great deal of time? The answer to these questions is *no*. The purpose of the records called for in the bill is to enable it to be administered 1) without confusion and with the least consumption of time, and 2) with certainty that persons who are not following the humane principles established are easily identified. The written records are designed to avoid the necessity for prolonged questioning by personnel of the Department of Health, Education and Welfare in order to ascertain what the animals are being used for and which animals are which.

Most of the record-keeping required under the bill is already carried out by responsible investigators. The certificate of compliance and the annual report with reprints of published work attached are the only added requirements. In Britain, where a somewhat stricter and more detailed law on this same subject has been in force since 1876 with no adverse effect on the quality of biological research in that country, the annual report is no more than a single page requiring answers of a dozen or so lines, listing the projects carried out, with whom the work was done, how many animals were used and for what purposes. The certificate of compliance would be no more complicated than any other professional licensing.

For some reason, the idea that a separate report on every animal would have to be made has gained credence. But this is not so. The project-plans submitted would be no more extensive than those voluntarily submitted at the present time by federal grantees to the Bio-Sciences Information Exchange of the Smithsonian Institution. (See The A.I.B.S. Bulletin, Vol. IV, No. 5, October, 1954. "The Bio-Sciences Information Exchange of the Smithsonian Institution," by Stella Leche Deignan, Director.)

Surely, it is well worth this very minor effort to ensure high humane standards for American research. Those who pay the taxes from which ever growing research funds are obtained (a 65% increase in government funds for medical research was requested by research leaders on May 19) have a right to effective guarantees that animals are never used unnecessarily or subjected to needless suffering.

AN ACT

To provide for the humane treatment of animals used in experiment and tests by recipients of grants from the United States and by agencies and instrumentalities of the United States Government, and for other purposes.

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That it is declared to be the policy of the United States that living vertebrate animals used for scientific experiments and tests shall be spared unnecessary pain and fear; that they shall be used only when no other feasible and satisfactory methods can be used to ascertain biological and scientific information for the cure of disease, alleviation of suffering, prolongation of life, or for military requirements; and that all such animals shall be comfortably housed, well fed and humanely handled.

SEC. 2. From and after January 1, 1962, no grant for scientific research, experimentation, testing or training, and no advance or payment under any such grant, shall be made by or through any agency or instrumentality of the United States Government, or by or through any person or agency pursuant to contract or authorization of the United States Government, to any person who uses live animals in research, experiments, tests or training unless the person applying for or receiving the grant has a Certificate of Compliance with this Act, issued by the Secretary of Health, Education and Welfare.

SEC. 3. The Secretary shall, pursuant to such rules and regulations as he may prescribe, issue Certificates of Compliance to persons applying therefor upon proof satisfactory to him:

(a) That the Applicant's projects involving the use of live animals are in accordance with the requirements of this Act and the policy of the Congress;

(b) That the Applicant's personnel and facilities are adequate and appropriate to enable it to comply with the requirements of this Act and the policy of the Congress stated herein; and

(c) That the Applicant has complied with the requirements of Section 4 of this Act.

SEC. 4. Each person to whom a Certificate of Compliance has been issued, and each agency or instrumentality of the United States which uses live animals for research, experiments, tests or training shall comply with the following requirements:

(a) All premises where animals are kept shall provide a comfortable resting place, adequate space and facilities for normal exercise, and adequate sanitation, lighting, tempera-

ture control and ventilation;

(b) Animals shall receive adequate food and water and shall not be caused to suffer unnecessary or avoidable pain through neglect or mishandling;

(c) Animals used in any experiment which would result in pain shall be anesthetized so as to prevent the animals feeling the pain during and after the experiment except to the extent that the use of anesthetics would frustrate the object of the experiment, and in any event, animals which are seriously injured as a result of the experiment or which are suffering severe and prolonged pain shall be painlessly killed:

Provided, that, unless the project-plan on file with the Secretary specifies a longer period during which animals must be kept alive for essential purposes of the experiment or test, consistent with this Act and the rules and regulations hereunder, such animals shall be painlessly killed immediately upon the conclusion of the operation inflicting the injury or causing such pain.

(d) An accurate record shall be maintained of all experiments and tests performed. Procedures shall be employed to make possible the identification of animals subjected to specified experiments and tests, and a record shall be kept of the disposition of such animals;

(e) All cages or enclosures containing animals shall be identified by cards stating the nature of the experiment or test, or numbers which correspond to such description in a record book;

(f) Painful experiments or tests on living animals shall be conducted only by persons licensed under Section 5 of this Act or by students in an established training institution who are under the direct supervision of a licensee and all animals used by students in practice surgery or other painful procedures shall be under complete anesthesia and shall be killed without being allowed to recover consciousness;

(g) No experiment or test on living animals shall be undertaken or performed unless a project-plan is on file in such form as the Secretary may prescribe, describing the nature and purposes of the project and the procedures to be employed with respect to living animals;

(h) An annual report and such additional reports or information as the Secretary may require by regulation or individual request shall be submitted to the Secretary. The annual report shall specify the number of animals used, the procedures employed, and such other matters as the Secretary may prescribe, and shall include a copy of any published work prepared or sponsored by the reporting person or agency, involving the use of live animals; and

(i) Authorized representatives of the Secretary shall be given access to the animals and to the premises and books and records of the agency or person for the purpose of obtaining information relating to the administration of this Act, and such representatives shall be authorized to destroy or require the destruction of animals in accordance with rules, regulations or instructions issued by the Secretary, in conference with this Act.

SEC. 5. For purposes of this Act the Secretary shall license individuals to engage in experiments or tests upon their submitting an application in such form as the Secretary shall prescribe, if the Secretary is satisfied that such individuals are qualified for such purposes.

SEC. 6. If the Secretary shall at any time determine that any agency or instrumentality of the United States has not complied with the requirements of this Act, he shall forthwith notify the head of said agency or instrumentality, and if such non-compliance is not corrected to his satisfaction within thirty days after notice is served, he shall give public notice of such non-compliance.

SEC. 7. The Secretary is authorized and directed to adopt and issue rules, regulations, procedures and orders to carry out the provisions and purposes of this Act.

SEC. 8. The Secretary may, subject to such terms and conditions as he may specify, suspend or revoke any Certificate of Compliance issued pursuant to Section 3 of this Act, or any license issued pursuant to Section 5 hereof, for failure to comply with any provision of this Act or the policy of the Congress stated herein, upon notice by registered mail to the holder thereof. Such notice shall set a time limit within which the holder may apply for reinstatement pursuant to such procedures as the Secretary may prescribe. A copy of any notice of suspension or revocation of Certificate of Compliance shall be sent to all agencies which are considering or have made a grant to the holder of the Certificate, and no grant or payment under a grant shall be made to any person whose Certificate is suspended or revoked to the extent that the Secretary's order shall provide for the purpose of obtaining compliance with this Act.

SEC. 9. The Secretary may refuse to accept any project-plan for filing under the provisions of subsection (g) of Section 4 of this Act, or may strike any project-plan from filing if he determines that it does not conform with any provision of this Act or of the rules, regulations, procedures and orders issued pursuant to this Act, or any of the purposes stated herein. The Secretary shall notify the person filing the project-plan of his refusal to accept it for filing or of his action in striking the plan from filing, and his action shall be effective upon notification: *Provided*, that the Secretary shall provide a reasonable opportunity for the person filing such project-plan to submit its justification thereof pursuant to such procedures as the Secretary may prescribe.

SEC. 10. The term "person" as used in this Act includes individuals, institutions, organizations, corporations and partnerships.

ANIMAL CARE PANEL REPORTS ON DOG CARE

Two outstandingly well prepared and humane articles on the care and housing of experimental dogs have recently appeared in the Proceedings of the Animal Care Panel. In the March, 1960 issue, *Preoperative and Postoperative Care of the Laboratory Dog* by N. Bleicher gives a detailed description of good care for dogs used in experimental surgery which might well be used as a model for all institutions. Not only does Dr. Bleicher give sound advice on disease prevention, but he recognizes and seeks to deal with the mental suffering of dogs which has too often been ignored in the past.

For example, under the heading "Adaptation to Environment", Dr. Bleicher writes, "The effects of sudden changes in the environment have long been observed by pet owners and animal trainers. Oddly enough, laboratory workers often fail to observe this in the care of experimental animals. In the dog the importance of environmental stresses is becoming better known. (DuBois, 1955; Smythe, 1959), and the idea that the dog should be allowed to adapt to its environment before being subjected to the stress of surgery should be given consideration. Environmental stress in the dog may be evidenced by vomiting, diarrhea or constipation, neurodermatitis, loss of appetite, nervousness, fear, and excitability. In addition, it is suggested that animals so stressed are less resistant to disease and surgical trauma.

"These stresses include the changes in quarters, personnel, food, and climate. Adaptation to each is possible with time and individual care.

Quarters. The new dog must become accustomed to confinement to the limited space of a cage that allows little exercise.* It has been our experience that some of the larger breeds, especially collies, have difficulty in adjusting to this confinement. Daily exercise periods, either in runs or a small exercise area, are helpful. The dog may have been accustomed to certain sleeping conditions of which it is now deprived. Some dogs experience difficulty in becoming accustomed to urinating and defecating in the cage. Some dogs become intimidated or excited by the proximity and barking of other dogs. Tranquilizers are at times helpful to such dogs.

Personnel. In the laboratory kennel the new dog must become accustomed to handling by new people. Most dogs seem quite affectionate from the start. Others are frightened and therefore difficult to handle. Each attempt to handle the animal only serves to increase its fright and belligerence. These animals need patience, time and gentle treatment to win their confidence. Frequent hand feeding of dog biscuits and meat tidbits is an excellent way to befriend a dog."

Quite a number of the problems so explicitly described above could be eliminated by the provision of humanely designed animal quarters, but it is clear that Dr. Bleicher is doing the best he can with the facilities provided, and the individual care he suggests is a most vital requisite regardless of the type of housing provided.

It is certain that if Dr. Bleicher's suggestions were followed in all experimental canine surgery, the mortality of laboratory dogs would be greatly reduced. For example, he states, "It should be standard practice to keep the animal in the laboratory until recovery is well advanced unless an adequate recovery area is available." Regrettably, this is far from being common practice.

Further, under the heading "*Observation*", he states: "Dogs should be observed frequently during the immediate postoperative days. Particular attention should be given to the animal's feeding behavior and to the detection of systemic infection. Rectal temperatures taken daily for

the first 3 to 5 days may aid in early detection of disease. Return of normal renal function may be determined by observing the dog's urinary output. A few moments spent quietly observing the animal's behavior in the cage can be quite helpful. If possible, the investigator should not be noticed by the dog, or no overt attention should be paid to the dog, so that its behavior will be as nearly normal as possible. Often a dog will appear normal and active when the investigator comes to the cage and handles the animal although it otherwise shows evidence of discomfort or other adverse behavior. At this time one might notice evidence of pain, and can observe respiratory movements and general behavior. This presupposes, of course, that the observer is familiar with the normal preoperative characteristics of the animal. Abnormalities observed can be evaluated in relation to the nature of the experiment and appropriate corrective measures can be taken.

"During the later postoperative period each dog should be seen daily for general appraisal of its condition. At least once a week extra attention should be given to the wound area, presence of parasites, weight, and a discussion with the animal caretaker of the animal's feeding, elimination and behavior.

"Only in this way can the individual dog be maintained in optimum health, and disease detected and treated promptly.

Relief of Pain

"The detection of pain in the dog is often quite difficult. This, unfortunately, has led many people to assume that pain is not present postoperatively. There may be some truth to the impression that the dog possesses a higher pain threshold or can endure more pain before showing evidence of discomfort. This should not, however, excuse us from the responsibility of examining each animal for evidence of pain and treating for it.

"Signs of pain in the dog are: a) Withdrawal or yelping on touch to a painful area. b) Licking or biting at an area. c) Avoiding use of the afflicted part. d) Refusing food. e) Vomiting, especially in esophageal and abdominal cases. f) Withdrawal behavior, pacing, belligerence. g) Excessive barking or howling. h) Ulcerated and denuded areas are generally painful. i) Headache is generally characterized by squinting, withdrawal, flinching on noise, back arched and head withdrawn, and photophobia.

"We must constantly be aware of the responsibility to detect pain when present and to administer suitable analgesics, local or systematic."

The article concludes: "Dogs housed in cages or on a hard surface for a long time may develop callouses on their paws that become sore and are painful (Moss, 1959). Cage padding, resting areas and exercise periods may help in prevention and treatment. Callouses should be protected with soft padding and treated to prevent infection and promote healing."

The problems associated with the caging of dogs have been wholly eliminated by Drs. A. C. Anderson and H. R. Baker, whose paper, *The Production and Use of Beagles for Radiobiological Research* appeared in the June, 1959, Proceedings of the Animal Care Panel. They write: "Two important factors contributing to the general health of the dog are: allowing at least 10 sq. ft. of pen area per inch of body height for each dog, and proper nutrition. Although several rations and dietary regimes have been tried, we have found that meat is highly desirable in the ration." They further state: "The optimum number of dogs for each pen is two, which permits companionship and minimizes undesirable traits such as jumping, pacing, and digging."

Since all of their dogs are bred for the purpose, the trauma Dr. Bleicher describes in some dogs suddenly forced into laboratory conditions never comes about with these beagles.

The conclusion states: "We feel that the four main factors contributing to a successful kennel are: 1. Adequate space for voluntary exercise. 2. Maintaining dogs

*NOTE: The Animal Welfare Institute strongly objects to the widespread use of cages for housing of dogs and urges instead the use of roomy inside enclosures connecting whenever possible with outside runways.

in pairs for companionship. 3. Proper nutrition. 4. Rational use of therapeutic measures.'

In these two articles, the needs of experimental dogs are recognized as they should be in all institutions doing work with dogs. These needs, in summary, are for friendly treatment, companionship of another dog whenever possible, thorough and capable veterinary supervision during sickness and convalescence, space for exercise, a comfortable resting place, good food and fresh water.

LEGISLATION PROPOSED ON MASS APPLICATION OF AGRICULTURAL POISONS

A chemical pesticides coordination act was proposed by U.S. Representative Leonard G. Wolf, March 31, 1960, and a companion bill introduced in the Senate by Senator Warren G. Magnuson, May 3. Their purpose is stated as follows: "to provide for advance consultation with the Fish and Wildlife Service and with State wildlife agencies before the beginning of any Federal program involving the use of pesticides or other chemicals designed for mass biological controls."

In introducing H.R. 11502, Representative Wolf said, "I have today introduced a bill to avert the serious and unnecessary losses of fish and wildlife that have occurred in many areas as a result of the careless or uninformed use of chemical pesticides." He further stated, "The need for coordination in the use of pesticides has been amply demonstrated, Mr. Speaker. This is but another example of the problems we encounter in this age of technology when man's invention of new tools frequently outruns his wisdom in using them." He quoted a statement of the Southeastern Association of Fish and Game Commissioners, February 25, 1960, as follows: "In an east Texas area bird life decreased 92 to 97 percent in 2 weeks along ranch roads in treated areas. In acre plots studied, bird populations were reduced 85 percent and nesting success 89 percent. An Alabama 9,900-acre area experienced an 88 percent decrease in its quail population following treatment and a Georgia area, even after two breeding seasons following poisoning, showed considerably less than half the normal number of quail found on adjacent and comparable untreated land."

Representative Wolf further stated, "My bill would assure that in any program proposing to drench the land with powerfully toxic chemicals, we know what we are doing before we expose wildlife, domestic animals — and man himself — to unknown hazards."

Hearings on H.R. 11502 were held May 3, 1960 before the Subcommittee on Fisheries and Wildlife Conservation headed by Representative Frank F. Boykin of the House Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries. The Animal Welfare Institute submitted testimony urging enactment of H.R. 11502.

COMFORTABLE HOUSING FOR F.D.A. BEAGLES URGED AT HEARING

At the hearings held May 5, 1960 before the Senate Appropriations Subcommittee headed by the Hon. Lister Hill (D. Ala.), animal protective organizations including the Animal Welfare Institute requested favorable action on the request by the Food and Drug Administration for a laboratory-kennel building to be located in a non-urban area. The kennels would provide outside runways connecting with individual inside enclosures for the hundreds of test dogs now shut in small mesh-bottom cages in the sub-basement of the South Agriculture Building, deprived for years of normal exercise and daylight. It is hoped that the building will be constructed in the near future. The case is urgent.

SENATOR NEUBERGER

Senator Neuberger was a public servant such as our country needs, courageous, humane and with a sense of

justice. He was most widely known as a conservationist, but all who worked to obtain enactment of the Federal Humane Slaughter Act know that his unflinching determination to see animals decently protected was of incalculable importance in bringing about passage of the law in 1958. He had a true sympathy for animals and was, in the experience of the officers of the Animal Welfare Institute, completely fearless.

To the very end Senator Neuberger was doing his best to stop cruelty. He had sent a trusted representative to inspect the test beagles perpetually caged in the sub-basement of the South Agriculture Building, and was effectively supporting action to release the dogs from this cruel and useless imprisonment. He expressed the desire to co-sponsor the laboratory animals bill. He was the chief sponsor of the humane trapping bill.

The Wilderness Bill, still pending before the Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, lost a most ardent and able supporter when Senator Neuberger died. This bill would preserve in perpetuity a tiny part of the magnificent wild mountains, forests, rivers, lakes and seashore of our country. It will be a great tribute to the memory of the Senator if the bill is passed. For our country, it will be a triumph of wisdom and restraint that will be admired for centuries. It will stand as a memorial to a truly great man.

NEW TEACHING AID (Continued from Page 1)

"To the extent that it is ever necessary to put certain questions to nature by placing unnatural restraints upon living creatures or by subjecting them to unnatural conditions or to changes in their bodily structure, this is a task for the mature scientist. It is essential that the beginning student should first become acquainted with the true meaning of his subject through observing the lives of creatures in their true relation to each other and to their environment. To begin by asking him to observe artificial conditions is to create in his mind distorted conceptions and to thwart the development of his natural emotional response to the mysteries of the life stream of which he is a part. Only as a child's awareness and reverence for the wholeness of life are developed can his humanity to his own kind reach its full development.

RACHEL CARSON"

Publication of the manual was made possible by the fine generosity of the Ingram Merrill Foundation which donated the cost of the printing. The entire contents of the manual was contributed, and the Animal Welfare Institute is very grateful to the scientists and educators who so generously cooperated in its preparation. Special mention should be made of Dr. Charles G. Wilber, Chief, Comparative Physiology Branch, Directorate of Medical Research, U.S. Army Chemical Warfare Laboratories Army Chemical Center; Dr. Dorothy D. Hammond, Assistant Professor of Biology, Hunter College; Dr. Lee R. Dice, former Director, Institute of Human Biology, University of Michigan; Dr. H. W. Youngken, Jr., Dean of the College of Pharmacy of the University of Rhode Island; Dr. Ernest P. Walker, former Assistant Director, National Zoological Park, Smithsonian Institution; Dr. L. S. McClung, Chairman of the Committee on Education of the Society of American Bacteriologists; Dr. R. Dean Schick, Professor of Science at the New York State University of Education, and to the following members of the staff of the New York Botanical Garden: Dr. Marjorie Anchel, Dr. Alma Barksdale, Mr. Charles C. Clare, Jr., Dr. Richard Klein and Dr. David J. Rogers.

Persons who would like to obtain a copy of the manual, though they do not qualify for a free copy, may purchase it at cost price, 25¢. (High school teachers, principals, superintendents, librarians, students and teachers at teachers' colleges may all obtain a free copy on request.)

ANIMAL WELFARE INSTITUTE

ADVISORY COMMITTEE

Dr. Lee R. Dice

Dr. Peter Okkelberg

Dr. Joseph Wood Krutch

David Ricardo

OFFICERS

Christine Stevens,
President

Alfred R. Glancy, Jr.
Vice-President

Roger L. Stevens,
Treasurer

Estella Draper,
Executive Secretary

Mary M. Richards,
Assistant Treasurer

164

COMPANION BILLS TO PROTECT LABORATORY ANIMALS INTRODUCED IN HOUSE

The Hon. Martha Griffiths (Mich.) introduced in the United States House of Representatives on June 9, 1960 a companion bill to Senator John Sherman Cooper's S. 3570 for the humane treatment of laboratory animals; and on June 14th, the Hon. Cleveland M. Bailey (West Virginia) also introduced an identical bill. Representative Griffiths' record as a humane legislator is a highly successful one. She introduced the first humane slaughter bill in the House in 1956, and the Federal Humane Slaughter Act was passed in 1958. Representative Bailey is a distinguished senior member of the House Committee on Education and Labor.*

Auguring well for prompt passage of the laboratory animals bill is the fine support given by such newspapers as the *Louisville Courier-Journal*, the *Washington Post*, the *Washington Star*, the *Cincinnati Enquirer*, the *Troy (N.Y.) Times-Record*, the *Progress-Index* (Petersburg, Va.), the *Columbian* (Vancouver, Wash.), the *Waco (Tex.) News-Tribune*, the *Asbury Park (N.J.) Evening Press*, the *Tacoma (Wash.) Daily News Tribune*, the *Hartford (Conn.) Courant*, the *Dayton (Ohio) Daily News*, the *Meriden (Conn.) Record-Journal* and the *Springfield (Mass.) Daily News*, *Waterbury (Conn.) American*, *Bergen (New Jersey) Evening Record*, *Peru (Indiana) Republican*, *Asheville (North Carolina) Citizen*, *Review Press and Reporter* (Bronxville, N.Y.), *Louisville (Kentucky) Times*, *Christian Science Monitor*, *Jefferson (Ohio) Gazette*, *Town Crier*, *Westport (Conn.)*, *Sacramento (Calif.) Bee*, *Modesto (Calif.) Bee*, *Fresno (Calif.) Bee*, *Fort Wayne (Indiana) News Sentinel*.

At both extremes, however, the battle against the bill is raging with so little regard for truth that it is necessary to correct in the following pages at least some of the fantastic allegations which have been made. They range from the accusation of the National Society for Medical Research that the bill is based on a Nazi statute which caused people to be substituted for animals in experiments, to the charge by the National Anti-vivisection Society that "the bill would cover only about 1% of the vivisection perpetrated in this country, and that adversely." According to the NAVS, "if this bill becomes law, animals which should be, and perhaps have been, household pets, will suffer more Hell than they have ever undergone before."

It is to be hoped that decent and intelligent scientists and animal protective workers will not be misled by the false statements directed at them by the NSMR and the NAVS and their allies. (The Humane Society of the United States has provided active assistance to the National Anti-Vivisection Society which duplicated and distributed nationally, by permission, the HSUS statement in opposition to the Cooper bill even before HSUS members had an opportunity to read it in their own bulletin.)

Following is some editorial comment on the bill, and beginning on page 2, columns are devoted to the correction of NAVS and NSMR assertions.

The Courier-Journal, Louisville, Kentucky, May 25, 1960 MEN OWE JUSTICE TO THE ANIMALS WHO SAVE LIVES

"Millions of animals are used every year for scientific experiments in the laboratories of America. Countless human lives have been saved by the knowledge gleaned from these adventures. Every person who has sat in a sick room and watched a patient win the battle against death with the aid of new drugs and new methods of treatment should offer up a prayer of thanks for the laboratory work that has brought such succor to suffering mankind.

Those who rejoice in the miracle of modern science could do so with a truly full heart if they could be assured that the animals used for experimentation have not suffered unneeded pain in the process. No such assurance has been possible up to the present. Now it is offered, in large degree, if Congress can be persuaded to pass a bill introduced by John Sherman Cooper of Kentucky and 11 other Senators. It is officially known as S. 3570.

Its Authority Limited

The Cooper Bill's purpose is "to provide for humane treat-

ment of animals used for research." Its authority extends only to animals used by recipients of grants from the United States Government or one of its agencies or instrumentalities. This will in fact cover a large majority of the laboratory animals, however. Also, the bill will place the Federal Government in the position of offering standards of decent practice for all other agencies using animals for experimentation.

The bill sets up a system of licensing for all such work conducted or financed by the government. Licenses would be issued by the Secretary of Health, Education and Welfare, whose office would also keep full records of all experiments conducted under the bill's terms.

The legislation establishes rules which every licensee must follow, or suffer the loss of his license. These include for every laboratory animal "a comfortable resting place, adequate space and facilities for normal exercise and adequate sanitation, lighting, temperature control and ventilation." There must also be "adequate food and water," and a ban against "unnecessary or unavoidable pain through neglect or mishandling."

In the operating process, the bill requires the use of anesthesia to prevent pain "during and after the experiment, except to the extent that the use of anesthetics would frustrate the object of the experiment." This section is typical of the practical and moderate tone of the bill.

A Sensible Balance

The whole measure strikes a sensible balance between the needs of medical research and the demands of humane treatment for animals. Because of its very moderation, it will displease extremists on both sides. Those who oppose vivisection for even the best purposes will condemn it. Those, on the other hand, who regard the welfare of animals as being of no consequence whatever in experiments for the benefit of the human race will be impatient of the bother caused by the bill's licensing requirements.

Surely there are many millions of Americans, however, who want scientific experiments to continue, but who also want to feel that human beings are not benefiting by the unnecessary agony to dumb animals. Their voices should be raised in behalf of the Cooper Bill. They will need to speak loudly and publicly, however, if they hope to overcome the outcries of small but highly vocal minority groups who are bound to oppose the measure.

The Washington Post, June 6, 1960 ANIMALS AND RESEARCH

Nearly a century ago, in response to a petition to the government signed by Charles Darwin, Thomas Huxley, Edward Jenner and some other distinguished scientists, Great Britain adopted legislation designed to prevent the infliction of needless suffering upon animals used in laboratories for research purposes. The United States has no comparable national legislation. A bill is now to be submitted to Congress, however, to provide for the humane treatment of animals used in experiments and tests by recipients of grants from the United States and by governmental agencies. Carefully drafted so that it will in no way inhibit or impede genuine research, such legislation deserves support.

Two postulates should be recognized. One is that experiments involving pain and death for animals have enlarged man's knowledge and brought great gifts to humanity; such experiments are, therefore, entirely justified. The other postulate is that needless pain is often inflicted on living creatures through carelessness, callousness, ignorance and wanton neglect in handling animals; the infliction of such suffering is unjustifiable cruelty demeaning to human beings. The aim of any legislation in this area must be to promote the one and prevent the other.

Real research will not be restricted by a law requiring decent care, feeding and housing of animals awaiting experimentation. In many experiments, it will not be inhibited by a little extra effort expended to anesthetize animals or to put them out of their misery when the experiment has been completed. The standards ought to be fixed by scientists themselves and they ought to make ample allowance even for remote possibilities of advancing human knowledge. But some setting and enforcement of standards are necessary to keep sadism from being confused with science.

[Inadvertently Edward instead of William Jenner appeared in the above.]

The Troy (N.Y.) Times-Record, June 6, 1960 PAY A DEBT WITH KINDNESS

Research laboratories of America use many animals for experiments which have saved countless lives in the past and will save many in the years ahead. These animals are sacrificed to test drugs and new medical treatment methods so that humanity may have a longer and better life.

Because of the boon these animals make possible for mankind the least that can be done is to make certain they do not suffer needless pain. This is the goal of the Cooper bill now before Congress.

The bill requires that laboratories keep a record of each experiment and provide proper treatment of animals, including a comfortable resting place, adequate space for exercise, proper sanitation and ventilation, and sufficient food and water.

These are minor considerations in return for what these experiments mean to humanity. The bill makes no attempt to curtail either scope or number of experiments which are so productive of blessings to mankind. This is an effort to strike a balance between the needs of science and the demands of humane treatment. The Cooper bill should be passed.

(Continued on Page 4)

*As the Report goes to press, news has arrived of the introduction by the Hon. James Oliver of Maine, of a third identical bill in the House of Representatives.

OPPOSITION TO THE COOPER BILL

The National Society for Medical Research

The National Society for Medical Research has issued a news release in which very serious allegations having no foundation in fact are made about the Cooper bill for the humane treatment of laboratory animals.

According to the NSMR, "The Cooper bill is identical in its major provisions to the German law adopted when the Nazis first came into power in 1933. The Nazi law was sponsored by Hermann Goering, who was then Honorary President of the German National Antivivisection Society. The Goering law did not prohibit animal experiments but so encumbered animal experimentation that it was cited at the Nuremberg trials as one reason why some Nazi experimenters turned to the use of prisoners in concentration camps."

It is interesting to review the history of the NSMR's exploitation for propaganda purposes of the fact that a rather weak and ineffective law relating to animal experimentation was passed under the Nazi regime in Germany. In the beginning, the NSMR referred to it regularly as an "anti-vivisection law" which required people to be substituted for animals in experiments. For example, in its pamphlet "38 Common Questions, Authoritative Answers", published by the NSMR "in the interest of public enlightenment", the following appears: "*Is Animal Experimentation Outlawed by any Country?* No. The only country that ever tried an anti-vivisection law was Germany under Hitler. Buchenwald, Dachau and Auswitz, where political prisoners were arbitrarily used for animal experimentation, are monuments to the Hitler anti-vivisection ideal."

As recently as May 30, 1960, this same story was being given out to the *Tampa (Florida) Tribune* which printed the following: "*Nazis Used People*. Dr. David Baumann, director of post-graduate training at Tampa General Hospital, pointed out that Germany under the Nazi rule banned experiments on animals and used humans instead." Apparently Dr. Baumann doesn't know that the NSMR has backed away from this version of the story.

On April 29, 1957, Edward M. Johnson, Assistant Executive Secretary of the NSMR, had a letter published in the *Akron (Ohio) Beacon Journal* which concluded with the following sentence: "The only national anti-vivisection law ever passed anywhere in the world was signed in Nazi Germany, 1933, by Adolf Hitler." In response to a request from the Animal Welfare Institute for a copy of this law, Mr. Johnson replied, "We have looked up the German law, have found that it is still in effect and have found that it does not prohibit or even seriously encumber animal experimentation."

Thus it may be seen that the NSMR offers three different choices of interpretation of the German law: it abolished animal experiments — it doesn't abolish or even seriously encumber animal experimentation — it so encumbers animal experimentation that scientists have to use humans instead. Obviously, the law on animal experiments had nothing to do with human experimentation in Germany. The correspondence cited in "Doctors of Infamy" shows that the first doctor to obtain permission to use humans pleaded that he had done tests with large animals and now needed to try them on people.

The NSMR statement that the major provisions of the German law are identical with those of the Cooper bill is untrue. The German law is not an effective or well-drafted piece of legislation. It does not give adequate protection to laboratory animals, and no sincere humanitarian would want to see it enacted in this country.

Actually, the German law is much more like the NSMR's own regulations accompanying the procurement bills such as the Hatch-Metcalf Act in New York. The Cooper bill is not a criminal statute, but the German law and the NSMR-sponsored laws are. Also, both the NSMR and German laws vest authority in the director of the laboratory and do not license or require reports from individual scientists as the Cooper bill does. The most important distinction of all is the fact that neither the NSMR-sponsored laws nor the German law have resulted in humane treatment of laboratory animals, whereas the Cooper bill and the British Act on whose main principles it is based are sound and effective humane measures.

The NSMR dismisses the British Act in one sentence: "The Cooper bill is also similar to the British law of 1876, except that unlike the British law, it does not re-

(Continued on Page 3, Column 1)

The National Anti-Vivisection Society

Clarence Richard of the National Anti-Vivisection Society has seen fit to publish a parody of the Cooper bill, which he describes as "An Act, To license the inhumane treatment of animals." His hostility seems to be equally divided between science and the government, as he begins:

"Be it enacted by the proper parties, in formal meeting assembled,

"That it is declared to be the policy of the authorities that animals used for scientific experiments and tests shall be required to suffer the most excruciating pain and the most devastating fright when the vivisector deems this desirable in the fulfillment of his experiment; that they shall be used in preference to other methods of experiment because they are readily available, inexpensive, compliant, and only animals anyway. . ."

This contempt for the "authorities" and the "vivisectors" also extends to the provisions of the bill. He seems to find it absurd and reprehensible that the bill should require that experimental animals be given adequate food and water. He is amused that the bill requires adequate sanitation, temperature control and ventilation in animal quarters. As he puts it: "Animals must not be permitted to die by freezing, over-heating or suffocating, until they are actually in the experimental laboratory." Mr. Richard omits any reference to the section which requires the use of anesthesia; this is surprising, as in previous publications he has stated: "Of all the factors contributing to the continuation of suffering in laboratories, anesthetics is the most far reaching and important . . . the public is anesthetized, not the animals."

The National Anti-Vivisection Society opposes any improvement in the care and housing of laboratory animals with the same enthusiasm that it expends in condemning anesthetics. Clearly if there were no more abuses of laboratory animals, the "vital need" which the Society conceives of itself as filling would dwindle.

Mr. Richard concludes his parody:

"Sec. 9. The term 'person' as used in this Act includes institutions, organizations, corporations, and partnerships. To sum up: vivisectors, personal and corporated."

He goes on to say: "This bill is a snare, a delusion and a fraud." He explains that only one per cent of vivisectors, personal and corporated, would be affected by the bill. He states that the bill provides no penalties. He states that the bill puts "regulation in the hands of the vivisectors." Differing in this from Dr. Dragstedt, he states that "the proponents of this bill are well intentioned people. However, the road to Hell is paved with good intentions." He states that the bill is "monstrous" and that it will cause experimental animals to "suffer more Hell than they have ever undergone before."

These extracts from the voluminous literature which the anti-vivisection societies have been circulating against the Cooper bill should be sufficient to illustrate their position on it. They combine untrue statements about the scope and application of the bill with the most impassioned rejection of its every principle. They consider its proponents to be on the road to Hell. They believe it will lead to "the most shocking cruelty of the 20th century."

In short, it is not their bill.

For the record, it is necessary to refute the false statements about the Cooper bill which the National Anti-Vivisection Society has been circulating:

1. *That the bill would protect only about one per-cent of experimental animals.* The Cooper bill would protect all animals used in all research institutions which receive Federal money for research. This includes every medical school in the country. It includes virtually every university in the country. It includes all agencies of the U.S. Government which use animals for research. It includes hospitals, institutes and other laboratories, the major non-profit research institutions. It is fantastic to assert that these institutions use only one per cent of experimental animals. They use the vast majority of experimental animals.

2. *That there are no effective penalties in the bill.* The penalty in the bill is the suspension or revocation of license to experiment on animals. The bill requires that no scien-

(Continued on Page 3, Column 2)

The National Society for Medical Research

require surgeons to make their first operations on human patients." Of course, the British law has no such requirement. It does have a prohibition against using live animals for the sole purpose of attaining manual skill; however, properly conducted experimental operations on living animals are completely in consonance with the Act, and any necessary student work may be done on decerebrate animals which are not considered to be alive within the meaning of the Act. (In the Cooper bill there is no reference to manual skill, and students may use living animals if they are fully anesthetized and not allowed to recover consciousness.)

Dr. Lester R. Dragstedt, President of the NSMR, is quoted as saying, "It does not seem logical to suppose that the bill represents a sincere effort to improve the care of laboratory animals." Every one of the fourteen legislators sponsoring this bill is unquestionably sincere in seeking a legal guarantee not only for improved care but for overall humane treatment of laboratory animals. Imputation of improper motives on the part of the very distinguished members of the United States Senate and House of Representatives sponsoring the measure is of a piece with the further statement that "the Cooper bill only proposes to create a cops-and-robbers game to drain away the time and resources of scientists who are trying to find better ways to save lives and alleviate suffering." It may be that Dr. Dragstedt's conception of the Cooper bill as a "cops-and-robbers game" explains his seeming inability to grasp its purpose and procedures. We had thought that it was only the most extreme anti-vivisectionists who believe that scientists feel the urgent necessity of hiding their activities. In Britain, all the inspectors have medical qualifications. Their presence in laboratories should not rouse feelings akin to those of an escaping criminal in biologists whose consciences are clear. Certainly, it has not done so in England.

Disrespect for the intelligence of ordinary animal owners is painfully evident in the NSMR President's assertion that "No pet owner spends as much for special diets, medicines, equipment and professional care as is spent on test animals. This is because a stray germ or an unanticipated physical condition in a test animal can waste all of the work put into a piece of research." Why, then, have representatives of the AWI visiting laboratories seen dogs too sick to stand up, soaked with hoses and left drenched; other groups of dogs covered with mange or suffering from distemper; colonies of coughing rats, of mice scratching themselves uninterruptedly; of chickens in cages so low they could not raise their heads; of rabbits compelled to crouch in one position because of cages too small to stretch out or turn around in? Why are the simplest rules of hygiene flouted in animal rooms so overcrowded that the probability of epizootics is very high even if the utmost precautions were taken?

It may be that Dr. Dragstedt's boast about the huge amount of money spent on "special diets, medicines, equipment and professional care" for test animals is true. These expenditures could certainly be reduced and the taxpayers' money saved if the simple, basic needs of animals for a comfortable resting place, room for normal exercise, fresh water and adequate food, air and light were not so often denied them.

SENATOR HUMPHREY PRESERVES THREATENED INTEGRITY OF HUMANE SLAUGHTER ACT

"The National Provisioner" in its June 11, 1960 issue announced: "The biggest buyer of meat for the U.S. Government made a cavity, if not a hole, in the teeth of the Federal Humane Slaughter Act as another State law with criminal penalties went on the books in Massachusetts and action on an even more stringent measure was postponed until fall by the New Jersey Legislature. In announcing its procedure for implementing the Federal law which becomes effective July 1, the Military Subsistence Supply Agency, purchaser of all meat for the Armed Forces, said it will require certification of compliance with the humane slaughter regulations only in contracts exceeding \$2,500. The Agency, through its Chicago headquarters and 10 regional buying offices, purchases about 500 million pounds of meat and meat products a year. Although the figures are not broken down by size of contract, a considerable

The National Anti-Vivisection Society

tist without a license to experiment on animals shall be paid Federal money under a research grant for experiments in which animals are used, nor shall he experiment on animals in an institution receiving government funds for research. Thus, the loss of license to experiment would mean the loss of all Federal funds for research granted to the scientist, and of the right to experiment on animals in a government supported laboratory.

3. *That the bill would not be enforced.* The NAVS offers four different and conflicting proofs that the bill would not be enforced.

1. That it is similar to the British Act, which does not protect laboratory animals, and

2. That it is similar to the California statute, which does not protect animals, and

3. That inspectors would not know what was being done in laboratories because they would not have "competence to evaluate the work done in vivisectional laboratories" and so would be unable to enforce the Act,

4. That the inspectors would know all too well what was being done in "vivisectional laboratories" but would refuse to report abuses because they would be officials of the Department of Health, Education and Welfare, which is "notoriously sympathetic to the views of the medical research group."

We submit that:

1. The Cooper bill is similar to the British Act; and the British Act is the most practical and effective legislation in this field which has ever been enacted. It protects animals and does not hinder responsible research.

2. The Cooper bill is not similar to the California statute, which is not effective for the protection of laboratory animals because it does not make the individual scientist responsible for his animals. The California law licenses laboratories, but not individual scientists. Without the individual responsibility of each scientist for his animals on which the British Act and the Cooper bill are based, enforcement of humane standards is impossible. It is not feasible to penalize an entire institution for the offenses of a few individuals working there, and the practical result of such legislation is that abuses are not corrected, because the legal workings of the bill are not practicable for enforcement.

3. There is no foundation for a suggestion that the inspectors would not be competent men with medical training which would enable them to give an accurate evaluation of the procedures being used in experiments on animals. In England, the inspectorate is composed of men with medical training, though not of men active in the field of research.

4. It is neither necessary nor desirable that the inspectorate should hate medical men. Rather, the inspectorate should consist of responsible government officials who are concerned with enforcing the law of the land and have sufficient technical knowledge to do so. The Department of Health, Education and Welfare is ideally competent to enforce the Act because it contains a balance of scientists who can advise on technical matters and of administrative officials who are able to contribute the judgment of the layman to the opinions of the scientists in reaching decisions.

portion of that volume is understood to be acquired in lots of \$2,500 or less."

Senator Hubert H. Humphrey and Representative W. R. Poage, chief sponsors of the legislation in the Senate and House, and Representative Martha Griffiths immediately pointed out that such an attempted exemption was illegal. Senator Humphrey said on the Senate floor:

"... there is a law which even the U.S. Army does not have authority or power to abrogate. That law was passed by the Senate, by the House of Representatives, and signed by the President. I am the author of the Humane Slaughter Act, and I intend to see that the act is fulfilled.

"The Act will go into effect July 1. We allowed 2 years' time for the slaughterhouses to get themselves into conformity and compliance with the Act. The act provides:" [here Senator Humphrey quoted relevant sections of the law]. He then continued: "The law is clear. The only possibility of exemption is by the President of the United States or by the Congress to meet the requirements of procurement in a national emergency. The law specifically states that no agency or instrumentality of the Federal Government shall make any purchase — and I underscore the word 'any' — of any meat product from any slaughterer who has affiliates that in

(Continued on Page 4)

SENATOR HUMPHREY PRESERVES

(Continued from Page 3)

any way do not subscribe to and fulfill the requirements of the Humane Slaughter Act.

"The U.S. Army had better get in line. I do not care who the lawyer is who wrote the exemption for the Secretary of the Army. There are no exemptions in this law. The law is specific.

"The packers have had from a year and a half to 2 years to bring themselves into compliance. A vast amount of purchases of meat products for the Army fall into the classification of \$2,500 a year or less. The Assistant Secretary of the Army for Logistics, Courtney Johnson, is supposed to be, according to my information, the official who authorized this exemption. He, of course, is responsible for the administrative application of the Humane Slaughter Act insofar as purchases of meat products for the Army are concerned.

"I respectfully suggest to Mr. Courtney Johnson, who is a competent and able man, that he look at the law again, and that he call in his legal advisers and get in step with the law. There are no exemptions, and I do not intend to see the law emasculated by the Department of the Army. I was afraid of this when we passed the act. That is why the law was written as expressly and explicitly as it was. If we go back to the hearings we find that the feeling of suspicion I had at that time is well documented. I felt that if we permitted any exemptions other than for national emergencies, we would find some agency, such as the Defense Department, which can always claim that an exemption is for the security of the country, offering such exemption to ease the impact of the law or to accommodate its own bookkeeping.

"It requires no more bookkeeping or intelligence in the procurement section of the Army to procure meat products according to law than it does to avoid the law. It required a good deal more time to figure out how to evade the law and avoid its impact. I suggest that the Department of the Army get in step at once. It is out of step. I propose that those in charge of this activity read the act and comply with its provisions.

"With respect to the processors and those who are making these meat products available to the Army, I suggest that, despite the exemption which is granted them by the Army, they are in violation of the law, and I would suggest that they reexamine their contracts with the Army, because the

law is that eligibility must be certified. Eligibility means certification of full compliance with the standards of the Humane Slaughter Act. The one in violation is subject to criminal penalties. I do not wish to see any of the packinghouses brought into court through another department of the Government and charged with criminal violation or the violation of a law which invokes criminal penalties. So for the benefit of those processors who are apparently taking at face value the exemption of the Army, an exemption which is null and void, which is meaningless, which is ineffective and without sanction, I suggest that the processors call the Army at once and say that they do not want to involve themselves in this kind of activity. This is a case of an instrumentality of the Federal Government leading private industry into a violation of the law; and the Army of the United States does not have that much authority.

"The processors can be taken to court — and they most likely will be — by one of the associations or one or more competitors which are interested in the enforcement of the Humane Slaughter Act. I hope that no such action will take place because I do not wish to do any disservice to the processors. So I suggest to the Army that it get busy in a hurry and revise its order.

"I invite the attention of Senators to the *National Provisioner*, the magazine from which I read, which is published in Chicago, Ill. It serves the meat manufacturing industries. It is a private publication. In the item of which I spoke, there is a subheadline 'Army Snipes Humane Law.'

"The *National Provisioner* points out that the Army is undermining the very act that Congress passed.

"I trust these remarks will find their way into the hands of the Secretary of the Army, which will save my writing a letter to him. I trust that Mr. Courtney Johnson, the Assistant Secretary in Charge of Logistics, will read what I have said carefully, and if he does not, I intend to call upon the Department of Justice to enforce the law. The law is there, and it needs enforcement. We have plenty of attorneys who can do so. There is an office of the U.S. Attorney in Chicago that can take care of the matter promptly. The law will be enforced."

On June 14th, Senator Humphrey received a statement from the Army that it will comply in full with the provisions of the Humane Slaughter Law.

COMPANION BILLS

(Continued from Page 1)

The Evening Star, Washington, D.C., June 8, 1960

HUMANE EXPERIMENTS

Nearly all the dramatic breakthroughs in surgery and chemotherapy which have extended man's life span in recent years have relied in some measure on animal experimentation. Although thousands of laboratory animals have been sacrificed in the course of this research, no one can seriously contest its value and desirability. The least man can do in return, however, is to set standards which insure that none of these dumb animals suffer needlessly, and that they receive humane care amid decent surroundings.

These are the purposes of a bill introduced by Senator Cooper of Kentucky and 12 other members of the Senate, and we would like to add our voice to the support it has received from numerous national organizations. Basically, the bill would direct the Department of Health, Education and Welfare to set up a licensing system for any animal experimentation employed by the recipients of Federal grants. In order to be so licensed, researchers would be required to comply with specific conditions, primarily concerning the care and comfort of the animals. For the most part, the larger research institutions already take adequate precautions, but the limited instances of appalling cruelty which have been disclosed justify governmental action.

As to detailed provisions of the bill, Secretary Flemming is in the best position to comment, and his advice should be considered carefully. In general, however, the spirit of the Cooper bill steers a sensible middle course between the extremes of those who would avoid any scrutiny of their experimentation and those who would abolish entirely the use of animals in laboratories to save human lives.

Asbury Park (N.J.) Evening Press, June 14, 1960

ANIMAL EXPERIMENTATION

A bill is pending in the House of Representatives, HR 12587, and another in the United States Senate, S. 3750, which would assure humane treatment to laboratory animals. These are animals used for experimental purposes in science's effort to find cures for human disease.

These bills do not ban the use of animal experimentation. They merely seek to make it humane as, we assume, every decent person would like to see it. It must be recognized that through animal experimentation stupendous discoveries have been made which have greatly improved man's health and extended his longevity. It would be difficult to rationalize the abolition of such experimentation. It is equally difficult to rationalize the continuation of such experimentation without adequate assurance that cruelty will be outlawed.

The development of sound, healthy bodies and the conquest of disease are goals worth striving for. The physical growth of mankind is of compelling importance, but it is no more important than his mental and moral development. Physical hulks, with no sense of right or wrong, or with no thought

for anything but their own well-being would make a cruel shambles of the world in a short time. It is only as man develops a sense of compassion for other living things that he may be said to have emerged from the brute stage. Kindness to other living things is a mark of civilization.

Thus, the conclusion is obvious. If man can further his battle for survival through animal experimentation he can scarcely be condemned for employing it. But if he does not surround that experimentation with every safeguard against needless suffering he has fallen far short of the destiny he has so confidently assigned himself.

The Hartford (Conn.) Courant, June 15, 1960

HUMANE TREATMENT OF ANIMALS IN RESEARCH

Bills have been introduced in both houses of Congress to set standards for the treatment of animals in laboratories. Man has benefited greatly from medical research in which animals were used in testing new drugs and techniques. Those who oppose the sacrifice of animals in such experiments appear to think more of them than of people. Their feelings for their pets have carried them beyond common sense. The protection of animals will not be advanced by sentimentality. But it will be furthered by such measures as those now in Congress. They are based on experience and contain safeguards for both animals and scientists.

The reason for the proposed federal law is that animals are sometimes mistreated through carelessness or ignorance. Unnecessary cruelty has no connection with legitimate medical research. Some animals must suffer in order to save human beings, but the work should be limited by the demands of useful experiments. Needless pain should not be inflicted when there is no possibility of increasing medical knowledge. This can be done by setting standards for laboratory care. Recipients of grants from government agencies would be required under the proposed law to meet conditions set up by the Federal Government.

Experience in Great Britain shows that animal experiments can be regulated by scientists. Avoidable pain is not inflicted in the laboratory. Experiments involving suffering are not used for teaching purposes. Painful experiments are not repeated, once the results have been validated. And animal experiments are only carried out in properly equipped laboratories. These principles have been so well enforced that since the British legislation was passed in 1876 there has never been a prosecution under the law.

The bill introduced by Senator Cooper in the Senate would direct the Department of Health, Education and Welfare to set up a licensing system. Researchers working with federal grants would have to comply with regulations for the care and comfort of the animals. Adequate food and water, sanitation and ventilation would be required. The bill also calls for the use of anesthesia to prevent pain where possible. Large institutions already follow this policy as a matter of course but a few smaller laboratories have been negligent. Unnecessary suffering in unimportant medical research would be prevented by the adoption of a federal law.

ANIMAL WELFARE INSTITUTE

ADVISORY COMMITTEE

Dr. Lee R. Dice

Dr. Peter Okkelberg

Dr. Joseph Wood Krutch

David Ricardo

OFFICERS

Christine Stevens,
President

Alfred R. Glancy, Jr.
Vice-President

Roger L. Stevens,
Treasurer

Estella Draper,
Executive Secretary

Mary M. Richards,
Assistant Treasurer

168

CANCER RESEARCH DIRECTOR ADVOCATES WIDE ADOPTION OF LEGISLATION EQUIVALENT TO THE BRITISH ACT OF 1876

Serious thoughts about the moral responsibilities of scientists towards the animals they use were well expressed by Professor Alexander Haddow, Director, Chester Beatty Research Institute, Institute of Cancer Research, Royal Cancer Hospital, London, in a paper presented at the Laboratory Animals Centre symposium held at the Royal Society of Medicine, London, on May 23, 1960.

The opening and closing paragraphs of his paper, "Fundamental Programmes in Causation, Prevention and Therapy", are quoted with the kind permission of Professor Haddow. The AWI strongly supports his conviction that all experimental animals should have legal protection such as those in Britain have and that, as he recently wrote in *The Lancet*, "in animal experimentation also we should keep matters under continual review. In this country we are fortunate in the control which is exercised by the Home Office, but increasingly I believe that each one of us must impose upon himself the highest standards of responsibility."

* * *

"In opening this paper, I wish to convey a thought—a sober thought but one which we should have constantly in our minds—namely, that great discoveries can be made by the intelligent observation of very few animals, with little, or very little, in the way of organization. *Slide 1* takes us back to the early days of the century, when Bashford and his small team at the Imperial Cancer Research Fund were helping to lay the very foundations of cancer research, with only modest resources, through their studies of the biological characteristics and transplantability of mammary cancer in mice. We had a classical instance of French genius, when Lacassagne used two mice on the day of birth — *deux souris, jour de naissance* — and emerged with a key discovery in the production of cancer by endocrine means. Lastly, we must not forget that a great part of Kennaway's work on the carcinogenic hydro-carbons was achieved using mice of mixed or indifferent origin, in groups of no more than ten. I am convinced that these principles still apply, and that the best experiments — that is, the most decisive — are those most carefully designed, and executed with greatest simplicity. In other words, the supply of animals in ever-increasing numbers or even quality must never be regarded as an end in itself, and can only be justified by demonstration of a clear need. . . .

"In closing, may I allude to an aspect which at first may not appear directly relevant, or ostensibly, but which I believe to be profoundly so. In this country we are fortunate in having legislation, and machinery whereby this is operated, through the Home Office, designed to demand and impose the highest standards in animal experimentation. I fervently hope that any extension of the supply of animals internationally will at the same time be accompanied by, and linked with, an extension of similar measures — an example of control at its best — in such other countries in which they do not at present apply. And above and beyond such admirable official control, we must all of us impose our own control, so that animal experiment is carried out with utmost responsibility not only to man, but to the beast as well. This is an aspect which had not given me so direct personal thought years ago, but which looms the larger as the years go by."

NSMR ATTACK REFUTED

While the Bulletin of the National Society for Medical Research announced that the National Anti-Vivisection Society was probably giving "strong behind-the-scenes support" to the Cooper bill for the humane treatment of experimental animals, the National Anti-Vivisection Society circulated a bulletin gleefully announcing that Senator Cooper had withdrawn his bill and thanking anti-vivisectionists for forcing him to do so.

So great is the amount of misinformation spread by the NAVS and the NSMR in seeking to destroy the bill, that correction of even a small proportion of the misstatements would occupy the whole of this issue of the Information Report to the exclusion of more interesting and important information.

It may be stated, however, that the above two allegations are typical of the complete falsity and irresponsibility of the propaganda being turned out by the two extremes that oppose this humane measure. Readers who have honest questions about the provisions of the bill are cordially invited to write to the Animal Welfare Institute for information, and their letters will be promptly and fully answered.

Those who read the NSMR Bulletin Vol. 14, No. 2-3, will be especially interested in a letter from the Secretary General of the Universities Federation for Animal Welfare, Major C. W. Hume, commenting on the article by Dr. Wilburt C. Davison, Dean of Duke University Medical School. This excellent letter speaks for itself:

"9th September, 1960

"My attention has been called to an article by Wilburt C. Davison (Bulletin of the N.S.M.R., May, 1960) in which he attacks the British system whereby persons devoid of scientific competence are precluded from carrying out allegedly scientific experiments on animals for the purpose of acquiring spurious prestige. Dr. Davison alleges that Charles Darwin and T. H. Huxley accepted restrictive legislation only reluctantly and as the lesser of two evils, because of the anti-vivisectionist threat.

"It is to be regretted that the confusion of thought which prevails in the U.S.A. on this subject should be made worse confounded by statements which are not true, and such statements seem particularly culpable when the truth can readily be ascertained. I gave the true facts, taken mainly from the biographies of Darwin and Huxley which can be consulted in any library, in Chapter I of the *first* edition of the *UFAW Handbook on the Care and Management of Laboratory Animals*.

"In not only accepting but recommending legislation, both Darwin and Huxley were animated by a humane concern for animals, though they also wished science to be properly safeguarded. In 1870 the British Association for the Advancement of Science laid down humanitarian principles governing experiments on animals, and next year the British Medical Association followed suit. Darwin and his friends wished to implement these principles in practice and at first they co-operated with the anti-vivisectionists, but soon this became impossible. Before long the anti-vivisectionists began to substitute passion for reason, just as they and the N.S.M.R. do in America today. Nevertheless the scientists knew that, exaggeration apart, unjustifiable experiments entailing great cruelty were being performed. Darwin wrote to Ray Lankester (22 May, 1871) that vivisection was a subject which 'made him sick with horror' and kept him awake at night. Huxley's attitude can best be judged by his reaction to evidence which was

given to the Royal Commission of 1871 by a foreign physiologist. Huxley was a member of the Commission, but he happened to be absent when that evidence was given. He wrote to Darwin on 30 October, 1875: 'I have felt it my duty to act as counsel for science, but if what I hear is a correct account of the evidence K. gave I might as well throw up my brief. I am told that he professed the most entire indifference to animal suffering, and said he only gave anaesthetics to keep the animals quiet! I declare to you that I did not believe the man lived who was such an unmitigated cynical brute as to profess and act upon such principles, and I would willingly agree to any law which would send him to the treadmill.' Huxley signed the report of the Commission, which included the following paragraphs:

"Besides the cases in which inhumanity exists, we are satisfied that there are others in which carelessness and indifference prevail to an extent sufficient to form a ground for legislative interference . . . Cases may not improbably arise in future in which the physiologist may be disposed to underrate the pain inflicted. . . .

"We believe that by such a measure as we have now proposed the progress of medical knowledge may be made compatible with the just requirements of humanity. In zeal for physiology the country of Harvey, Hunter, Bell and Darwin may well endure the test of comparison. We trust that Your Majesty's Government and the Parliament of the Kingdom will recognize the claim of the lower animals to be treated with humane consideration, and will establish the right of the community to be assured that this claim shall not be forgotten amid the triumphs of advancing science.'

"Dr. Davison then goes back no less than *forty-five years* in search of a stick with which to beat present-day British practice. In 1915 he was a student at Oxford and he would have us believe that the famous Dreyer-Leishman discovery relating to triple inoculation was due to him and suffered serious delay because of delay in granting him a licence! My information is, however, that he inoculated one guinea-pig in 1915 and eight in 1916, and that was all. Delay may have occurred; there may have been good reasons for it, and anyhow in 1915 the British Civil Service was hampered by the loss of many Civil Servants who had gone to the front. Today there should be no unjustifiable delay in granting a licence if the would-be licensee is fit to have one and if he co-operates intelligently. Nevertheless the licensing procedure under the Cooper Bill is more practical than ours, which is not ideal though it works pretty well in practice.

Yours sincerely,

C. W. HUME"

LETTER TO EDITOR OF "SCIENCE" IN SUPPORT OF COOPER BILL

The following letter from the Chairman of the Biology Department of the University of Oregon, which was published in *Science* on September 23, 1960, is reprinted with the writer's kind permission.

"The bill S. 3570 recently introduced into the Senate by Senator Cooper and others, 'To provide for the humane treatment of animals . . .,' has been strongly attacked both in *Science* [132, 7 (1960)] and in the *Bulletin of the National Society for Medical Research*. These attacks have given what I think to be a false idea of the nature and intent of the bill, and of the motives of its sponsors, and prompt me to make a carefully considered statement of my own opinion.

"The issue of humane treatment itself is a moral one: To what extent are we justified in inflicting pain and discomfort on other organisms in our search for knowledge? Bill S. 3570 takes the position 'that living vertebrate animals used for scientific experiments shall be spared unnecessary pain and fear; that they shall be used only when no other feasible and satisfactory methods can be used to ascertain biological and scientific information for the cure of disease, alleviation of suffering, prolongation of life, or for military requirements; and that all such animals shall be comfortably housed, well fed, and humanely handled.' This is a statement with which, I think, most biologists would agree in principle; personally I should

feel more comfortable if the words *potentially valuable* were inserted after the words *scientific information*, but I think that the efforts of the National Society for Medical Research, the Animal Care Panel, and the American Physiological Society over the past several years have been directed toward the general aims stated above.

"The second issue posed by the bill is a practical political one: Granted that humane treatment is desirable, is legislation, and in particular this legislation, the best means to assure it? The alternatives would seem to be voluntary action by the investigators or local control by individual communities. The charges recently brought against Stanford University and the College of Medical Evangelists in California show that local action under the influence of extremist pressure groups may still endanger medical research; it seems probable that the existence of federal legislation of the type proposed in S. 3570 would do much to protect laboratories against this sort of local attack. The question of voluntary action is a more debatable one. In my own experience I have never come across an instance of wanton cruelty to experimental animals, but I have encountered numerous cases of neglect due to callousness, inadequate facilities, inexperience, or carelessness; again, it would seem that S. 3570 would help to eliminate such instances.

"The reasonable objections which have been made to the specific provisions of S. 3570 are well summarized in the *Science* editorial: 'Advance approval of experimental plans by the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, burdensome record keeping, annual or more frequent reports to HEW, additional costs . . . and a new and unnecessary amount of red tape.' As I read the bill, it seems to me that the requirements are not greatly beyond those now in force. Every application for federal research funds requires submission of an experimental plan which is approved by a panel of scientists. I hope that all of us who publish results of animal experiments do at least the amount of record keeping specified by the bill. Every federal research grant now requires an annual report. The only additional features are that the experimental plan must specify what animals are to be used and what type of experiments are to be performed; there is nothing in the bill requiring advance approval of every minor change in experimental procedure. The report, also, must specify the animals used and the procedures employed, but there is nothing in the bill to say that this must coincide exactly with the plan proposed. Compliance with the provisions of the bill will cost more, insofar as the existing laboratories do not provide adequate facilities for the animals used, but this should result in better experimental results as well as more humane care.

"The National Society for Medical Research has devoted much attention to the provision for inspection of facilities and for certificates of compliance with regulations to be laid down by the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare; this is presumably the red tape with which *Science* is concerned. At present, every institution receiving grants from federal agencies is visited—or if you wish, inspected—by officers of those agencies. On the basis of past experience, I think that we have nothing to fear from these officers, who have abundantly demonstrated that their main aim is to further research of the highest quality. Any regulations which HEW might lay down under an act of the sort proposed would, I think, not depart from this aim. In any event, the bill gives no police powers to HEW or anyone else, so that work sponsored by any but federal agencies would not be in any way affected.*

"In sum, I cannot find in this bill the evils which the National Society for Medical Research or *Science* profess to see, and I would urge my colleagues who are interested in animal experimentation, humane treatment, or both, to read the bill with care, to make their own appraisals on the basis of their own judgments, and to communicate these judgments to their representatives in the Congress.

BRADLEY T. SCHEER

*College of Liberal Arts,
University of Oregon, Eugene."*

(Reprinted from *Science* by permission)

*NOTE: The provisions of the bill cover all scientists experimenting on animals in an institution supported in whole or in part by federal funds. Ed.

NEW INSTITUTE ADVISOR

The Animal Welfare Institute is proud to announce that Miss Rachel L. Carson has agreed to serve on the Institute's Advisory Committee.

Miss Carson is best known for her classic, "The Sea Around Us", but before its publication the American Association for the Advancement of Science had recognized her work with its George Westinghouse Science Writing Award. Among her many honors are honorary Doctor's Degrees from Johns Hopkins University, Oberlin College, Drexel Institute of Technology and Smith College and the following awards: John Burroughs Medal; Henry G. Bryant Gold Medal; National Book Award; Page-One Award; Frances K. Hutchinson Medal; Gold Medal, N.Y. Zoological Society; Silver Jubilee Medal, Limited Editions Club; Book Award, National Council of Women; Achievement Award, American Association of University Women.

Miss Carson began her studies at the Marine Biological Laboratory, became a member of the zoological staff at the University of Maryland and went into the Fish and Wildlife Service as a biologist in 1936, serving as editor-in-chief for the Service from 1949-52. She wrote "Under the Sea Wind" in 1941, "The Sea Around Us" in 1952, and "The Edge of the Sea", in 1956. She is at work on a new book now.

HUMANE BIOLOGY PROJECTS MANUAL SENT FREE TO TEACHERS

Thousands of copies of "Humane Biology Projects", the Institute's latest manual for use in schools, have been sent free to educators who have been requesting copies since its publication at the end of the last school year. The 41-page, illustrated manual provides a wide variety of teaching and science fair projects in such fields as ecology, physiology, botany, bacteriology and animal behavior.

Teachers are cordially invited to write for their free copy.

Humane societies wishing to provide sample copies to schools in their area are invited to write for up to ten free copies. Order blanks for use of teachers will also be sent to humane societies and other groups who wish to call the humane manual to teachers' attention.

Some progress has been made toward stopping cruel animal experiments by high school and grade school students. This progress needs to be consolidated with practical, positive teaching suggestions such as are contained in "Humane Biology Projects". All readers of the Information Report are invited to assist in encouraging use of the manual by high school teachers in their area.

FLORIDA TAKES LEAD

A first-rate statement on animals in class-rooms, concise, humane and to the point, has been published by the Florida State Department of Education. Every State in the Union would do well to give the same sound guidance to its teachers. Following is the section on this subject from "A Guide to Science in Florida Secondary Schools" (Bulletin No. 8, Revised 1960):

"The Use of Live Animals as Teaching Aids

"In many cases, animals should be kept in biology classrooms so that students can be given opportunities to be trained in careful observation of animal behavior. This is important if students are to learn effectively the many facts about animal behavior, heredity, learning ability, natural habitats, sociological factors, adequate care as related to eating, sleeping, exercising, compatibility with other animals or those of like kind but of the same or different sex.

"A science teacher who proposes to use live animals in teaching procedures must be aware, first of all, that issues of morality may be and often are involved. It is important that the health and well-being of animals not be interfered with when they are being used in the classroom.

"The teacher must also realize that any classroom use of animals, even those that by most persons would be regarded as benign, may evoke disturbing emotional reactions in some students. Demonstrations or experiments in which animals are unnecessarily killed or are subjected to any procedure that offends a student's moral and ethical standards may, in the opinion of many psychologists and psychiatrists, be harmfully traumatic to the student. A student may 'learn' many things from classroom use of animals, and physiology may be the least of them.

"When animals are used as teaching aids in the classroom, it is suggested that these recommendations be followed:

1. Do not kill animals in the presence of students.
2. Animals shall be kept in the classrooms for the minimum time necessary for the teaching purpose. If kept over week ends or during holidays, a responsible person shall provide daily food and water and shall clean the cages.
3. All animals must at all times have a plentiful supply of fresh, clean water and healthful food, appropriate to the species.
4. Cages and enclosures for animals shall be appropriate to the species and the number of animals, allowing room for healthful exercise and comfortable existence, with provision for humane environmental conditions — temperature, humidity, and the like.
5. It should be emphasized to students that cruelty to animals is unethical and in Florida is illegal.
6. The teacher using animals in a classroom is personally responsible for maintaining these standards and for carefully considering the ethical and moral issues involved."

DR. PETER OKKELBERG

It is with deep regret that the Animal Welfare Institute announces the loss of a most valued advisor through the death of Dr. Peter Okkelberg, who was one of the first to join the Advisory Committee. Dr. Okkelberg, who was Associate Dean of the Graduate School of the University of Michigan prior to his retirement, received his Bachelor's and Master's degrees from the University of Minnesota and his Doctorate of Philosophy from the University of Michigan. He specialized in germ cell work as Professor of Zoology at the University of Michigan.

Dr. Okkelberg, who acted as Editor for the Michigan Academy of Sciences for eight years, gave much thoughtful attention to the editing of such AWI publications as "Basic Care of Experimental Animals", "First Aid and Care of Small Animals" and "Humane Biology Projects". His sympathy with the animals he knew so well as a scientist and a friend, and his belief in the ultimate success of the aims of the Institute, were best expressed by himself in a letter to the Institute regretting that he was unable to attend an annual meeting. He wrote, "I shall be with you, however, with the hope and supplication that the cause for which you are working may succeed in the end and lead to a greater control of unwarranted and unnecessary cruelty to our dumb and helpless friends. Let us also trust, that as time passes, there may be a greater understanding of the aim and purposes of the Institute and that the shortsighted intolerance to its cause in certain quarters may eventually subside. If you as chief promoters of this new movement in this country will keep in mind that little progress has been made in any field without opposition, you should take courage from the fact that truth will in the end conquer and a righteous cause succeed."

CAN-PAK'S SPEEDY AND SAFE KOSHERING METHOD

(From *The National Provisioner*, September 10, 1960)

Up to 70 cattle per hour can be slaughtered in the kosher manner with an improved restraining method and pen developed by Canada Packers, Ltd., Toronto. While this method was developed primarily to bring the plant's kosher slaughtering operations into compliance with humane regulations, in common with many humane handling practices, it has materially improved the performance factor. In conventional kosher slaughtering after the live animal is shackled and hoisted, it requires one and sometimes two men to hold the head in proper position for the shochet's knife stroke. The assistant usually has to wrestle with the animal to hold the head steady. Kosher type cattle are well-finished, heavy and have a considerable amount of strength in their necks.

The new technique eliminates manual holding and supplants it with positive mechanical action. It also simplifies the shochet's task since the animal's neck is brought in clear view. He does not have to reach down under the suspended animal to make the knife stroke.

The equipment and method were developed in following up earlier work done by a Canada Packer's task force which was charged with developing a method for kosher slaughtering that would satisfy humane requirements in a practical, efficient manner. This task force, consisting of L. T. Force, general superintendent; H. B. Yerex, plant superintendent; W. F. McCartney, beef supervisor, and W. Trott, engineer, first developed a device of the sling type. Force showed slides of this method at the 1959 American Meat Institute convention in Chicago. While this system was adequate, it was also slow since the animal had to be penned, strapped, lifted and finally manually restrained for the cut. (See page 103 of *The National Provisioner*, October 10, 1959, for details of the system.)

The group then designed the present restraining pen. It is constructed from 7-gauge steel plate with suitable frames and stiffeners; the unit is welded to minimize any bruising of the animal during restraint.

The pen is designed to hold one animal at a time. Its inside dimensions are 7 ft. long by 2 ft. 4 in. wide. The box has two fixed sections, the front and one side, and two air-lifted sections, the rear and the side adjacent to the landing area from which the animal is shackled. The height of the sides is approximately 5½ ft. with the exception of the front which is 7 ft.

One man drives the animal into the pen when the rear gate is in the raised or open position. About midway on the rear gate is a rounded protrusion (see drawings) which is 2 ft. in height and extends at its farthest point 30 in. into the pen. This gate, which can be padded for extra protection against bruising, is lowered gently with a positive action air cylinder. The protrusion aligns with the rump of the animal and forces it to move forward and extend its neck fully through the opening in the front. This opening is 32 in. from the bottom and is 33 in. high by 21 in. wide. On all edges of the opening at which the animal's neck comes in contact with the plate, ½-in. steel quarter round is welded to prevent bruising of the animal.

When the animal is in position in the pen, its shoulders are firmly against the front gate and it cannot back up to

withdraw neck and head. The animal is standing on its own feet and the only movement it can make is to move head and neck slightly.

At this point the pen operator places a veterinarian's restrainer in the animal's nostrils. This is a modified cattle leader, or "hum bug," and points of contact are rubber-covered.

The restrainer is attached to a cable from a hand winch which is so placed that the operator can use one hand to turn it and pull the animal's neck up at a 50-degree angle from horizontal.

When the head and neck are in the best position for slaughtering, the ratchet is locked. The animal's neck is taut and fully extended for the shochet's cut. There is no danger of a miscut.

After the cut is made, the restrainer is released and the animal falls to the floor of the pen. The floor is made of perforated metal with a blood drain underneath. The movable side of the pen is raised pneumatically and the dead animal is shackled by the third operator and hoisted in the usual way to the dressing rail. The side door is then lowered and the rear door is raised to allow entry of the next animal.

The Can-Pak kosher restraining pen has several advantages. It is rapid. The Toronto plant's kosher killing rate with the new method is between 60 and 70 animals per hour. No more than 10 seconds elapse between the time the restrainer is placed on the animal's nose and it falls dead on the floor. In addition to being humane, rapid dispatching precludes dark cutting beef, which often is associated with prolonged excitement of the animal.

The animal is restrained humanely while standing on its feet. There is no danger of bruising the animal through loss of balance.

Neither the shochet nor the shackler is endangered since the animal's body and feet are confined. Trying to shackle the protruding feet of the downed animal in the conventional pen is time-consuming since the shackler must avoid being kicked.

The ritual cut is always true with the head and neck held firmly. No one is trying to hold a struggling animal's head in a fixed position.

The Can-Pak restraining pen could also be used advantageously in conventional beef slaughter since the put-through rate is within the range of most killing floors. Once the animal was in position, the head would be within easy reach of the stunner who could render the animal insensible with an air- or cartridge-driven tool. The stunner would not have to waste time waiting for the head to be in the correct position, as is the case in conventional knocking pens where the animal frequently ducks out of reach. If the animal were to duck his head in the new pen, the stunner would simply follow it with the stunning stool.

Canada Packers officials estimate the cost of installing the new restraining pen for kosher slaughter amounts to around \$3,000.

The technique has received the approval of various humane, rabbinical and Canadian inspection agencies.

NEW MANUAL ON ANESTHESIA OF SMALL LABORATORY ANIMALS

"An Introduction to the Anesthesia of Laboratory Animals", by Phyllis G. Croft, Ph.D., M.R.C.V.S., is now available from the Animal Welfare Institute, at a cost of 50¢. This brief manual is a publication of the Universities Federation for Animal Welfare of Great Britain. Dr. Croft writes in her introduction, "The purpose of this booklet is to assist those who are not already familiar with the administration of anesthetics to small laboratory animals, or those who find themselves confronted with the need for an anesthetic procedure other than the one they normally use. It deals with the elementary practical aspects of the subject and is wholly based on experience in the laboratory."

The manual deals with specialized procedures which are needful in anesthetizing rabbits, guinea pigs, hamsters, rats and mice. There are sections on equipment, handling of animals, choice of drugs, administration of drugs, pre-operative and post-operative measures and emergency measures. It is a useful supplement to the UFAW Handbook, in that it treats in more detail specific problems which may arise in the anesthetization of small animals; its convenient size makes it easy to use for quick reference. We recommend it for the training of technicians, and as a reference book which should be available in every laboratory where small animals are used.

Following are excerpts from reviews of the book which appeared after its publication in England:

The Pharmaceutical Journal, July 9, 1960: "The accurate description of involved practical techniques required for the anaesthesia of small laboratory animals has been vigorously attempted in this book. The result-

ing manual should fulfill its purpose and will make an excellent introduction to the subject."

British Book News September, 1960: "The author, a Research Fellow of the Universities Federation for Animal Welfare attached to the Royal Veterinary College, London, gives in this short book detailed advice on the principles to be applied in anaesthetising laboratory animals. The factors influencing the choice of method and of anesthetic are discussed together with pre- and post-operative care of the animal. Special methods for handling rats, mice, rabbits, hamsters and guinea pigs conclude the manual. This should provide an excellent guide for the junior technician and it augments some chapters of the UFAW Handbook."

The Veterinary Record, August 6, 1960: "Some welfare societies pursue their objective of relieving suffering by showering criticism upon all research workers who use animals for experimental purposes, but UFAW continue a well directed policy of educating biologists in the proper care and handling of animals. This latest UFAW booklet, written in accordance with this policy, will meet a long felt need of all research workers."

ANIMAL WELFARE INSTITUTE

22 East 17th Street

New York 3, New York

Please send me copies of "An Introduction to the Anesthesia of Laboratory Animals" by Phyllis G. Croft.

I enclose money order (or check) for

Name

Address of Institution

ANIMAL WELFARE INSTITUTE

ADVISORY COMMITTEE

Dr. Lee R. Dice

Rachel L. Carson

Dr. Joseph Wood Krutch

David Ricardo

OFFICERS

Christine Stevens,
President

Alfred R. Glancy, Jr.
Vice-President

Roger L. Stevens,
Treasurer

Estella Draper,
Executive Secretary

Mary M. Richards,
Assistant Treasurer

DISCUSSION AND DEBATE ON COOPER BILL FOR HUMANE TREATMENT OF LABORATORY ANIMALS

During the Congressional recess, representatives of the Animal Welfare Institute and the Society for Animal Protective Legislation have devoted efforts to bringing about a better understanding of the Cooper bill for the humane treatment of laboratory animals among those who would be most directly affected by its provisions: research scientists who use animals. The Institute's President was invited by Berton Hill, Executive Secretary of the Institute of Laboratory Animal Resources, to speak on the bill at the annual meeting of the Animal Care Panel held in St. Louis, October 25th to 28th. Later, an invitation from Dr. Herbert Heist of the Wisconsin Alumni Research Foundation to attend a meeting of the Wisconsin Branch of the Animal Care Panel, and take part in a panel discussion with the Dean of the Medical School of the University of Wisconsin, Dr. John Z. Bowers, in Madison on December 14th, was also accepted. Dr. Van R. Potter, Assistant Director of the McCordle Institute, acted as moderator. Following the opening presentations and discussion, there was a lively question period in which members of the audience, comprised largely of members of the faculty and medical students, asked some two dozen questions about the bill.

Dean Bowers put forward as a reason for substandard treatment of animals the fact that the extremely rapid expansion of federal funds for medical research (from 3 million up to 380 million since the war) did not bring with it corresponding increases in quarters and personnel to care for the animals involved. However, he reported substantial recent expenditure and efforts by the University of Wisconsin Medical School to improve conditions for the animals there. He indicated that continued progress is needed and that he does not disagree that there are problems. However, he expressed a strong preference for voluntary improvement rather than federal law to bring about humane treatment of animals in laboratories throughout the country.

This is the official position of both the National Society for Medical Research, of whose Board Dean Bowers is a member, and of the Animal Care Panel. However, both organizations, while opposing the bill, nevertheless indicate a continuing wish to discuss it. With the encouragement of Dr. Chauncey Leake, 1960 President of the American Association for the Advancement of Science, representatives of the Animal Welfare Institute and of the Society for Animal Protective Legislation met with representatives of the National Society for Medical Research and the Animal Care Panel in Chicago, December 16th. Because of the inability of some to attend, no attempt at formal discussion was made. However, conversation about the NMSR exhibition booth, which is devoted to a fierce and misleading attack on the bill, led to an unusual arrangement at the Exposition of Science and Industry of the American Association for the Advancement of Science held in New York between Christmas and New Year's. Although the NSMR refused the AWI request to cover the sections of the booth which start out with the largely lettered false allegation: "Scientific Research Threatened by Proposed Police Regulation! Under the spurious guise of 'providing for the humane treatment of animals used in

experiments by recipients of U.S. Government grants' bills have been introduced in Congress that would stifle the advance of biology and medicine in the United States", it was, nevertheless, agreed that the cardboard panels prepared by the AWI, giving information of interest to scientists about the bill, might be displayed in a vacant part of the NSMR space. Accordingly, these panels were attached between the edge of the booth and a lamp belonging to a neighboring booth, so visitors who came during the second half of the exhibition period, were able to get positive information about the bill including the AWI point-by-point refutation of the nine points of opposition being distributed by the NSMR. In addition, copies of the bill and of the AWI publication, "Basic Care of Experimental Animals", were made available at the booth and the supply of the latter completely exhausted. The need for the AWI panels was made clear even while they were being put up, by the surprised exclamation, "You mean it's not secret?" which came from a passerby who had been reading the NSMR version of the purposes and provisions of the bill. The AWI is grateful for the opportunity given it to present information about the bill.

At the same time, the debate continued in the pages of *Science* which, in the December 23rd issue published a long letter from Dr. Maurice Visscher of the University of Minnesota opposing the bill, and a short letter from Dr. John R. Baker, Department of Zoology and Comparative Anatomy, University Museum, Oxford, England, as follows:

"In your editorial of 1 July 1960 you gave your reasons for opposing a bill (S.3570) which, if enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives, would control vivisection in the U.S.A. In support of your opposition you made some quotations from a book written by myself. I recognize that you did so in good faith; but, to prevent misunderstanding, I want it to be known by your readers that I have studied this bill and hope that it will be enacted, for it has my full approval. I am a licensed vivisector under the laws of my own country.

JOHN R. BAKER

Department of Zoology and
Comparative Anatomy,
University Museum,
Oxford, England."*

The AWI continues to appeal to all humane scientists to support the measure, some of the provisions of which continue to be misunderstood. Following is the opening statement of the President of the AWI given at the panel discussion at Madison, Wisconsin which was referred to above and in which a particular effort was made to clarify the most persistent misunderstandings.

"I am happy to be able to meet with you and to discuss with your distinguished Dean, Dr. Bowers, the proposed legislation for the humane treatment of experimental animals. I earnestly hope that when we have finished both he and you will wish to support the bill. In England where the prototype of the bill has been in effect for the past 84 years, it has strong scientific support. The humane tradition built up in British laboratories as a result of the law is a source of pride to scientists, and it has its practical aspect, too, for by guaranteeing humane standards in the treatment of experimental animals it provides the strongest and most reliable protection against anti-vivisectionist attack or unfounded allegations of cruelty from any source.

*Reprinted from *Science* by permission.

Word has just been received that the Hon. Martha Griffiths has reintroduced her bill to provide for the humane treatment of experimental animals. Congresswoman Griffiths' bill was the first to be introduced in the United States House of Representatives last year as a companion bill to the Senate bill introduced by Senator Cooper. She has included some revisions suggested by interested scientists and humanitarians.

"Anti-vivisection groups oppose the bill as they oppose the British Act, and it has been pointed out that the Cooper bill has caused the most startling rapprochement between the National Society for Medical Research and the National Anti-Vivisection Society who are in full agreement about just one thing: that the Cooper bill must be defeated.

"While I do not know of any way in which the bill could be made acceptable to the National Anti-Vivisection Society, it should not be difficult to make it acceptable to the National Society for Medical Research. All that would be necessary to make it similar to regulatory bills previously passed at the request of that Society, would be to remove a sufficient number of the bill's effective provisions to prevent it from being enforced. I hope that no one here will be tempted to take that course, for it is a temptation to those who make up the Animal Care Panel, scientists, technicians, animal breeders and purveyors of various types of scientific equipment as well as to the administrators of scientific institutions, to rationalize the situation and tell themselves that a weak bill preceded by a statement of humane intent would serve the purpose well enough. No one opposes the humane treatment of experimental animals in principle, and it would be hard indeed to find a man who would care to stand up and say he is against making it a policy of the United States government that experimental animals be humanely treated. But when it gets down to the practical means whereby humane treatment of these animals can be achieved, then a bevy of objections comes bubbling forth. Some individuals, for example, have stated that the whole idea of regulating animal experiments is an insult to scientists. Yet these same men have been ardent supporters of the National Society for Medical Research's seizure bills, nearly all of which include regulation of animal experiments. If I were a scientist with a chip on my shoulder looking for insults, I would be much more insulted by the implications contained in one of the regulations of the Hatch-Metcalf law (New York's animal seizure law) than by anything contained in the Cooper bill. The provision I refer to is to the effect that animals shall not be kept in cages too small for them to stand up, lie down and turn around in. I should think it would be extremely insulting to any decent man to suggest that he would consider for one moment confining any animal to a cage smaller than that.

"Strangely enough, I am told that the provision some scientists think the most insulting of all is that they should be licensed as individuals. Far from being an insult, such a license indicates that the possessor is a qualified man. No one thinks it an insult to be asked to show that he can drive before being issued a driver's license. A license to practice medicine is a thing of which a doctor is quite properly proud—no medical man considers such a license an insult. A license to experiment on animals would be no insult either but rather an indication of his competence and of the privilege to use animals for scientific investigation which is properly reserved for the trained individual.

"I think we may safely pass over the idea of insult. No unbiased person reading the bill has ever even thought of the possibility of any of its contents being insulting. I would like to add my personal assurance that I know for a fact they are not intended to be.

"Personal licensing serves a very practical purpose in carrying out the humane provisions of the bill, for it makes possible enforcement of the law without punishing the innocent along with the guilty. Laws of the type promoted by the National Society for Medical Research customarily license the entire laboratory or institution but do not license individuals. This means that an infraction of the law calling for suspension or revocation of license would put a halt to all animal experiments throughout the institution. The result of such legal draughtmanship is that the innocent suffer with the guilty or the law is never enforced. The latter is generally the case. Clearly, the Cooper bill ought not to follow this highly unsatisfactory pattern. It has long been obvious that this pattern is unsatisfactory, to say the least, for enforcing humane treatment of animals. The current troubles now being undergone by the College of Medical Evangelists, Stamford University and the California State Health Department, which Dr. Soave described so well at the annual meeting of the Animal Care Panel in St. Louis, show how bad this legal concept is from the scientific side as well.

"The British Act of 1876, on the other hand, has weathered the years without any such embarrassing incidents (which is one of the reasons why it is so heartily disliked by the trouble-making sort of anti-vivisectionist). The Cooper bill leans heavily upon this well-tested precedent because, in a complicated area such as animal experimentation, long years of experience in legislation is clearly of the utmost value. In the Animal Welfare Institute we have given this matter intensive study for the past ten years. We have been assisted in this study by the Universities Federation for Animal Welfare, whom many of you know as the publishers of the 'UFAW Handbook on the Care and Management of Laboratory Animals.' Professor Brian Medawar, this year's co-winner of the Nobel Prize for Biology and Medicine, is the Chairman of its Scientific Advisory Committee.

"As long ago as 1952, I went to England and had personal interviews with leading physiologists to ask them their views on the British Act regulating experiments. All without exception supported the Act, a few had minor criticisms which were met in drafting the Cooper bill. These men were not selected for any known fondness for animals but came from a list of a dozen or so whom my father named as foremost in scientific achievement. My father was Chairman of the Department of Physiology at the University of Michigan Medical School.

"As you know, the British Act was passed at the urging of the greatest scientists alive at that time and of the major British scientific organizations. It is my hope that American scientific leaders are no less alive to their responsibilities than were those of ninety years ago. There is far, far more needless suffering and distress endured by animals in American laboratories today than there was in British laboratories then. The need is great. American scientists ought not to oppose a measure such as the Cooper bill.

"Some are said to oppose it only because of the 'red tape' or 'burdensome record keeping' they say is involved. Let us examine this carefully. To be a modern scientist and not keep records is obviously unthinkable. The greater the emphasis on the statistical approach the more records necessarily have to be kept. This is hardly the fault of the Cooper bill which asks no more, so far as records and identification of cages or individual animals, than every responsible scientist now keeps. Some one has spread the false story that each individual animal used (for example, a thousand mice in a single experiment) would have to have a separate piece of paper filled out for it. This is not the case either with regard to the Cooper bill or the British Act upon whose principles it is based. Neither is the story true which runs that every mouse would have to be separately identified. Of course, in some experiments each mouse *is* separately marked, but where, for example, five mice in a single box undergo the same procedure, they can be treated as a group. The record would show just what the research worker must know: how many mice, what procedure, what happened to the mice. All well-run laboratories have cages or animals or both marked so that they do not get mixed up. The Cooper bill would require all to maintain proper standards in this respect.

"Another aspect of the so-called 'red tape' which has been heatedly attacked is the project-plans. Every scientist who gets a grant from the federal government has to present in far greater detail his experimental plans. He has to wait considerable periods before he learns whether his grant has been accepted or not. Unscrupulous opponents of the Cooper bill have deliberately misled many scientists into believing that the same would hold true with regard to the submission of project-plans in this bill. The truth is that the bill was most carefully drawn to prevent any possible delay. Project-plans must be pre-filed but not pre-approved. There can be no delay because the scientist is at liberty to proceed as soon as his plan is on file. Supposing that he later finds a different promising avenue of approach, will his original project-plan cover him legally? If there were no difference in the procedures relating to animal suffering he probably could. If, on the other hand, he decided to change from an experiment involving no pain to one involving pain, he would clearly have to let the Secretary know of this change.

"What is the purpose of filing project-plans? From the moral standpoint, to encourage the most humane design of experiments. From the practical standpoint, to make possible effective enforcement of the measure without needlessly wasting the time of the scientist or the inspector. If inspectors had to start from a basis of complete ignorance of the experiments being carried on, they would have to ask a great many questions, get corroboration from others, and end up, perhaps, with a confused report, aggravating to all concerned. But when the inspector, a qualified man, (in Britain all inspectors are medical men) has the facts in hand, the project-plans clearly in mind, and finds the cages properly marked, he can do an efficient job of inspection within a short time, and, if all is in order, be on his way again.

"The Cooper bill would not in any way hamper humane and responsible scientists. An even stricter law in England has not hampered them. In England, the experimental plans must have prior approval from the Home office. Under the Cooper bill, the potential delay, which conceivably might occur in our much larger country, has been completely eliminated by placing the burden on the Secretary to disapprove if he believes the law is being violated, but not to require prior approval. While this gives less protection to the animals, we believe the great majority of scientists will play fair realizing that the law is drawn in this way in order to save their valuable time.

"At the end of the year, each licensee would send to the Secretary of Health, Education and Welfare reprints of his work published during the year and a brief report on the numbers of animals used, procedures used, and names of co-workers. Thus the previous records are annually confirmed.

"As Dr. Bradley Scheer wrote in a letter published in *Science*, 'As I read the bill, it seems to me that the requirements are not greatly beyond those now in force. Every application for federal research funds requires submission of an experimental plan which is approved by a panel of scientists. I hope that all of us who publish results of animal experiments do at least the amount of record keeping specified by the bill. Every federal research grant now requires an annual report. The only additional features are that the experimental plan must specify what animals are to be used and what type of experiments are to be performed; there is nothing in the bill requiring advance approval of every minor change in experimental procedure.'

One other question has been asked concerning the Cooper bill—"Is it necessary?" To that the only true answer is an overwhelming "Yes". It is completely wrong for a great nation such as ours to be below par on a humanitarian matter such as this. This is the scientific age. The United States is the leader of the free world. Animals used for scientific purposes by us *must* receive the best possible treatment. Only federal law scrupulously administered will achieve this purpose. I urge you to join with us in obtaining enactment of the Cooper bill.

HUNDREDS OF EXPERIMENTAL BEAGLE DOGS STILL CAGED PERPETUALLY IN SUB-BASEMENT

Many members of the Animal Welfare Institute have expressed distress and anxiety over the continued imprisonment of the hundreds of test beagles in the sub-basement of the South Agriculture Building, by the Food and Drug Administration.* The dogs, housed from two to seven years in cages 30" x 36", are never removed from their cages for exercise. This cruel confinement serves no purpose and should have stopped years ago.

Urgent public demand brought some preliminary action by the 86th Congress; it appropriated \$100,000 for plans for a laboratory-kennel building where the necessary pharmacological tests could be run and the dogs housed in comfortable kennel-runways. These would provide the exercise, fresh air and sunlight which have for many years been denied these friendly, active animals who are giving their lives to protect the nation's health.

Following is a report on the current situation from the offices of the Food and Drug Administration:

"The Bureau of the Budget has released \$26,000 of the \$100,000 appropriated by the Congress in fiscal year 1961 for planning a Pharmacological-Animal Research Facility. This sum is adequate to acquire the services of an architectural engineering firm to prepare tentative drawings, make soil tests, surveys, etc. The Congress, in approving \$100,000 for planning funds, directed that every effort be made to determine the availability of Government-owned facilities which might serve the purpose. The General Services Administration is now in the process of making this determination prior to negotiating a contract with an architectural engineering firm.

"In the meantime, a considerable amount of work has been done on the site selection. The selection has been narrowed to two possibilities approximately 10 miles from downtown Washington. Consideration must be given to the availability of utilities, roadways and other services. All steps relating to the early planning should be completed within 60 to 90 days.

"The Food and Drug Administration is extremely anxious to relieve the current situation and can be expected to put forth every effort to acquire new quarters.

November 29, 1960."

Ann Cottrell Free, the Washington newspaperwoman who was responsible for bringing the plight of these dogs to light, writes: "All agree that it will be at least two years before those miserable animals will be in the new building. Two years is the entire lifetime of many!" She urges that interim space be promptly found for them where they can have exercise outside of their cages. Such interim space requires joint effort on the part of several agencies, the most closely concerned being the General Services Administration and the Food and Drug Administration. Both agencies may be addressed simply at Washington 25 D.C., and everyone who believes that dogs ought not to be perpetually caged should let the agencies concerned know. Those whose interest is primarily scientific, as well as those whose interest is primarily in the prevention of cruelty to animals, should take an active part in releasing these dogs from their grim and purposeless imprisonment which is a disgrace to our national government.

SUPPORT FOR COOPER BILL

At its annual meeting October 21, 1960, at Binghamton, New York, the New York State Humane Association passed the following resolution:

"Resolved: That the New York State Humane Association endorses the Cooper bill for the protection of laboratory animals, and urges its members to work for its passage at the next session of Congress."

*See Information Report Vol. 9 No. 1 for additional details.

AMERICAN BIOLOGY TEACHER PUBLISHES A WI ARTICLE ON HUMANE TEACHING METHODS

"The Abuse of Animals in the Classroom and How It Can Be Avoided" is the title of the article prepared by the Institute and published in the November issue of "The American Biology Teacher". Free reprints are available on request from the AWI office.

The article gives examples of painful and distressing animal experimentation in schools which the Institute strongly opposes. It states in part: "Sensationalism in the teaching of high school biology seems to us to be on the increase. No doubt the majority of our teachers avoid the practices listed below, but there are numerous cases of educators, possibly unable to convey the intellectual interest of their subject by more conscientious means, encouraging children to make cruel and pseudo-scientific experiments paralleling whatever field of research is receiving popular publicity at the time." The article does not suggest the exclusion of all animal life from the biology classroom, but states: "Prospective scientists must be made to realize that a normal healthy condition in the research animal is the *sine qua non* of an authentic biological experiment, and that it is a part of the scientist's job to see that his animals are well kept. . . . The importance of a well developed technique of observation in biology can hardly be overestimated. . . . Cruel experiments involving surgery or stress are not the training students need. Respect for living things, sound judgment, reliability, and a technique of observation will go further towards making competent biologists than will the kind of emotions aroused by crude surgery in supposed imitation of a fantasy hero.

"Students who are induced to perform painful experiments on the higher animals should first be made aware of two points:

1. What they are doing is not advancing scientific knowledge or serving any altruistic purpose.

2. The enjoyment of tumor transplantation or other simple surgery is not an intellectual pleasure; the child who takes pleasure in such practices is likely to be indulging the darkest and most destructive side of his personality."

Teaching biological principles with live unicellular organisms such as protozoa, yeast and bacteria, as well as colonies of ants or bees and the fruit-fly *Drosophila*, is suggested. Specific instructions on the proper care and feeding of higher animals kept in the classroom, for observation only, are given. These include sections on mice, rats, guinea pigs, rabbits, amphibians and fish.

Biology teachers were invited to write to the Institute for copies of the Institute's two publications prepared for school use, "Humane Biology Projects" and "First Aid and Care of Small Animals", and many have done so.

"HUMANE BIOLOGY PROJECTS" GOES INTO SECOND PRINTING

The enthusiastic response of educators to the Institute's manual "Humane Biology Projects" has made necessary a second printing of 10,000 copies, the first 10,000 having been exhausted by requests from teachers, superintendents and others. Leaflets describing the manual and offering one free copy to each teacher were distributed with the last general mailing of the National Science Teachers Association to each of its approximately 20,000 members, and over 100 responses a day are coming in as a result.

A typical comment from a high school biology teacher in Texas reads, "I have just examined a copy of 'Humane Biology Projects', your 1960 publication, and find that it is filled with valuable suggestions for beginning Biology students. The 'Preface' and 'Introduction' so well express points of view and purposes that I feel are very important. Thank you for this manual."

Another teacher, from New Jersey, requests a copy for classroom use and states, "Recently, I had the good fortune to read a copy of your most interesting booklet 'Humane Biology Projects'. I am very concerned with the number of cruel and dangerous projects taken on by junior high and even some high school students, and I feel your booklet may help these students to find challenging and yet humane projects."

The head of a Massachusetts high school science department asks for two copies of "your remarkable publication called 'Humane Biology Projects'", and an Oklahoma educator writes "I am glad you are issuing this manual, which I hope to put in the hands of all biology teachers". The supervisor of science of a New York board of education requests 175 copies so that each junior and senior high school science teacher in his area may have a copy.

The Animal Welfare Institute is deeply grateful to the Winley Foundation for its contribution of one thousand dollars toward the cost of the second printing of "Humane Biology Projects". Contributions for this purpose are invited from other humanitarian groups and individuals who wish to prevent needless cruelty to animals and demoralization of young people.

STATE HUMANE SLAUGHTER LAWS URGED IN READERS DIGEST ARTICLE

"Let Us Have Mercy on These Dumb Animals" is the title of an article in the January issue of the *Reader's Digest*. "Modern methods of humane slaughter are available and in partial use. Simple decency demands laws to enforce these methods in every state in the Union," state the authors, Paul W. Kearney and Richard Dempewolff.

Paul Kearney, winner of the Albert Schweitzer Award of the Animal Welfare Institute for 1957, has been a strong advocate of legislation to require humane slaughtering methods ever since he visited the killing floors of slaughter-houses in 1956. He testified repeatedly at Congressional hearings in Washington in favor of the Federal Humane Slaughter Act which went into effect August 30, 1960, and his accurate reporting of personal observation carried great weight. Richard Dempewolff's studies of the situation with respect to small packing plants convinced him of the urgent need to enact legislation requiring the use of humane methods in plants not covered by the Federal Law.

The article should be of much value to all who are working for such legislation, and the editors of the *Reader's Digest* have very thoughtfully made reprints available at the following prices: 4¢ each; 100—\$3; 500—\$12.50; 1000—\$18. Address Reprint Editor, The Reader's Digest, Pleasantville, New York. A limited number of free copies are available on request from the office of the Animal Welfare Institute.

Also available from the Institute's office are sample copies of the uniform State Humane Slaughter Act, approved by the Council of State Governments and the national animal protective societies. This well-drafted bill is intended to serve as a model for the assistance of state legislatures. Many humane organizations will wish to distribute copies of it with reprints of the Kearney-Dempewolff article which provides a concise summary quickly read by busy State Senators and Assemblymen. All should read the descriptions of needless suffering still undergone by millions of food animals, recognizing as the article states, "This medieval brutality is strangely out of place in the 20th century in a nation which professes the highest ideals of humane treatment for animals."

The Federal Humane Slaughter Act has brought about merciful methods of killing for the majority of our food animals. Through the enactment of sound State laws making it mandatory for all plants to slaughter humanely, this essential requirement of civilization can be brought to completion in our country.

SCHWEITZER AWARD TO HUMANITARIANS IN AFRICA

The Albert Schweitzer Award of the Animal Welfare Institute for 1960 is shared by Mrs. Isobel Slater and Chief A. S. Fundikira of Dar es Salaam, Tanganyika. Chief Fundikira is President and Mrs. Slater is Executive Director of the R.S.P.C.A. Tanganyika Division which she founded. There are nearly 800 branches and smaller centers of the organization throughout the country, which comprises some 40,000 African members. The organization works actively to protect both wild and domestic animals from cruelty and needless destruction, and to provide an effective program of humane education throughout the country.

Chief Fundikira is Minister for Land and Surveys of Tanganyika, and wildlife is under his jurisdiction in this capacity. During a recent visit to the United States, he greatly impressed representatives of the Animal Welfare Institute with his thinking on conservation in Tanganyika and the humane approach to this work which he considers basic to its success. Chief Fundikira writes of the Schweitzer Medal that he is "looking forward to the day when I shall have the honour to receive it here among my own people", adding that they will "share the joy and honour of such an international award."

Award to be Presented by
The Hon. G. Mennen Williams

Governor G. Mennen Williams, newly appointed Assistant Secretary of State for African Affairs, has very graciously agreed to take the medals to Tanganyika early in 1961 and present them to Chief Fundikira and Mrs. Slater.

In her letter accepting the award, Mrs. Slater writes:

"I honour Dr. Albert Schweitzer as one of the greatest humanitarians in the world, if not the greatest, and as part of Humane Education in this country, I try to instill into every person the meaning of 'having reverence for all living things'. You will be happy to know that these words have become known and loved by many, many thousands of our African members. And they, wonderfully compassionate people that they are, take the meaning very seriously, and put the words into practice all the time.

"There is a tremendous job to be done in Tanganyika to protect our Wild Life against almost perpetual atrocities, but the animals must be saved, and to that end every member of this vast organization is striving. The indigenous people now fully realize the great natural heritage they possess, and are only too eager to help in every way they can. On the other side, livestock also must receive all care possible, for there too lies so much wealth that the country so desperately needs at this difficult period of transition. Humane Education is the answer, and the people realise this, with the result that the demand for literature, talks, and practical demonstrations in animal care is proving a big strain on the limited resources of this Society. However, every effort is being made to cover as much ground as possible with the resources available, and the Society is assisting in a complementary capacity, the Government, to institute measures which it is hoped when put into operation will do much to save the Wild Life and promote better conditions for livestock also.

"Our new Government has started well, and all praise is due to its Ministers who are determined to set a progressive and successful course towards achieving all that the country requires for its satisfactory development — and animals are included in the future plans. This is all very heartening to a Society for animal welfare which has had to fight against so much indifference, and frustration for years past. But in all this, we do need the help from outside friends and supporters.

"This award will be a cherished possession, and I'm sure will go a long way to encouraging all our people to promote the welfare and protection of animals harder than ever."

ANIMAL WELFARE INSTITUTE

ADVISORY COMMITTEE

Dr. Lee R. Dice

Rachel L. Carson

Dr. Joseph Wood Krutch

David Ricardo

OFFICERS

Christine Stevens,
President

Alfred R. Glancy, Jr.
Vice-President

Roger L. Stevens,
Treasurer

Estella Draper,
Executive Secretary

Mary M. Richards,
Assistant Treasurer