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pressure was also exerted on doctors through editorials in the British Medical Journal, resulting in a massive deputation to the Home Secretary of several hundred medical doctors and researchers who, on 10th July, presented a petition signed by some 3,000 members of the profession. The British Medical Association had demonstrated its strength. Influential though they were, neither the RSPCA nor the Victoria Street Society could prevent modification of the bill after this.

On 22nd July the scientific contingent met with the Government and outlined the major changes it wished to see in the bill. Amendments were instituted in Committee two days later. These included license to perform acute experiments on any species without certificate, and a requirement for special permission from the Secretary of State before prosecutions could be instituted. The latter provision was adopted and has proved effective in protecting scientists. No successful prosecution for cruelty has ever been brought under the 1876 Act and there have been only 3 prosecutions altogether, the last in 1913.

Feelings among reformists were divided as to whether they ought to acquiesce to the amendments. Cobbe felt that they should not, but was persuaded to do so by Lord Shaftesbury, who saw the bill as better than no legislation at all and a foundation upon which to build. Thus the antivivisectionists mounted no opposition and the amended bill became the Cruelty to Animals Act, 1876. The most important amendment won by the scientists is that the Act placed no real restriction upon legitimate purposes for experiments other than that “the experiment must be performed with a view to the advancement by new discovery of physiological knowledge or of knowledge which will be useful for saving or prolonging life or alleviating “suffering.”

The Act, far from providing the foundation referred to by Lord Shaftesbury, has never been amended since that day. It has kept abreast with changing trends in research only because its administration has continually been updated. In enacting this administration, the Home Office has found itself stretching the literal meaning of the Act far beyond what could ever have been envisaged in 1876.

In 1876, physiologists were searching for answers to fundamental questions of life; of bodily functions in health and disease. Today much work covered by the 1876 Act can hardly be described as experimental at all. It includes the development and testing of a wide range of products both medical and otherwise. It is largely this trend, the use of animals in routine commercial testing and the increasing numbers of animals so used, which has disturbed humanitarians in the last decade. It is a great pity that the controversy was not better resolved in 1876. Protagonists of ethical and utilitarian arguments had never come so close to agreement as they did just prior to the First Royal Commission. However, attitudes on both sides hardened during the Commission’s sittings and a polarization of attitudes took place which is still evident more than a century later.

Disillusioned with the Act during the first few years of its operation, most of the humanitarians who had campaigned for control now became abolitionists, convinced that animal experimentation could not be regulated by law. Thus the animal welfare movement was deeply and permanently fragmented. The scientific community, however, consistently maintained that the law worked well and successive governments have been happy to leave the matter there. Only two public enquiries into the subject have been conducted in Britain since 1876. The 1906 Royal Commission sat for six years and heard a great mass of conflicting evidence. It concluded that the Act had worked well on the whole and instigated some administrative changes, the main one being the setting up of a special Home Office Advisory Committee on Animal Experimentation.

In response to public pressure, a Departmental Enquiry was set up in 1965 under the Chairmanship of Sir Sydney Littlewood. This Committee made 83 recommendations for change to the 1876 Act, some of which required legislation. Apart from addition of lay members to the Advisory Committee, a strengthening of the Inspectorate and a number of minor administrative changes, the Littlewood recommendations were not implemented. Also, there has never been a full debate of the Report in Parliament, despite constant pressure maintained by humanitarian MP’s throughout the late ’60s and early ’70s. The failure of the government of the day to take action on Littlewood led to a spate of Private Members Bills at this time, none of which progressed through all parliamentary stages.

In the meantime, the public debate over the issue of experimentation grew more intense in the 1970s, and in the ’80s the possibility of Parliamentary action has become that much greater.

Sewer Science & Pound Seizure

Kenneth P. Stoller

Significant decisions are being made in the City and County of Los Angeles over a seemingly insignificant issue — pound seizure. Outwardly, the issue is a trifle — potentially inconvenienced animal research professionals vs. irate citizens who don’t want lost pets sold for research. However, on another level, this conflict has implications that reach to the very depths of irrationality — for far from fighting to promote the practice of pound seizure, scientists should be fighting to end it.

Sec. 53.11(h), L.A.M.C., came into being as the result of a special municipal election in 1950. The ordinance permits “reputable institutions of learning, hospitals, research laboratories or their allied institutes” in the City to “use humanely, un­claimed impounded animals for the good of mankind and the increase of knowledge relating to the cause, prevention, control and cure of disease.” Such institutions must be certified by “the Health Officer” when “he is satisfied (that the institutions) will use animals humanely for purposes above specified.” This ordinance was passed by the voters of Los Angeles after proponents of pound seizure cajoled voters by using a media campaign which blatantly implied that if one did not vote for the pound seizure ordinance one would be voting away one’s own life.

On October 18, 1980, the Animals in Research Advisory Committee of the Los Angeles Department of Animal Regulation submitted a report to the Department. The report represented a year’s study by the Advisory Committee of the use of animals in research, testing and teaching in the City of Los Angeles. Some of the observations contained in this report were: 1) failure of some facilities to comply
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with federal law regarding housing standards; 2) destruction of animals at one facility by injections of potassium chloride; 3) duplication of painful and otherwise distressing experiments; 4) increased stress and suffering in "former pets" placed in the laboratory environment; 5) certification of institutions (i.e., that they will use animals humanely) based on the Federal Animal Welfare Act, which only addresses itself to minimum standards for housing and maintenance and not to actual use; 6) transfer of animals sold to certified facilities to "affiliate" institutions outside the City which had not been certified; 7) no requirement for investigators to demonstrate knowledge of the physiological or psychological makeup of the animals on which they experiment; and 8) an elitist, defensive posture on the part of much of the research community.

Based on these observations the Committee made the following recommendations regarding all live vertebrate creatures used for research in the City (These are abridged):

1) All animals in research shall be humanely treated, i.e., with the kindness and compassion that exemplifies the best qualities of humankind in its treatment of sentient creatures.
2) All animals shall receive proper sanitation, protection from extremes of weather and temperatures and space for normal exercise, as well as adequate veterinary care.
3) All animals shall be separated by species when such separation is necessary for humane reasons.
4) No animal shall be subject to the immediate physical sensation of pain, or to debilitation or psychological and behavioral distress without being adequately anesthetized, and if pain or lack of normal functioning will result after the anesthesia has worn off, which cannot be controlled by analgesics during a normal recovery period, animals shall be humanely destroyed with the most accepted means of euthanasia available.
5) No animal shall be used for more than one unrelated operative procedure or for related operative procedures of the same type not united by a common hypothesis.
6) No animal which is used for practice surgery shall be allowed to recover from the anesthetic and must be euthanized at the conclusion of the surgery.
7) A veterinarian must be in attendance during any surgical procedure performed on any animal.
8) No animal will be used in medical, commercial or educational research if an alternative exists.
9) The use of the LD-50 and Draize tests for cosmetics shall be prohibited.
10) Each facility shall appoint an animal care committee consisting of five persons, one of whom shall be a veterinarian and one of whom shall be a representative of an animal welfare organization, with the power to disapprove any experiment based upon pain, debilitation or psychological suffering to which an animal is subject, order euthanasia when needed, and refuse animal models to investigators who do not evidence sufficient knowledge of the animal in question. It shall also keep records on all experiments done and their results.
11) A central overview committee shall be established to supervise the functioning of the animal care committees and to receive reports from them.
12) The General Manager of the Department of Animal Regulation shall appoint a staff veterinarian to serve as liaison between the Department and its overview committee and the research facilities and their animal care committees.

The Los Angeles proponents of pound seizure have been led by a lobbying organization called the "Medical Research Association of California." This association claims to have every local hospital, research establishment and medical school represented on its Board of Directors. It is also the parent of a number of committees, such as the Committee for the Ethical Use of Animals in Research. As in the 1950's, a media campaign was begun by medical research interests and no less than Charlton Heston could be heard telling radio listeners that a serious life or death issue would be at hand if the practice of pound seizure were to come to an end. The radio-spots contained such blatant inaccuracies that parts had to be censored by the station which was paid to play them. The idea that the end of pound seizure would significantly curtail medical science was desperately conveyed at all public hearings; in addition, at least one person with an incurable, debilitating illness could be found at any given hearing in order to drive home the point. The fundamental question which must be asked is what could motivate such an effort on behalf of pound seizure?

The use of city pound animals for research has been frowned upon for years. In 1968, Dean Pritchard of the School of Veterinary Medicine at U.C. Davis said, "...the biologist can ill afford to treat animal experimentation in the same na"ive manner as is currently the fashion. It is all too common to find multi-million dollar research projects, consuming the time of highly talented scientists, based upon studies on animals from city pounds, with little thought given to their suitability for the research being conducted..." (Lab An Care 18:230, 1968). In 1973, Dr. Thomas Bowery, then Director of the National Institutes of Health, stated in Congressional testimony that the house pet is "not a good or desirable research animal." What then is the reason for so many people feeling that it is necessary to use lost or abandoned pets for research?

One of the common justifications for the use of dogs is that they have proved very useful in the development of cardiovascular surgery and organ transplantation; however, it has been argued that the dog is a poor model for cardiovascular research. In fact, differences in the clotting rate of dog and human blood back
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13) Licensed animal dealers must submit to the City a list of animals acquired, the names and addresses of the persons from whom they were acquired, and the dates of acquisition.
14) The City of Los Angeles should take immediate steps to rescind Sec. 53.11(h), L.A.M.C., on the grounds that the ordinance has been proved unenforceable, and institute instead a prohibition against the surrender of impounded animals for research, testing or teaching, or laboratory work of any kind.

On November 18, 1980, the Animal Regulation Commissioners of Los Angeles voted 4 to 1 in favor of rescinding the pound seizure ordinance (the lone dissenting vote came from the only veterinarian Commissioner, who stated that if he had been in a concentration camp in World War II and that if he had the option of going to the gas chamber or being subjected to medical research, he would have chosen medical research).

The General Manager of the City's Department of Animal Regulation sent a comprehensive memorandum to the Mayor on January 2, 1981, requesting repeal of the seizure ordinance. The memorandum concluded that such action "...is necessary if we are to restore full public confidence in the Department of Animal Regulation and to facilitate the return of lost pets to the rightful owners."

The Los Angeles proponents of pound seizure have been led by a lobbying organization called the "Medical Research Association of California." This association claims to have every local hospital, research establishment and medical school represented on its Board of Directors. It is also the parent of a number of committees, such as the Committee for the Ethical Use of Animals in Research. As in the 1950's, a media campaign was begun by medical research interests and no less than Charlton Heston could be heard telling radio listeners that a serious life or death issue would be at hand if the practice of pound seizure were to come to an end. The radio-spots contained such blatant inaccuracies that ports had to be censored by the station which was paid to play them. The idea that the end of pound seizure would significantly curtail medical science was desparately conveyed at all public hearings; in addition, at least one person with an incurable, debilitating illness could be found at any given hearing in order to drive home the point. The fundamental question which must be asked is what could motivate such an effort on behalf of pound seizure?

The use of city pound animals for research has been frowned upon for years. In 1968, Dean Pritchard of the School of Veterinary Medicine at U.C. Davis said, "...the biologist can ill afford to treat animal experimentation in the same naive manner as is currently the fashion. It is all too common to find multi-million dollar research projects, consuming the time of highly talented scientists, based upon studies on animals from city pounds, with little thought given to their suitability for the research being conducted..." (Lab An Care 18:230, 1968). In 1973, Dr. Thomas Bowers, then Director of the National Institutes of Health, stated in Congressional testimony that the house pet is "not a good or desirable research animal." What then is the reason for so many people feeling that it is necessary to use lost or abandoned pets for research?

One of the common justifications for the use of dogs is that they have proved very useful in the development of cardiovascular surgery and organ transplantation; however, it has been argued that the dog is a poor model for cardiovascular research. In fact, differences in the clotting rate of dog and human blood hold back
application of open heart surgery to human beings by several years.

Perhaps pound seizure is an economic issue. The purchase price of pound animals is small compared to the cost of a conditioned animal obtained from a dealer or to the cost of a purpose-bred animal. The apparent economy of using pound animals in research is just that, apparent. In 1977, Bristol Laboratories (New York) reported that 59% of the 558 dogs and 75% of the 163 cats requisitioned from pounds proved unsuitable for research. Another study (Lab An Care 19:506, 1969), produced the following data: In an experiment involving open heart surgery to replace heart valves, 79 out of 85 purebred Labrador retrievers survived whereas only 55 of 75 conditioned mongrels survived. If one were to extrapolate this to 100 animals surviving the experiment, one would have to start with 108 purebreds or 137 mongrels. The extra cost involved in performing surgery on 137 mongrels as opposed to 108 purebreds would have been the equivalent (in 1969) of the cost of sixty purebred dogs, and this does not even include the surgeon’s and technician’s time, nor institutional overhead.

It has also been argued that the number of pound (random-source) animals required by research is very small compared with the number of animals that are euthanized annually. Dr. Andrew Rowan (Institute for the Study of Animal Problems, Washington, DC) testifying at the Los Angeles City Council May 27, 1981, made it clear that a very similar argument could be made for the millions of sewer rats that are exterminated every year. Instead of poisoning them wastefully, they could be trapped and used in research laboratories, but research scientists would not welcome this idea because sewer rats (random-source rats) are not standardized or characterized and are carriers of all sorts of diseases.

The Los Angeles Times accused City Council members of sentimentality when a Council subcommittee unanimously voted to rescind the pound seizure ordinance. Dr. Rowan, responding to this statement, told the City Council that if our decisions are made without sentiment and compassion we have no right to call ourselves human beings.

The deeper implications of this issue are revealed in the myopic irrationality which motivates the advocates of pound seizure, for this sort of irresponsible behavior also perpetuates a number of negative practices which can have global consequences. Nature’s love is unconditional, but her secrets are given only to those who have earned her trust, yet look how we have abused that trust in the application of our knowledge of the atom. Therefore, as we go about trying to learn Nature’s secrets, whether in medicine or in physics, it might behoove us to remember the words of Albert Schweitzer when he spoke of the progress mankind could be making if we had only a little more respect for life. He also said that it is the duty of those (that use animals for research) to ponder in every separate case whether it is really and truly necessary thus to sacrifice an animal for humanity.

On June 30, 1981, the Los Angeles City Council voted 10-3 in favor of rescinding the pound seizure ordinance, but added a codicil regretting that purpose-bred animals would now be doomed to the fate that pound animals had been spared.

Abnormal Behavior as an Indication of Immaterial Suffering

Hans Hinrich Sambraus

I do not believe that I am the only one who has occasionally been satisfied to take three steps forward and two steps back. Despite the setback, “progress” of one step has been made. At present, the task of animal welfare seems to me to be the preservation of that small bit of progress. In the animal welfare laws of various countries that have come into force in the last few years, terms like “appropriate conditions” and “species-specific activity requirements” have appeared. (These are the three steps forward.) Only the ethologist can determine what they mean in specific cases. But many ethologists who have never concerned themselves with animal welfare problems also feel called upon to voice their opinions. Because the necessary competence is lacking, the resulting judgments are often very curious. Recently a prominent ethologist felt obliged to contribute seven theses to the animal welfare problem. Only a few excerpts will be quoted here (they constitute the two steps back):

“The animal welfare law that insures the safety and well-being of animals does not protect the animal’s legitimate interests, which we cannot even identify…”

“The goal of animal welfare laws is not the well-being of all animals, but rather the education of man with respect to humanity. Cruelty to animals is forbidden only so that we will not become inured to it and be cruel to other people.”

Is it really true that we cannot say anything about the pain and suffering of animals? And if we do say something about it, is it only speculation, or in any case not objectively measurable?

I believe that much more than this can be said about the problem. Pain and suffering are feelings, and feelings as such cannot be ascertained by scientific/theoretical means. This is not only true for our judgments concerning the feelings of animals, but also for our judgments concerning the feelings of other people. One could argue that man has language, and hence sufficient possibility to communicate. But we can also simulate pain and suffering or avoid talking about that pain and suffering which we feel. Deceptive behavior therefore leaves room for error in human judgment. But let us also consider preverbal children, the mentally retarded or people whose language we do not understand. In these cases we can recognize pain and suffering from certain symptoms. Some of these in humans include the following: crying; clenched teeth; unusual movements (physical contortions): protection of wounded area; direction of attention to painful spot (looking at, touching); and breaking out in sweat. The same symptoms can also be witnessed in animals in corresponding situations. When a person confirms pain or suffering in another person or in animals, it is done only through reasoning by analogy. We ourselves know how it is to experience pain or to suffer, and also know our corresponding expressions. When we see the same symptoms in animals or other people, we can conclude that they are feeling approximately the same things that are familiar to us from our own experiences.

Prof. Dr. Sambraus is at the Institute for Animal Breeding and Hygiene, University of Munich, Veterinaerstrasse 13, 8000 Muenchen 22, FRG.