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New UK Proposal on Lab Animals

The Select Committee of British Parliament which has been reviewing Lord Halsbury's Laboratory Animals Protection Bill [See Int J Stud Anim Prob 1 (1): 54-56, 1980] is now examining a suggestion made by Professor Robert Hinde of the Association for the Study of Animal Behaviour to create two separate bills on laboratory animal use: one regulating scientific research and the other regulating product safety testing.

Jeremy Cherfas explained the rationale for such a division in a recent issue of New Scientist (85:634, 1980). According to Cherfas, fundamental differences in approach as well as in value and predictability of results mandate separate consideration and control of the use of animals in basic research, which can lead to new medical knowledge, and routine, bureaucratized product testing, which satisfies legislative imperatives without necessarily improving product safety. Indeed, the LD50 acute toxicity test and the Draize eye irritancy test, both of which use live animals, have been criticized in Britain and the United States for their often inconclusive results and thus questionable utility in determining the safety of products for human consumption.

Cherfas acknowledges that public demand for government involvement in product safety testing necessitates the death of a certain number of animals, but argues that new legislation could help ensure that the smallest number is used in procedures which, through review of existing regulations, can be streamlined to eliminate or reduce tests of dubious value.

Biomedical research, on the other hand, will do better under legislation which guarantees that the needs and rights of animals are considered by researchers who choose to use them, but also preserves the freedom to make that choice.

US Predator Control Policy

Secretary of the Interior Cecil Andrus has issued a document stating the goals of the United States Fish and Wildlife Service's Predator Control Program as follows:

1. In the near term, preventative control should be limited to specific situations where acceptable high levels of losses have been documented during the preceding 12 months. In the long term, through additional research, our goal should be to minimize and phase out the use of lethal preventative controls, including creation of buffer zones.

2. Emphasize corrective control, utilizing nonlethal, noncapture methods and focusing on offending animals to the greatest degree possible.

3. Reduce conflicts between predators and livestock by encouraging the use of appropriate livestock husbandry techniques which decrease exposure of livestock to predators.

4. Expand the availability of extension services to ranchers.
5. Deploy resources to locations and in seasons of greatest need;
6. Redirect and refocus research efforts to support the above goals and to achieve the long-term objective of preventing predator damage rather than controlling predators.

In addition, Andrus placed the following restrictions on the use of certain techniques.

1. The practice of denning should be eliminated;
2. The use of aerial shooting, particularly in winter, should be tightly controlled to achieve policy goal (1) above;
3. All efforts will be made to utilize traps in the most selective and humane manner possible, through such practices as the use of tension devices, prohibition of bait sets, and frequent checks of traps;
4. There will be no further research or development of potential uses of Compound 1080. However, research may be continued on other toxicants that do not have secondary effects, are selective and humane.

Although denning (management jargon for the killing of cubs still in the den) is eliminated in these restrictions, no provision is made for the humane disposal of cubs if a lactating female is taken. This loophole introduces the possibility of continued denning by local predator control personnel.

Andrus also called for a five-year research program on nonlethal control methods and animal husbandry techniques and practices.

(Abstracted from The Humane Society of the United States News 25:19, 1980.)

FORTHCOMING MEETINGS


American Society of Animal Science: Annual Conference, July 27-31, 1980. Cornell University, Ithaca, New York. Will include a symposium co-sponsored by the Institute for the Study of Animal Problems on "The Role of Animal Behavior in Agriculture." Contact Dr. Clifton A. Bailey, University of Pennsylvania School of Veterinary Medicine, 382 West Street Road, Kennett Square, PA 19348, USA.


American Association for Laboratory Animal Science: 31st Annual Session, October 5-10, 1980, Indianapolis, Indiana. Contact Mr. Joseph J. Garvey, Exec. Secy., AALAS, 210 N. Hammers Ave., Suite 205, Joliet, IL 60435 USA.

Israel Association for Biuratics: Eleventh International Congress on Diseases of Cattle, October 20-23, 1980, Tel Aviv, Israel. Contact Dr. E. Mayer, Congress Secretariat, P.O. Box 9610, Haifa, Israel.

MEETING REPORTS

BSAVA Symposium

The British Small Animal Veterinary Association (BSAVA) held a symposium on the Human-Companion Animal Bond in London on January 24-25, 1980. Long neglected or taken for granted, the human-animal bond was dissected and explored by over a dozen speakers whose backgrounds included veterinary medicine, psychiatry, anthropology, ecology and sociology.

The symposium opened with an historical review of the relationship between man and other animals by Michael W. Fox (Institute for the Study of Animal Problems). This paper emphasized how perceptions, attitudes and values influence the man-animal relationship, contemporarities, and societally conditioned unethical animal exploitation. Following a cautionary note on misguided "naturalism", he described what he terms 'actualizing relationships' and developed the concept of responsible humane stewardship.

Jules Cass (Veterans Administration) gave an overview of pet facilitated therapy (PFT) in the Veterans Administration hospital setting. He discussed animal behavior problems that can arise from animal-human attachment and how to take preventive measures with animals that are used in pet facilitated therapy. He also noted that 90% of clients use parental expressions when addressing their animals, e.g., "Come to Daddy," etc. Giseler Guttmann (University of Vienna) gave an intriguing review of his studies in Vienna of people's attitudes toward pets. He reported four major characteristics of pet owners: they regard the companion animal as someone with whom to talk; they find it acceptable to keep the animal without the company of its own species; they enjoy providing the care involved in pet owning; and in contrast to non-pet owners, they were less likely to keep a pet if friends did not approve. Non-pet owners were more concerned about disease hazards and loss of personal freedom, and they did not value an animal as someone with whom to talk.

Michael McCulloch (Oregon State University) gave a particularly stimulating paper on the benefits of pet ownership for chronically ill and depressed outpatients. He urged that more emphasis be given in veterinary and medical schools to the pet-owner bond. A veterinarian should have some knowledge of the pet's family background and be more sensitized to the emotional impact of animal euthanasia. In this connection, Leo Bustad (Washington State University) presented guidelines for a veterinary school curriculum tailored to promote a greater understanding of the pet-owner relationship. Dr. McCulloch concluded that pets give joy, make people feel needed, improve morale, and help maintain a sense of humor in chronically ill and emotionally disturbed patients.
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