France; 2) creation of an expanded board of animal protection under the Ministry of Agriculture; and 3) drafting of stricter and more enforceable legislation.

These cornerstone recommendations have counterparts in existing policies in the U.S. although emphasis and the degree of federal involvement in specific areas differ. The need to educate the public on the needs and problems of companion animals (overpopulation, abandonment, improper care) is common to both countries. However, in the United States, the responsibility for disseminating information on companion animals has been assumed primarily by the private sector: local and national humane societies, pet food and supply companies, etc. In contrast to Micaux' suggestion that public authorities bear the cost of educating citizens in this area from school age onward, the U.S. government role does not extend beyond issuing information to people who are directly affected by provisions of the U.S. Animal Welfare Act, e.g., breeders and dealers.

The second recommendation, expansion of the existing board of animal protection in France into an agency of the Ministry of Agriculture which would be involved with the rearing, transport and slaughter of food animals, the treatment of companion and pleasure animals, and the care of laboratory animals as well as the issue of animal experimentation itself, is slightly more ambitious than the existing role of the Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service (APHIS), the agency within the U.S. Department of Agriculture charged with administering the Animal Welfare and Horse Protection Acts. (See P. Chaloux and M. Heppner, History and Development of Federal Animal Welfare Regulations, Int J Stud Anim Prob 1(5):287-295, 1980.) USDA regulates slaughter and some types of transport, but legislation does not yet cover the welfare of farm animals in the rearing stage. Furthermore, the Animal Welfare Act specifically prohibits the Secretary of Agriculture from having any say on the actual design and protocol of animal experiments. (Congresswoman Pat Schroeder [D-Colo.] has, however, introduced a bill, H.R. 6847, which among other amendments, would delete this proviso.)

The question of government regulation of animal experimentation must also be examined in light of the third proposal, namely, to increase the severity of current animal protection and anti-cruelty legislation. M. Micaux stressed that legislation must be designed to protect the innocent as well as punish the guilty. Le Monde (17 July 1980) construed this statement to be a reference to possibly unjust accusations which have been or could be made against those using animals in biomedical research. In the U.S., the care and use of laboratory animals are covered by the Animal Welfare Act; state anti-cruelty statutes are rarely if ever invoked to protect animals in research. If anti-cruelty legislation is made stricter in France, it will be interesting to compare the effectiveness of enforcement with that of the U.S. federal law. In any case, M. Micaux made no radical recommendations concerning animal experimentation, and instead stressed limitation rather than abolition, and the development of alternative methods.

M. Micaux also recommended that French regulations, especially those affecting animals in commerce, harmonize with those of other European countries. Both the EEC and the Council of Europe are working toward that end. For example, the European Commission of the EEC has drafted a regulation which would control trade in endangered species in all EEC countries rather than just in those which have already ratified the Convention on International Trade in Endangered Species of Wild Fauna and Flora (CITES, New Scientist 87[1213]:439, 1980). Regulation of battery housing of food animals and mandatory tattooing of dogs and cats to deter abandonment by owners were two specific measures suggested in the Micaux report which are readily applicable to other European countries and the United States.

Like any other country, France has unique problems in the area of animal protection, owing to myriad factors such as legislative history, cultural attitudes, economic profile and political structure. The new animal welfare policy outlined by M. Micaux, however, points up far more similarities than differences in approach between France and the U.S. and by extension, between Europe and the U.S. in attempting to handle problems of animals, who observe neither national nor political boundaries.

Current UK Legislation on Animals

Three recent articles by Margaret Cooper, a British lawyer, in the Biologist (26:33-37, 1979; 26:110-114, 1979; 27:183-185, 1980) provide a lucid introduction to various aspects of United Kingdom law relating to animal care and animal research. The first article deals exclusively with controls on animal experiments, the second broadens the scope to discuss all animal welfare law and laws to control animal diseases, and the third examines how other laws can affect biologists. The author makes little or no attempt to deal with moral issues or with the current arguments about the need for new legislation. However, there is much useful and interesting information. For example, even if one is not a veterinary surgeon, one is permitted to treat one's own animals, but not those belonging to other people. Furthermore, causing an animal unnecessary suffering because of ignorance on the part of the owner practice makes one liable to prosecution under the UK Protection of Animals Act, 1911.
Comparison of French and U.S. Animal Welfare Policies

In October 1979, the French parliament appointed M. Pierre Micaux to the Ministry of Agriculture to undertake a study of the rearing and slaughter of food animals, the use and care of animals in laboratories, and companion animal problems. Micaux (known less formally in France as “Monsieur Animaux”) and his collaborators made unannounced visits to laboratories, slaughterhouses, kennels, and breeding and rearing facilities. They found that in many cases, regulations were not being observed, and in others, regulations needed to prevent unnecessary suffering did not exist. Micaux also gathered information on how comparable problems were being handled in other countries including the United States.

Last July, “‘M. Animaux’” presented the results of his study to President Giscard d’Estaing in a report which contained three major recommendations: a new French animal welfare policy: 1) launching of a vast public information campaign within France; 2) creation of an expanded board of animal protection under the Ministry of Agriculture; and 3) drafting of stricter and more enforceable legislation.

The cornerstone recommendations have counterparts in existing policies in the U.S. although emphasis and the degree of federal involvement in specific areas differ. The need to educate the public on the needs and problems of companion animals (overpopulation, abandonment, improper care) is common to both countries. However, in the United States, the responsibility for disseminating information on companion animals has been assumed primarily by the private sector: local and national humane societies, pet food and supply companies, etc. In contrast to Micaux’ suggestion that public authorities bear the cost of educating citizens in this area from school age onward, the U.S. government role does not extend beyond issuing information to people who are directly affected by provisions of the U.S. Animal Welfare Act, e.g., breeders and dealers.

The second recommendation, expansion of the existing board of animal protection in France into an agency of the Ministry of Agriculture which would be involved with the rearing, transport and slaughter of food animals, the treatment of companion and pleasure animals, and the care of laboratory animals as well as the issue of animal experimentation itself, is slightly more ambitious than the existing role of the Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service (APHIS), the agency within the U.S. Department of Agriculture charged with administering the Animal Welfare and Horse Protection Acts. (See P. Chaloux and M. Heppner, History and Development of Federal Animal Welfare Regulations, Int J Stud Anim Prob 1(5):287-295, 1979; 2(1) USDA regulates slaughter and some types of transport, but legislation does not yet cover the welfare of farm animals in the rearing stage. Furthermore, the Animal Welfare Act specifically prohibits the Secretary of Agriculture from having any say on the actual design and protocol of animal experiments. (Congresswoman Pat Schroeder [D-Colo.] has, however, introduced a bill, H.R. 6847, which among other amendments, would delete this proviso.)

The question of government regulation of animal experimentation must also be examined in light of the third proposal, namely, to increase the severity of current animal protection and anti-cruelty legislation. M. Micaux stressed that legislation must be designed to protect the innocent as well as punish the guilty. Le Monde (17 July 1980) construed this statement to be a reference to possibly unjust accusations which have been or could be made against those using animals in biomedical research. In the U.S., the care and use of laboratory animals are covered by the Animal Welfare Act; state anti-cruelty statutes are rarely, if ever invoked to protect animals in research. If anti-cruelty legislation is made stricter in France, it will be interesting to compare the effectiveness of enforcement with that of the U.S. federal law. In any case, M. Micaux made no radical recommendations concerning animal experimentation, and instead stressed limitation rather than abolition, and the development of alternative methods.

M. Micaux also recommended that French regulations, especially those affecting animals in commerce, harmonize with those of other European countries. Both the EEC and the Council of Europe are working toward that end. For example, the European Commission of the EEC has drafted a regulation which would control trade in endangered species in all EEC countries rather than just in those which have already ratified the Convention on International Trade in Endangered Species of Wild Fauna and Flora (CITES) (New Scientist 87(1213):439, 1980). Regulation of battery housing of food animals and mandatory tattooing of dogs and cats to deter abandonment by owners were two specific measures suggested in the Micaux report which are readily applicable to other European countries and the United States.

Like any other country, France has unique problems in the area of animal protection, owing to myriad factors such as legislative history, cultural attitudes, economic profile and political structure. The new animal welfare policy outlined by M. Micaux, however, points up far more similarities than differences in approach between France and the U.S. and by extension, between Europe and the U.S. in attempting to handle problems of animals, who observe neither national nor political boundaries.

Current UK Legislation on Animals

Three recent articles by Margaret Cooper, a British lawyer, in the Biologist (26:33-37, 1979; 26:110-114, 1979; 27:183-185, 1980) provide a lucid introduction to various aspects of United Kingdom law relating to animal care and animal research. The first article deals exclusively with controls on animal experiments, the second broadens the scope to discuss all animal welfare laws and laws to control animal diseases, and the third examines how other laws can affect biologists. The author makes little or no attempt to deal with moral issues or with the current arguments about the need for new legislation. However, there is much useful and interesting information. For example, even if one is not a veterinary surgeon, one is permitted to treat one’s own animals, but not those belonging to other people. Furthermore, causing an animal unnecessary suffering because of ignorance or carelessness or veterinary practice makes one liable to prosecution under the UK Protection of Animals Act, 1911.