

LAW NEEDED TO PREVENT SLAUGHTERHOUSE CRUELTY

Recent tests held in Chicago appear to have satisfied the packing industry of the efficiency and effectiveness of the new Remington stunning instrument which has been in process of development over the past six months. One thing is certain, the "knockers," who have been wielding the old-fashioned hammer to stun cattle, were in favor of the new device when they observed how effective it was in stunning cattle instantly with one blow.

The packers, as a group, have vigorously resisted the use of any of the other three practical, humane methods of slaughter, but in the face of the humane slaughter bills now pending before Congress which have brought a record volume of mail to Washington urging their passage, this new instrument may gain a wider acceptance. It is a decided improvement from the practical as well as from the humane point of view in the stunning of cattle, and it should go far to eliminate the repeated blows which so many steers are currently suffering with the primitive hammer method of stunning which most packers use for these animals.

It must be remembered that most packers do not even attempt to stun any other animals but cattle; they shackle and bleed them in full consciousness. Will they use the new instrument or another humane method on calves, sheep, lambs and pigs? Their past performance shows that there is no reason whatsoever to believe they will. But the Department of Agriculture apparently thinks so, for the Department refused to give a favorable report on legislation to make humane slaughter compulsory. An analysis of the Department's statement is printed on page 3 of this Information Report.

HANDLING LABORATORY ANIMALS

A new 16 mm. sound film for the training of laboratory personnel has been produced with the cooperation of the National Institute for Medical Research, London, England, by MacQueen Films, Bromley, Kent, and will soon be available in this country through the Animal Welfare Institute. Its title is "Handling Laboratory Animals."

The first announcement of the film was presented at the Institute's booth at the annual Exposition of Science and Industry at the Atlanta meeting of the American Association for the Advancement of Science, December 27-30, 1955.

Although it is generally recognized that good handling and care of laboratory animals is of fundamental importance in biological research, scientific institutions throughout the world have experienced difficulty in finding and training first-rate personnel for this work. Materials for their education and guidance are scarce. This new film is the first ever produced for the purpose.

(Continued on Page 4)

DEMORALIZING PROJECTS AND CLASSROOM DEMONSTRATIONS

Are *all* animal experiments justifiable regardless of how, why and by whom conducted? Should high school boys and girls be induced by offers of cash, free trips and personal publicity to engage in "slicing animals" as the headline reproduced on this page puts it? Is this the right way to educate young Americans?

The Animal Welfare Institute most emphatically answers NO to these questions. In its May-June Information Report (Vol. 4, No. 3), the Institute gave details on some of the cruel experiments which young people have been encouraged to conduct, and it reprinted the excellent column written by Dorothy Thompson urging that children's experiments on animals should be stopped. In the past few months, even more gruesome high school experiments have been reported. Reproduced below is a news story about a 15-year-old girl who laughingly posed for a front-page picture while telling about her investigation of tumor transplants in mice.

New York World-Telegram The Sun

Girl Slices Animals Into Talent Melon

By MARIANNE COLE,
Staff Writer.

Susan Zimet, the only New York City girl to win a 1956 Science Talent Search award, isn't the afraid-of-a-mouse type.

The 15-year-old Brooklyn high school senior doesn't hop on a chair when she sees a rodent. She cuts it up.

In fact, it was her experiment with mice—cutting them up to investigate their immunity to tumor transplants—that won her a trip to the nation's capital with 39 other promising young scientists from high schools all over America.

Eight girls and 32 boys, winners of the 15th annual talent search conducted by Science Clubs of America, have been invited to spend March 1 through 5 in Washington, where they will compete for \$11,000 in Westinghouse science scholarships.

Other Winners.

* * *

Robert had to rush off to his after-school job in a paper box plant immediately after receiving a telegram announcing his selection. But he admitted he was too excited to do much work.

Susan, on the other hand, was cool as a lab report as she answered congratulations in the home of her parents, Mr. and Mrs. Sidney Zimet, of 953 E. 31st St., Bklyn.

She explained that she was able to do her mouse experiments in a "professional" laboratory since her cousin is a medical student at Bellevue Medical Center. He did a little supervising, but she wrote her 2300-word contest report all by herself.

She found the study "very interesting," but said she didn't care to delve further into it. She wants to study engineering physics at either Cornell University or Radcliff College.

'Susan's also interested in hosteling, folk singing, and astronomy. She has a telescope but doesn't "get to use it much in Brooklyn."

Omitted from the above news report are the names of the other young winners listed. It is hoped that their pro-

jects fell within the wide range of scientific study appropriate for high school students. Only one, a mathematics project, is mentioned, and the reaction of the young mathematician described.

In addition to contests which currently encourage young people to experiment on animals outside school, instruction is now being given to some science teachers on how to conduct painful experiments and demonstrations in their class-rooms. On October 15, 1955, one hundred and eighty science teachers from the Washington, D.C. area came to the cancer laboratories of the National Institutes of Health to observe a series of demonstrations and learn how to carry them out. These included such items as the induction of fatal cancer in mice and chickens for class-room observation. A newspaper account provided startling evidence of the blind-spots in the outlook of those who prepared the demonstrations. Apparently it did not even occur to them that the infliction of purposeless suffering and slow death on helpless animals before the eyes of impressionable young people is a cruel and profoundly shocking procedure. Commenting on the demonstrations, Dr. John R. Heller, Chief of the National Cancer Institute, was quoted by the Washington Star as recommending them to high school teachers to "brighten up their laboratories and possibly create more interest."

Following are quotations from the mimeographed instructions made available to the teachers. One of the first suggestions for high school laboratory "brightening" is entitled "Transplantation of Tumor Tissue" and reads in part as follows:

"The demonstration will show how this important technique is done, utilizing a rapidly growing malignant connective tissue tumor, designated Sarcoma 37. This mouse tumor produces an easily visible mass about five days after a very small piece of the tumor is placed under the skin of a mouse; the tumor usually kills the animal in about three weeks. The actual transplantation is made by inserting under the skin of the mouse some tumor tissue that was taken from a tumor previously transplanted seven days before."

Another demonstration is entitled "Genetics and Skin Grafting" and it is stated that "The demonstration will show the technique of skin grafting in mice and its application in transplanting an area of skin in a single animal from one area to another and also in transplanting an area of skin from one animal to a different individual. Successful grafting should result in the first case, but not in the second unless the animals are both members of a highly inbred strain of mice."

The effects of unskilled skin grafting on the animals can be imagined by the reader.

One more sample from the 13 suggested ways of "brightening" classrooms will suffice. This one is called "The Induction of Cancer and a Virus-Induced Tumor" and reads as follows: "Cancer can be induced by different types of agents, such as certain chemical compounds, radiation, and a few viruses. These latter materials are produced in living organisms, are cell-free, large-molecular compounds made up of nucleoprotein, and can be purified by means of a very high speed centrifugation. One of these viruses, the Rous sarcoma virus, is a tumor-produc-

ing agent highly specific for chickens, and, after injection of the purified material into the muscle of a young chicken, tumors appear within five to ten days and kill the animal in about three weeks. The demonstration will show the simple technique used for the induction of the tumors with the available virus material and typical tumors in chickens at various stages of growth."

It is not known whether any of the high schools in the nation's capital are engaging in this aimless cruelty which was demonstrated to 180 of their science teachers. However, the New York Times of February 12, 1956 reports that students at the Port Washington (New York) High School "will carry out two projects to determine genetic factors in cancer."

It is not surprising that children think up even livelier (though no more cruel) forms of experiments on their own—and receive newspaper publicity and prizes for it. From time to time responsible scientists speak out against such grim procedures as that of the boy who wanted to send mice up in a home-made rocket. The following excerpt from a letter written by a veterinary officer, to the editor of his local paper, is self-explanatory:

"The Editor,

"I am not a crackpot anti-vivisectionist, but a veterinary officer of the U.S. Army. Among my various responsibilities is the procurement, care, and use of various laboratory animals.

"I was interested to note recently the item about a high school boy here who plans to send mice up in his home-made rocket. Just recently I received this copy of the Animal Welfare Institute Report covering just such matters. While I am not a member of the Institute, as such, I am in general sympathy with their views.

"For example, what does the boy expect to accomplish by sending the mice up in the rocket? Suppose they die or become ill; is he qualified to draw any conclusions from this? Is there no law relating to the control of experimentation involving the use of live animals? Frankly, I see little difference between this and tying firecrackers to the tail of a puppy.

"Perhaps you can do a service by looking into this matter and 'plugging' for some sort of sane approach, if not for legal supervision. Yours for kindness to helpless animals."

This intelligent letter makes two important points about animal experimentation by children:

1. It is brought down to earth by the observation that there is "little difference between this and tying firecrackers to the tail of a puppy".
2. The all-important question is asked: supposing that certain observations are actually made by a child, "Is he qualified to draw any conclusions?"

Serious research with animals is made a mockery by having it become a children's game—a hobby which any little boy can indulge in when the spirit moves him. Yet many serious research workers are afraid to speak out publicly against it for fear of offending the National Society for Medical Research or its powerful friends. The Animal Welfare Institute has had long experience with the fact that the NSMR attacks those who dare to speak out against *any* kind of animal experimentation—even if it is conducted by children who have scarcely learned to read.

The infliction of suffering on animals in the much-abused name of science has already extended far beyond reasonable bounds. Urged on by a relatively small number of fanatical enthusiasts, animal experimentation in schoolrooms and children's homes is now growing through pure thought-

lessness. For example, obviously nice children are writing into the Institute asking help in giving animals vitamin deficiencies. It is clear that they have no idea of what they are doing and want only to win a prize. High school teachers, too, are confused. It is heartening to receive letters such as one from a teacher which states: "To be honest, I hadn't thought very much about the treatment of animals in high school classes. One of the real factors which prevented me from encouraging some of my students from performing a 'nutrition' experiment was that it would involve too much work. Again, thanks to you!; now I am not as indifferent."

It is of vital importance that educators, scientists and the humane-minded public at large should demand that a firm position be taken in schools and in the science contests and science fairs open to high school students throughout the country to prevent the demoralization of young people through the infliction of suffering on defenseless animals.

AWI DISTRIBUTES ANIMAL FIRST AID MANUAL FREE TO TEACHERS

"First Aid and Care of Small Animals", the manual written by Ernest P. Walker of the Smithsonian Institution and published in October by the Animal Welfare Institute, has proved extremely popular with the teachers and students in primary and secondary schools, for whose use and guidance it was prepared. The first printing of 5,000 copies has already been exhausted and a second larger printing is in preparation.

The Evaluation Committee of the National Science Teachers' Association was reported to be enthusiastic about the booklet and unanimous in giving it top rating for literature made available to science teachers through the Association; the Association mailed to its members 8,000 leaflets describing it and offering one free copy to teachers upon request. An announcement in the February Girl Scout "Leader" brought requests for copies from 658 different troops throughout the country. Seven hundred animal protective organizations received a free copy so they could bring it to the attention of local educators.

"First Aid and Care of Small Animals" continues to be available free on request to each teacher who sends a written request to the offices of the Animal Welfare Institute. To the public, it sells at the cost price of 25¢ each.

FALLACIES IN DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE'S VIEWS ON HUMANE SLAUGHTER

The U. S. Department of Agriculture reported unfavorably on the humane slaughter bills introduced in the last session of Congress, stating that American enterprise could provide humane slaughter better than legislation could. This statement reflects unfairly on American enterprise because the fact is that it has failed to provide a merciful death for more than a minute proportion of our food animals whereas legislation has been effective in

providing such a death for these animals in most of the civilized countries of Europe. Not only was the statement unfair, it was untenable and inconsistent—unless the Department is counting on American enterprise to eliminate the necessity for the Federal Meat Inspection Bureau and the rest of the Department's regulatory functions as well. Nevertheless, the same line of opposition is being mailed out (in the form of a mimeographed statement, this year) to the thousands of Americans who are writing to Secretary of Agriculture Benson requesting him to approve legislation to prevent unnecessary cruelty to the tens of millions of animals slaughtered in the United States annually.

The Department says it approves of humane slaughter but is "guided by a sincere belief that mandatory Federal legislation would not be the best way to assure continued real progress in the solution of this problem" and that this "can best be accomplished by private initiative and individual ingenuity in the traditional American manner." As it wanders into a series of unsupported and highly dubious generalizations, the statement strikes the same note repeatedly, speaking of "continued real progress", "continuing effort", and "continued progress" all within the space of a few sentences. It seems clear that these ideas originated with the lobbyists for the American Meat Institute, the organization which represents the major packing interests, because an objective review of the facts could not possibly lead to the belief that there has been any continuity of progress toward humane slaughter in our country. A look at the record should be helpful.

- 1874 Switzerland requires that animals be rendered insensible before slaughter.
- 1912 The captive-bolt pistol is invented in England.
- 1920 The Netherlands enacts humane slaughter legislation.
- 1924 Norway enacts humane slaughter legislation
- 1928 Scotland enacts humane slaughter legislation
- 1929 Electrical stunning invented in Germany
- 1929 The American Meat Institute forms its Committee for Improved Methods of Slaughter. The American Humane Association receives assurances that "the packers are with us" and will voluntarily adopt humane methods of slaughter.
- 1932 Ireland enacts humane slaughter legislation
- 1933 England enacts humane slaughter legislation
- 1934 Finland enacts humane slaughter legislation
- 1937 Sweden enacts humane slaughter legislation
- 1948 Fiji enacts humane slaughter legislation
- 1950 George A. Hormel Company, Austin, Minnesota, invents and installs CO2 tunnel for anesthetizing hogs prior to shackling and bleeding.

- 1951 New Zealand enacts humane slaughter legislation (Parts of France, Germany, Austria and Australia have also enacted humane slaughter legislation).
- 1953 Humane slaughter regulations adopted in Denmark
- 1954 Inexpensive modification of CO₂ tunnel designed and manufactured by N.E. Wernberg, Copenhagen, Denmark.
- 1955 Senator Humphrey introduces the first humane slaughter bill ever to be presented in the Congress. The American Meat Institute calls it "premature" (only 82 years behind Switzerland and a quarter century behind most of the other countries which have adopted such legislation—and only 27 years after the American Meat Institute set up its Committee on Improved Methods of Slaughter.)
- 1956 The present position: Although the captive bolt pistol and CO₂ are available on the open market to every packer in the United States, Hormel's remains the only American firm to anesthetize hogs with CO₂, and only one nationally-advertised packer, the Oscar Mayer Company, stuns cattle humanely with the captive bolt pistol. **No other major packer uses any humane method whatever. Not one single calf, lamb or sheep receives a merciful death from any major packer in the United States** (though some small American packers stun all animals voluntarily.)

The cruelty and waste of meat through bruising which are the direct results of the present system of shackling and sticking conscious hogs are most clearly described by its own most powerful advocate: the American Meat Institute. In the fifth revised edition of its publication "Pork Operations" (1954), the Committee on Recording of the American Meat Institute describes the tendency of the shackler to "rush" the animals which "are excited by the shouts of the drivers and shacklers, the whir of the machinery, and the squealing of hogs already shackled." (Carbon dioxide anesthetization would eliminate all of this.) The American Meat Institute reports the obvious result of this general mayhem: the shacklers "are apt to become impatient and strike the hogs with the shackle." The painful blows with the heavy metal of course cause big bruises in the meat.

If the hog is wrongly shackled in the excitement—that is, if he is turned facing the wrong way on the 12 to 15 foot wheel which slowly elevates the struggling animals to the sticking area—"the hog is sure to be thrown over. This is the cause for many face-torn and inside bruised hams." (But still the American Meat Institute won't advocate carbon dioxide anesthetization which would eliminate such accidents and the pain and fear attending them.) The AMI goes on to describe other bruises which can be

caused by the "twisting" of the desperate animals and, on the following page, the frequent failure to stick the hogs properly: "Workmen are sometimes in the habit of sticking hogs just as they come to them and without adjusting their position. In many such cases, the jugular vein is missed." Again, if the animal were hanging unconscious, limp and quiet, the sticking operation could be done accurately, but the AMI apparently prefers to stick conscious animals and have the men work in the deafening atmosphere of their screams.

As the Hormel invention of 1950 and the new Remington stunning instrument, now in the final stages of development, have clearly demonstrated, American enterprise is capable of leading the world in the invention and manufacture of humane slaughter equipment, but it cannot obtain the use of such equipment on all of the tens of millions of animals slaughtered throughout the country. Only legislation can do that.

"HANDLING LABORATORY ANIMALS" (Continued from Page 1)

Dr. A. S. Parkes, F.R.S., of the National Institute for Medical Research and first President of the Animal Technicians Association, gave invaluable encouragement and advice in the planning of the film. Dr. Parkes has said: "In encouraging animals to breed and in keeping them under conditions in which they have no chance to fend for themselves, we incur a responsibility for their welfare. This, however, is not the only incentive to the proper treatment of laboratory animals. In modern research only first-rate animals are good enough, and animals cannot be first-rate unless they are contented and well cared for. Enlightened self-interest, therefore, if nothing else, should make us promote in every possible way the well-being of laboratory animals."

The film shows the Chief Animal Technician at the National Institute for Medical Research, Mr. D. J. Short, demonstrating correct methods of handling twelve common laboratory animals. Mr. Short has had extensive experience in the management and breeding of laboratory animals and in the teaching of young people entering this work. He is a frequent lecturer for the Animal Technicians Association and last year visited the United States, where he spoke at the Animal Care Panel and visited laboratory animal colonies.

"Handling Laboratory Animals" takes 20 minutes to run. Every man and woman handling these animals will benefit from seeing it one or more times.

Those interested in the purchase or rental of the film in the United States may write to the Animal Welfare Institute.

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

Assistant Treasurer
Mary M. Richards,

HUMANE SLAUGHTER RESEARCH AT MICHIGAN STATE UNIVERSITY

SPONSORED BY ANIMAL
WELFARE INSTITUTE

Carbon dioxide anesthetization of the bovine species prior to slaughter is the subject of scientific investigation being undertaken at Michigan State University under the direction of Dr. Ralph Barner of the Department of Animal Pathology. The work is being carried out with the assistance of a grant made by the Animal Welfare Institute.

Tunnels containing carbon dioxide have proved outstandingly humane and efficient for rendering hogs unconscious prior to slaughter, both in this country and abroad. The United States Department of Agriculture has carried out valuable tests on anesthetizing turkeys before shackling and bleeding. Work on the anesthetization of sheep by this process is being undertaken in Europe. The new project at Michigan State University will, therefore, help to complete the picture on the various applications of this method which recommends itself by its painlessness and by the fact that it produces no injury whatsoever to the animal's body.

It is hoped that a system of applying carbon dioxide to calves and cattle can be found whose efficiency will be equal to that already developed for hogs. The two types of machine now in operation provide respectively for anesthetization of 600 and of 240 hogs per hour.

The latest development in carbon dioxide anesthetization of hogs is the method of sticking and bleeding recently inaugurated in the Fremont, Nebraska plant of the George A. Hormel Company. According to an article in the April 14, 1956 issue of the National Provisioner, internal bruising has been reduced 90% by bleeding unconscious hogs in a prone position. The article states: "In evaluating the new prone dispatching system, T. H. Hocker, vice president, states it will eliminate virtually all the cost of internally bruised hams which, last year, cost Hormel \$50,000.00 in paid claims."

(Continued on Page 4)

TEACHING OF SCIENCE

The Animal Welfare Institute is proud to publish the following outstanding article by Dr. Clive McCay. It represents sound thinking on the part of a serious scientist who has the best interests of science and of the young generation at heart. Every responsible educator should read it and carefully compare the merits of humane science teaching as recommended by Dr. McCay with the cruel and demoralizing experiments unfortunately being advocated in some quarters as school projects. (See Information Reports, Vol. 4, No. 3, and Vol. 5, No. 1)

ANIMAL EXPERIMENTS BY HIGH SCHOOL STUDENTS

By CLIVE M. MCCAY, *Professor of Nutrition
Cornell University, Ithaca, New York*

Research laboratories that work with animals receive letters every few weeks from teachers of biology or their students in high schools asking for animals. Most large laboratories have some surplus of rats, hamsters or rabbits that can be given these high schools.

The question arises about what type of experiments high school students should be encouraged to do with animals. In the past we have based our decisions concerning providing animals upon whether or not anything would be gained by experiments the student might do. Two typical examples will illustrate these matters.

A high school student who was eighteen years old and studying biology in a small high school wrote and asked us for forty young white rats in order that he might conduct research upon lathyrism (severe poisoning from certain seeds such as those of the sweet pea).

We wrote the biology teacher objecting to this request upon several grounds. Our first and minor objection was that it seemed somewhat thoughtless for a high school student to ask a research laboratory with moderate resources to give him about thirty dollars worth of animals.

However, our major objection was that we are convinced that only a genius among high school biology students would make any contribution to new knowledge about lathyrism inasmuch as highly trained specialists have studied this problem during the past seventy years.

The characteristics of lathyrism are well known as incontinence, paralysis of the legs, and spinal curvature. It was claimed that this boy had been awarded honorable mention in a state science talent contest by exhibiting an animal with such symptoms. (The judges were physical scientists who had probably never heard of lathyrism and thought the student had contributed something new.)

Our own objections to such demonstrations are that nothing is illustrated of practical or theoretical importance and the student gains attention by the suffering and malformation that he inflicts upon a lower animal. It is obvious that it is presumptuous for a high school student to say that he is going to do research upon lathyrism.

My own philosophy about such matters was crystallized early. At the age of about 5 years another boy and I became busily engaged with a research study upon a litter of kittens. Our study consisted of determining how many times a kitten could swim across a tub full of water. We had just gotten the research through the exploratory stages when my father discovered us. Needless to say we were both paddled soundly and taught that kittens had a right to fair treatment in the world as well as boys.

I believe that the student who was producing lathyrism is injured more than the rat because he fails to realize that there is no use inflicting suffering upon any animal unless new knowledge is acquired.

A second example of a projected study by a high school student has come to hand within the past week. This student wrote and wanted to know if we could provide him with two young rats. He desired to build or buy an exercise cage for each animal and then feed each rat a diet typical of that eaten by two different athletes.

No one would anticipate that this student would make great discoveries, but he would learn much about food in planning and carrying out such a study.

There are hundreds of good nutritional experiments of this type that can be done without any suffering of the animal and without injury to the sensitivity of the student. I believe it is the duty of biology teachers to orient students so that they will realize that they must have long and severe, specialized training before they

are fitted to go into research that involves poisons, surgery or vivisection. With such training is bound to come a realization that some suffering is inevitable in the advancement of knowledge but that there is never justification for needless suffering.

CONGRESSIONAL HEARINGS ON HUMANE SLAUGHTER BILLS

Public hearings on the first bill ever to be introduced in the Congress of the United States to require humane slaughter of food animals are scheduled to be held May 9th and 10th. Senator Humphrey, who introduced S. 1636, is Chairman of the Subcommittee of the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry which will hold the hearings. Public sentiment is strongly in favor of the legislation, and animal protective organizations in all parts of the country are urging its enactment.

In the House of Representatives, hearings on the humane slaughter bills introduced by Congresswoman Martha Griffiths (D) and Congressman Hiestand (R) are expected to take place in the near future.

MAJOR HUME OF UFAW

Major Charles W. Hume's achievements as founder and director of the Universities Federation for Animal Welfare are well known not only in England but in the many other parts of the world where his good work and influence for animal protection have effectively extended. UFAW began a quarter century ago as the University of London Animal Welfare Society. It now has branches in ten major universities in the British Isles and Honorary Secretaries in France, Germany, the Netherlands, Switzerland and the United States. The breadth of its interest in animals whose sufferings are often overlooked can be gauged by glancing over the headings in its last annual report: whaling (the attempt to develop a humane harpoon), trapping, laboratory animals, rat poison, humane killing of crabs, oil pollution of the sea, British wild mammals, poultry, veterinary section, publications, educational work and parliamentary work.

Major Hume's article, "Experiments on Animals", which appeared in *The Observer* of March 18, 1956 has been reprinted with kind permission from that distinguished newspaper and is enclosed with this issue of the Information Report.

CHICK EMBRYOS SAVE ANIMAL SUFFERING

One of the Animal Welfare Institute's objectives is practical replacement of the higher mammals by much lower forms of life, or life in lower stages of embryonic development (such as chick embryos), with a view to reducing the suffering undergone by animals with highly developed nervous systems. The manufacture of rabies vaccine using embryonated eggs in place of live, adult mammals represents major progress in the pharmaceutical field. Lederle laboratories deserve great credit for this, and all humane persons should demand substitution of Lederle avianized vaccine for the old type of phenolized vaccine. A recent report on similar substitution in cancer research was quoted in the New York Times, February 26, 1956 and is reproduced in full at the end of this article.

Another interesting and progressive step in developing work on lower forms was reported in the Philadelphia Bulletin of January 4, 1956 as follows: "Rutgers scientists studying effects of trace minerals on nutritional value of foods save thousands of dollars and working hours by using beetles in tests. Dr. M. Wight Taylor, professor of agricultural biochemistry, shows he gets the same information from [the] vial of beetles he holds as from rats in cages, resulting in huge saving in food bills and handling time."

The shift from laboratory rabbits to frogs in pregnancy tests is another piece of good news, for it is far easier to do a humane job of keeping frogs under laboratory conditions than of keeping rabbits. The Navy Times of January 28, 1956 states: "The frog is superior to the rabbit in many other ways. Of special importance to the Navy, the frog requires considerably less food (a tiny piece of raw liver once a week), much less space (a one gallon jar of water) and practically no care and cleaning. Another advantage of the frog is that it can be used for approximately 12 tests, whereas the rabbit had to be dissected and a minute search of the ovaries made by specially qualified technicians."

An enormous step forward in reducing the volume of severe pain which laboratory animals with highly developed nervous systems are now undergoing would be effected by shifting preliminary routine cancer tests from mice to embryonated eggs. The New York Times report states:

"The control of a cancer growth in embryonated eggs has been reported by two University of Texas scientists in the February Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences. Dr. Roger J. Williams, director of the University's Biochemical Institute, and Dr. Alfred Taylor,

his research associate, announced that they had been able to control with 'substantial success' the growth of a mouse mammary cancer cultivated in embryonated eggs. They suggested that cancer control might involve the simultaneous use of suitable drugs with certain physical agents, such as temperature increase.

"Although no one can foresee the pathway by which cancer investigation will progress, it seems likely that it may take a course involving, first, the control of cancer in embryonated eggs; second, its control in experimental animals, and last, its control in human patients,' the paper stated. The scientists' success in controlling the cancer resulted from the combined use of compounds able to inhibit tumor growth with a moderate increase in temperature. The temperature increase, by itself, had previously been found to be unfavorable to cancer growth. Though recognizing that a method that might control a cancerous growth in mice or rats could not be carried over unchanged to humans, Dr. Taylor and Dr. Williams said they believed that their technique would be an excellent tool for long-range cancer study.

"Unless we are able to solve the problem of cancer control in eggs, we are less likely to be successful with the more complex system inherent in experimental animals,' they explained. The paper noted that 'in a series of cancer-inoculated eggs, fifty-seven out of fifty-eight control embryos had been killed by the sixteenth day of incubation by tumor growth. The remaining one bore a large tumor.' The study added:

"In a parallel series of 140 cancer-inoculated eggs in which treatment was applied, eighty-six embryos remained alive on the sixteenth day. Among those, eighty-one contained mere traces of what may have been viable cancer tissue, but in five there were no observable traces. The effects of the cancer inoculation have thus been largely counteracted by the treatment, and we believe that this result merits careful attention."

BRITISH ANIMAL TECHNICIANS MEET AT LABORATORY ANIMALS BUREAU CONGRESS

The ninth annual Congress of the Laboratory Animals Bureau was held at the Royal Veterinary College in London, April 11th and 12th. The well-presented program included a variety of papers on the breeding of laboratory animals, animal feeding and management.

A series of scientific films presented on the afternoon of the first day featured "Handling Laboratory Animals" shown by permission of Sir Charles Harington on the Na-

tional Institute of Medical Research where it was photographed. The Animal Welfare Institute representative present was pleased to hear high praise of the film at this first full-length public showing in England. The film is being distributed in the United States by the Animal Welfare Institute.

The sixth Annual General Meeting of the Animal Technicians Association took place on the second day of the Congress which was attended by a large number of Technicians. The Principal, Vice Principal and professors of the Royal Veterinary College gave encouragement to the Association's work and took part in the program.

A trade exhibition where animal colony supplies were displayed by manufacturers also included a booth arranged by the Universities Federation for Animal Welfare. Humane methods of killing laboratory animals were described at the booth, and practical information on keeping needles for injection sharp in order to avoid the pain resulting from use of blunt needles was also given prominence. Technicians were interested in UFAW's "The Scientific Basis of Kindness to Animals" and other publications and in the Animal Welfare Institute manuals, "Basic Care of Experimental Animals" and "Comfortable Quarters for Laboratory Animals", which were also on display.

"HANDLING LABORATORY ANIMALS"

Requests from laboratories in 36 States, as well as the District of Columbia, Canada, Yugoslavia, Germany and Denmark, have been received for the new film "Handling Laboratory Animals" since the announcement of its availability was made in the January-February Information Report. The 16 mm. film, which demonstrates the correct methods of handling twelve common laboratory animals, was produced by MacQueen Films with the cooperation of the National Institute for Medical Research, London, England. It is available through the Animal Welfare Institute for both purchase and rental; the purchase price is \$65, with no charge for preview and the rental charge is \$3 for one week or less.

Because of the unexpectedly large response to the first announcement of the film, the Institute has ordered additional prints from England; inquiries are welcome from laboratories interested in renting or purchasing the film, and should be addressed to the Animal Welfare Institute.

Humane Slaughter Research

(Continued from Page 1)

This striking example of the fact that humane methods of slaughter are not only commercially feasible but decidedly profitable is accentuated by the rating given the Hormel Company by Forbes Magazine January 1, 1956. Hormel, which outranked other American meat packing companies for good management, is, to date, the only company in the United States to use a humane method of slaughter for hogs.

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

STATUS OF HUMANE SLAUGHTER BILL

The humane slaughter bill (S. 1636) upon which hearings were held May ninth and tenth before the sub-committee of the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry was reported favorably to the full Senate Committee by unanimous vote of the members, Senator Hubert H. Humphrey (D. Minnesota), Senator Karl Mundt (R. South Dakota), and Senator W. Kerr Scott (D. North Carolina). Persons interested in obtaining a complete transcript of the testimony given at the May hearings may obtain it by writing to the Clerk of the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, Senate Office Building, Washington, D.C.

Since the time the hearings were held, the Institute has learned that new humane slaughter devices, in addition to those already available to the packing industry, will soon be on the market. A spokesman of the Remington Arms Company has stated that the Company will have an instrument for the humane stunning of hogs available early this fall. The Remington cattle stunner is now being used in production, and final field tests are being made on the Company's calf stunner. The captive bolt pistol, which is now used voluntarily by a number of American packers to stun cattle humanely, costs \$100. The new stunners are expected to be slightly more expensive, but in the same general price range.

LABORATORY RULES TO PROTECT ANIMALS

Two rules worthy of adoption by all scientific institutions which use experimental animals are found in the Instructions for Graduate Students and Assistants in the Department of Physiology and Pharmacology, Michigan State University Veterinary College. They are:

1. "Humane treatment of animals is expected at all times. There are simple techniques used in the handling of the different species of laboratory animals. Familiarize yourself with them to avoid embarrassment to yourself when you obtain employment in another laboratory. For example: the tail of the rat or the ears of the rabbit are not handles (contrary to an all too common practice).
2. "When animals are to be destroyed, this must be done in a humane manner by an overdose of anesthetic. Seek advice if you are uncertain as to procedure. To avoid the incineration of a living animal after apparent death by anesthetization final positive assurance of death must be made by one of the following suggested means: decapitation in the case of rats, mice, rabbits, etc. and collapsing the lungs by intercostal invasion of the thorax and the insertion of a hollow object such as a wooden spool (obtainable from the Diener) in the case of dogs and possibly cats. According to a ruling by the Veterinary Dean, failure to observe this precaution may result in expulsion from the college if a student or termination of employment if an employee."

NSMR VS. AWI

An unusual feature appeared in the June issue of the Bulletin of the American Institute of Biological Sciences. It consisted of two pages, facing one another, the first headed "National Society for Medical Research", the second "Animal Welfare Institute." Above these headings was printed a brief explanation by the AIBS which read as follows:

"Due to the controversy that arose over assignment of a commercial booth (to the Animal Welfare Institute) at the East Lansing AIBS meetings, those AIBS officers present thought it best to cancel the booth. This action was agreeable to all parties to the controversy, contingent upon the publication of statements by the Animal Welfare Institute and the National Society for Medical Research in a future issue of the AIBS Bulletin. These statements were to set forth the aims and objectives of each group. The following articles were submitted under the above agreement. The views expressed in each do not in any way reflect the views or editorial policy of the AIBS Bulletin and the AIBS assumes no responsibility for the authenticity or accuracy of any of the statements therein."

Because the NSMR statement contains numerous incorrect allegations about the AWI, the two statements together with a letter of March 16th correcting these allegations are printed in this Information Report in order to keep the record straight.* Officers of the Institute do not know whether to be amused, flattered or insulted by the NSMR's comments, and will leave it to the reader to decide.

The sudden cancellation of the Animal Welfare Institute booth was made last September a few days before the opening of the AIBS meetings. With the space long contracted and paid for, the exhibit itself en route to East Lansing, and full announcements about it in print in AIBS and AWI publications, it was learned that the reason for censorship of the AWI exhibit was as follows: the man who represented the Physiological Society on the AIBS board had telegraphed a threat to withdraw the Society from the AIBS unless the AWI booth was cancelled.

When AWI officers protested the cancellation, a meeting was arranged between six officers of the AIBS and two officers and a member of the Advisory Committee of the AWI. Although the Physiological Society representative, who had started all the trouble, failed to appear at this meeting, nevertheless a long series of false charges which had been made against the AWI were presented. These were corrected at the meeting, except for certain items requiring documentary proof which was later submitted in writing.

After a thorough discussion, it was agreed that a statement by the AWI would be printed in the AIBS Bulletin with an opposing statement on the page facing. It was assumed that the NSMR, rather than the Physiological Society in whose name the booth had been cancelled, would want to make this statement, and the assumption

* The material is given in the order in which it was written: the AWI statement first, the NSMR statement second, and the letter of correction third. The letter of correction was not printed, but the other two are identical with those appearing in the AIBS Bulletin.

proved to be correct. It is doubtful, though, that anyone expected the blast which, after months of contemplation, the NSMR produced. Perhaps none but a NSMR author could have conceived of suggesting a comparison between the AWI and Machiavelli, Hitler and Stalin. The Executive Secretary, Assistant Treasurer and President, who do the daily work of the AWI, feel decidedly unequal to carrying on so imposing a tradition of villainy, even if they wanted to do so.

The Animal Welfare Institute is not a large organization. It has two full-time employees, the Executive Secretary and the Assistant Treasurer, and a one-room office. Its operating budget last year totalled \$20,642.05, most of which was spent for salaries, printing and mailing with a small travel allowance. On this budget, it supplied thousands of free copies of its manuals on animal care and housing free on request to laboratories in all parts of the country, and copies of its bi-monthly Information Reports to all members of the American Federation of Societies for Experimental Biology and many other scientists. This year, through a generous subsidy by a member, it has provided the film "Handling Laboratory Animals" for showing by scientific institutions at cost and has sent over 15,000 copies of "First Aid and Care of Small Animals" free on request to science teachers and other educators throughout the country.

These facts are of small interest to the NSMR author who, after running the gamut of famous villains, proceeds to cast innuendos designed to suggest to the reader that the AWI is both a Communist and an anti-vivisectionist organization, and resorts to distorting a whole series of facts including those which are a matter of public record, in order to support his attack. There is only one accurate assertion about the work of the AWI in the whole NSMR statement: the AWI opposes all attempts to promote cruel animal experiments done by or in the presence of children.

* * *

STATEMENT OF THE AWI IN AIBS BULLETIN

The Animal Welfare Institute appreciates this opportunity to state its principles and policy in the *AIBS Bulletin*.

The Animal Welfare Institute, founded in 1951 to promote the welfare of all animals and to reduce the total of pain and fear inflicted on animals by man, announced in its first publication that the Institute would concern itself particularly with humane safeguards in the use of animals for research and medicine. This field of humane work had received little practical attention and institutions vary widely in their care and use of animals. In some, conditions exist which inflict extreme and unnecessary suffering on the animals; in others, a genuine attempt is made to treat animals humanely.

The Institute further announced its interest in the establishment of a code for the handling and use of laboratory animals of all species, the encouragement of medical research of the highest possible quality as opposed to mere quantity, the development of techniques that will reduce to a minimum both the pain suffered by animals and the number of animals required, and the discovery of the best method of satisfying the needs of humanity in the advancement of medicine, public health, agriculture, etc., without jeopardizing practical animal welfare work or the general advancement of humanity through increasing consideration for all living creatures. In addition to working towards these aims, the Animal Welfare Institute has sought to replace cruel methods of slaughtering food animals with modern, humane methods of stunning by mechanically operated instruments.

Among other activities for the advancement of laboratory animal welfare, the Institute has issued two major publications, "Basic Care of Experimental Animals" and "Comfortable Quarters for Laboratory Animals," in addition to its bi-monthly Information Reports. All are provided free on request to scientists and laboratory personnel. To encourage new developments beneficial to experimental animals, as well as specific attention to their needs, the Institute established the annual Albert Schweitzer Medal and Award. It was presented for the first time at East Lansing on September 8, 1955 in conjunction with the AIBS

meetings, to Dr. Robert C. Bay, veterinarian in charge of a large colony of beagles used for radiation studies.

In addition to the Schweitzer Award ceremony, a booth exhibit featuring the medal had been arranged for display with the other booth exhibits at the AIBS meetings. However, as noted above, the booth was suddenly cancelled because the representative of the Physiological Society on the AIBS Board objected to the Institute's opposition to animal seizure legislation. The Animal Welfare Institute exhibit was to have been identical with that displayed at the last meetings of the American Association for the Advancement of Science in Berkeley, California, except for the addition of photographs of Dr. Schweitzer receiving the medal created in his honor. Orders were to have been taken for a new Animal Welfare Institute publication, "First Aid and Care of Small Animals," provided free to secondary school biology teachers. No reference to animal seizure legislation was contemplated, nor has there ever been any such reference in any exhibit presented by the Animal Welfare Institute.

This does not mean that the Animal Welfare Institute has not consistently expressed strong disapproval of this legislation which has dislocated and weakened the organized humane movement in this country to such a degree that only the most strenuous efforts can save it. Animal seizure legislation seeks to compel humane society animal shelters to turn over dogs and cats for experiments of any type which a laboratory may see fit to perform, regardless of the degree or duration of pain which may be inflicted. Humane society shelters were founded to protect lost and homeless animals from suffering. The most improper and immoral thing they could possibly do with these animals would be to release them unconditionally to the only places in the United States which are outside the jurisdiction of the anti-cruelty laws: experimental laboratories. Yet this is what the National Society for Medical Research, originator and sponsor of animal seizure legislation, demands that humane societies should do. The N.S.M.R. has succeeded in several cities and states in enforcing these demands.

Large numbers of dogs are destroyed annually in city or county pounds from which laboratories have been buying them for years without any need to resort to compulsory legislation. But the N.S.M.R. prefers to attack humane societies. No more effective means for wrecking these charities could be devised. Although the Animal Welfare Institute has never engaged in lobbying on animal seizure or any other bills, as its books which are open to inspection will show, it will remain firmly opposed to such legislation on principle and hopes that the premise on which it is working—that the majority of biologists are fair-minded and humane—will ultimately lead to the abandonment of this legislation.

The Animal Welfare Institute has proof of the interest of biologists in improving care and housing of laboratory animals through the response to its free manuals "Comfortable Quarters for Laboratory Animals" and "Basic Care of Experimental Animals"; thousands of copies have been distributed on request to laboratories throughout the United States and many foreign countries. They have been put to wide practical use in laboratory animal quarters with beneficial results to both scientific work and the animals used in it. This is the kind of cooperative work which it is the policy of the Animal Welfare Institute to pursue to a maximum extent. Readers of its bi-monthly Information Reports, which are sent to thousands of experimental biologists, libraries, humane societies and others, are aware that a very substantial proportion of the articles describe good animal quarters or good care of animals observed by representatives of the Institute during the course of laboratory visits, or they provide similar information by republishing expert statements on the subject.

Early in 1954, the Animal Welfare Institute published in an Information Report the Physiological Society's "Guiding Principles in the Care and Use of Animals", offering its congratulations to the Society on this forward step. The Principles were again republished in the AWI annual report, and each time the introductory statements were approved by a responsible officer of the Physiological Society, who expressed no hostility to the AWI. Nevertheless, as noted above, it was a representative of this Society who protested so strongly that a completely non-controversial AWI booth exhibit was cancelled by the AIBS at the last moment. To say that this is unscientific is to underestimate the case. It represents censorship in an unadulterated form.

The AWI will continue to dedicate itself to improving the welfare of animals, especially those used for experimentation, food or fur. An enormous amount of work remains to be done to cut down substantially the pain and fear unnecessarily inflicted on these animals in the course of their life or in the manner of their death. Biologists can be more helpful than any other professional group in this kind of humane work. The AWI most sincerely invites their assistance.

Christine Stevens

STATEMENT OF THE NSMR IN AIBS BULLETIN

* * *

Four hundred and fifty-eight years have passed since Machiavelli summarized so neatly the basic principle of deceit. He wrote: "A prince must take great care that nothing goes out of his mouth that is not full of . . . mercy, faith, integrity, humanity and religion, (but), everybody sees what you appear to be, few feel what you are . . . and in the actions of men . . . the end justifies the means."

The practice of Machiavelli's rule of deliberate hypocrisy has been perfected over the years. Among the great artists of our time have been Adolph Hitler and Joseph Stalin.

But using a beneficent mask for a malicious purpose is not limited to big-time politics. It occurs even in the relatively intimate organizational affairs of science. A representative example is the history of the Animal Welfare Institute.

In 1951 the legislatures of a number of states were considering laws that would make available for scientific use some of the unclaimed and unwanted animals otherwise destined to be killed in public dog pounds. In New York and Illinois, at least, appeared opposing lobbyists who stated that their efforts were backed by Roger and Christine Stevens of Ann Arbor, Michigan. The Illinois lobbyist, Mr. Paul Stickler, later contacted the National Society for Medical Research on behalf of the Animal Welfare Institute.

When the Animal Welfare Institute was formed late in 1951 its prospectus was almost the soul of virtue and noble constructive purpose. The National Society for Medical Research announced at that time that though the previous underground political activities of the proprietors of the Animal Welfare Institute constituted grounds for suspicion and caution, the NSMR recommended that any constructive efforts by the AWI for the advancement of animal welfare should be welcomed.

Unfortunately, the program of the Animal Welfare Institute assumed predominately an inflammatory character. It was only after several years of goading by the National Society for Medical Research that the AWI published its first booklet with the exclusive constructive purpose of advancing methods of animal care. During its first several years the AWI concentrated on attacking animal procurement laws and smearing animal research scientists—significantly, in general rather than specific terms.

As time has gone on the picture has become clearer and clearer. The Animal Welfare Institute has maintained the pose of being constructively concerned with the welfare of animals, and the AWI has carefully avoided the crazy headdress of the antivivisection cult. Yet from behind this much more appealing facade the Animal Welfare Institute has been making all of the points in the AV propaganda bag. Specifically, the AWI misses no opportunity to publicize the notion that there is widespread deliberate cruelty in animal research laboratories. The AWI missed no opportunity to talk vividly of suffering and to make the utterly ridiculous claim that scientists somehow are exempt from the cruelty-to-animal-laws. The AWI lyingly speaks of "pet seizure laws," knowing that no law has ever been proposed that would do anything but save some animals from pound gas chambers for use in scientific studies. The AWI has attacked animal nutrition demonstrations in high schools, projects in biology by students in the National Science Talent Search and exhibits involving animal studies at youth science fairs. Agitation by the AWI helped to bring about the embargo on the shipment of monkeys that seriously hampered the production and testing of polio vaccine last spring.

The Animal Welfare Institute is more effective than any doctrinaire antivivisection society ever was. The reason is that its program is soundly designed to exploit the desire of kind and fair-minded people to believe anyone's declarations of good intent.

It is extremely difficult to expose frauds in charity, religion, humane work and other sacrosanct fields because, as Mr. Machiavelli said, "everybody sees what you appear to be, few feel what you are."

The problem might be understood better in the light of a parallel example. Consider the Civil Rights Congress, a Communist trojan horse of a few years back.

Naturally the proclaimed purpose of the Civil Rights Congress appealed to many of the most sincere believers in the American ideal of equal justice under law. Judging the Civil Rights Congress on its official pronouncements alone, these ardent Americans ignored the significant fact that the organizers of the movement were not liberals but members of the most tyrannical absolutist cult of our time.

However, as the program of the Civil Rights Congress developed, its true purpose became apparent. Stirring resentment, fanning frustration and setting group against group became its inflammatory mission. Its theme became a cry for omnipotent government to deal with civil rights problems—an omnipotent government which could deny as well as grant civil rights.

Thus we see that neither in the high-sounding name nor in the higher-sounding declaration of purpose do we discover the true nature of a movement. And it is even difficult at times to judge by superficial actions. The subtle test is in the concrete things the movement sets about accomplishing.

In the case of the Animal Welfare Institute one can ask:

1. Why does the AWI always stand with the antivivisectionists in unqualified opposition to biological research legislation rather than taking at least a "yes but" position of *support* of biological research with amendments?
2. If the AWI is truly interested in improving care of laboratory animals, why have the AWI leaders carried on a bitter five-year long campaign against the American Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals—the humane group that has done more inspection, regulation, consultation and other constructive work to improve laboratory animal care than any other animal welfare organization?
3. Why, in the current struggle for control of the American Humane Association, are the leaders of the AWI associated not with the moderate faction but with the antivivisectionist wing?

We must concede that the AWI may not be deliberately Machiavellian. Its leaders may simply have trouble keeping their emotional prejudices in harmony with a sincere desire to be reasonable about the questions surrounding the use of animals in the biological sciences. Unfortunately if such is the case, reason is providing the window dressing while emotionalism is doing the dirty work.

Ralph Rohweder

* * * *

LETTER OF CORRECTION

ANIMAL WELFARE INSTITUTE

270 Park Avenue
New York 17, N. Y.
March 16, 1956

Dr. Hiden T. Cox
Executive Director
American Institute of Biological Sciences
2000 P Street, N.W.
Washington 6, D. C.

Dear Dr. Cox:

Thank you very much for sending me the copy of the NSMR statement about the AWI. I am willing that it be printed as it is, but in accordance with our agreement I am reporting to you some inaccuracies in their text. Perhaps you will wish to print the two texts as written and print our comments in the form of a "letter to the editor". If so, the inaccuracies are as follows:

Page 1, line 19. Mr. Stickler was not retained by my husband or myself after the formation of the Animal Welfare Institute. He represented us personally, but never represented the Animal Welfare Institute. Mr. Stickler obtained two amendments to the Illinois animal seizure bill; the home rule amendment and the exemption of humane societies from turning over animals in their shelters to laboratories. In 1953, without any hearings whatever, the humane society exemption was removed without the knowledge of humane societies or dog owners. The NSMR reported this in its Bulletin as a "victory".

Page 1, line 28. I suppose it is a matter of opinion as to whether our activities are "predominantly inflammatory" or not. I should be happy to send you a complete set of our publications if you desire so that you can judge for yourself. When it comes to line 30, the idea that the NSMR "goaded" us into publishing "Basic Care of Experimental Animals" is absurd. We published it because, after a careful study of the problems based on visits to laboratory animal rooms and reading of the literature, it became apparent that there was no simple, short text on the care and handling of experimental animals which could be used for the much needed instruction of animal caretakers. A study of our Information Reports will surely show that the idea that we "concentrated on attacking animal procurement laws and smearing animal research scientists" is not an accurate summary of their contents.

Page 1, line 43. A number of state laws have provisions

similar to the following which is part of the New York State law:

"Sec. 185. Overdriving, torturing and injuring animals; failing to provide proper sustenance. — A person who overdrives, overloads, tortures or cruelly beats or unjustifiably injures, maims, mutilates or kills any animal, whether wild or tame, and whether belonging to himself or to another, or deprives any animal of necessary sustenance, food or drink, or neglects or refuses to furnish it such sustenance or drink, or causes, procures or permits any animal to be overdriven, overloaded, tortured, cruelly beaten or unjustifiably injured, maimed, mutilated or killed, or to be deprived of necessary food or drink, or who wilfully sets on foot, instigates, engages in, or in any way furthers any act of cruelty to any animal, or any act tending to produce such cruelty, is guilty of a misdemeanor.

"Nothing herein contained shall be construed to prohibit or interfere with any properly conducted scientific tests, experiments, or investigations involving the use of living animals, performed or conducted in laboratories or institutions which are approved for these purposes by the state commissioner of health. . . ."

I believe you will agree that this is an exemption from the cruelty-to-animals laws.

Line 44. The Animal Welfare Institute has never used the term "pet seizure laws". We have used the descriptive terms "animal seizure legislation" and "forced surrender legislation", which are very accurate descriptions.

Line 49. The Animal Welfare Institute has consistently favored continuing trade with India on monkeys, because India appears to be willing to go to some trouble to regulate conditions under which monkeys are shipped. Further, it is not possible that our publications concerning the extreme cruelty inflicted on monkeys in some shipments could have brought about the embargo: our first publication on that subject went into print just *after* the embargo was put into effect. I learned about the embargo in a telephone conversation with an airlines official concerning Information Report Vol. 4, No. 1, which contained our first article on the subject. Our two subsequent articles provide information on regulations and recommendations for establishing humane transport of these animals.

To answer the three questions on Page 2:

1. As mentioned in the article which you already have, the Animal Welfare Institute has consistently proposed that the procurement problem be solved by permitting dogs from public pounds to be used for non-survival experiments under full anesthesia, and by raising dogs for chronic studies. Antivivisectionists oppose this solution.

2. While the statement that the ASPCA "has done more inspection, regulation, consultation and other constructive work to improve laboratory animal care than any other animal welfare organization" is untrue, it is also untrue to say that we have carried on a campaign against the ASPCA — however completely we disapprove of this organization's behavior in respect to the \$800,000 a year income it receives from dog license fees and the position it takes in regard to the Hatch-Metcalf Act. Officials of the ASPCA joined the New York State Society for Medical Research in opposing an amendment which would have given the New York State Humane Association the right to be represented among the official inspectors under the Hatch Metcalf Act. Because this amendment was defeated, neither the ASPCA nor any other New York animal protective society has any *legal* right to inspect laboratories. So far, laboratories which requisition dogs and

cats from the ASPCA shelters have *permitted* ASPCA veterinarians to inspect their animal rooms. However, the ASPCA admitted in response to questions at its last annual meeting that it is not even aware of the type of experimental work for which animals from its shelters are used. (Representatives of the Animal Welfare Institute visited one of the ASPCA-inspected animal rooms in the company of an official New York City inspector. He passed by a dog whose incision had come open exposing internal organs, and approved the whole room. This sort of thing would be unthinkable in effectively inspected premises.)

3. The third question can best be answered by statements already printed in the enclosed circular letter to Biologists, Animal Welfare Workers and Others. The American Humane Association is in urgent need of reform. The question of pro- or anti-vivisection is not an issue. Major issues are pro- or anti-humane slaughter, pro- or anti-animal seizure, and the use of the funds of the organization in accordance with its stated purposes.

Since the NSMR article consists largely of the expression of opinion rather than of definite statements, I would suggest that documentation be required simply for the whole paragraph beginning: "As time has gone on the picture has become clearer and clearer." The only accurate part of this whole paragraph is that we have issued (and expect to continue to issue) strong criticism of cruel experiments with animals done by or in the presence of children.

I realize that it is much too late now to have the AWI and the NSMR articles appear in the March issue of the AIBS Bulletin. I wonder when they will appear?

Sincerely,
CHRISTINE STEVENS, *President*

* * *

TRAINING FILM NOW AVAILABLE IN CANADA

Because of the number of inquiries received from Canada concerning the film "Handling Laboratory Animals," arrangements have been set up with a Toronto film distribution firm to handle it in that country for the Animal Welfare Institute. In addition to those in Canada, laboratories in five other foreign countries have expressed interest in purchase or rental of the film, since it was first announced.

In this country, requests for showings have come from laboratories in 36 States and the District of Columbia. Some which have already seen the film have indicated that they plan to rent it from the Institute each year for a week or more; other laboratories have purchased a print for their own regular use in training caretakers.

The film, which demonstrates correct methods of handling twelve common laboratory animals and was produced in England by MacQueen Films with the cooperation of the National Institute for Medical Research, sells in the United States for \$65.00 with no charge for preview. The rental charge is \$3.00 for one week or less. All inquiries for Canada, as well as the United States, should be addressed to the Animal Welfare Institute.

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

SUGGESTIONS ON ANIMAL HOUSE DESIGN FROM NATIONAL RESEARCH COUNCIL REPORT

Sound advice on animal quarters is to be found in the National Research Council Report on Design, Construction and Equipment of Laboratories edited by H. S. Coleman and entitled "Laboratory Design" (Reinhold, New York). The chapter on "Animal Room and Equipment" by Charles P. Carpenter of the Mellon Institute gives useful pointers to those who are planning new buildings. He states: "Whenever possible animal quarters should occupy the ground floor of a building. The considerations which support this view are as follows:

"(a) less restriction is imposed on the physical size of species that may be used

"(b) the labor required to handle incoming animals, their feed, bedding, refuse and the necessary cages may be kept to a minimum

"(c) immediate and ready exit from the building in case of fire or the accidental escape of noxious gas or a vapor is possible

"(d) the installation of heavy concrete floors and the multiplicity of floor drains is accomplished more cheaply

"(e) outside runs for larger animals may be constructed to communicate with inside home cages

"(f) animal quarters may be divorced from the office and laboratories, thus simplifying the air conditioning problem."

On the subject of kennel-runway accommodations for dogs and monkeys, he writes: "If ground floor or pent-house type quarters on the top floor are utilized, exercise runs can be provided. Cage fabricators furnish standard wire panels in various sizes which can be assembled to provide adequate runs. Sliding doors communicating with these outside runs are installed so that in good weather the animals may have free access to the exterior. A canopy for protection against strong sunlight and rain is built over that portion of the run adjacent to the building for dogs, or a wire enforced glass room may be constructed over runs for monkeys. With ground floor installations, shrubs planted around the runways will serve to conceal them from the passersby. . . ." It might be added that such shrubs are useful in providing cool, natural shade.

Dr. Carpenter recommends the housing of a single species in one room and points out that it is too costly to house extremely large numbers of animals in one room; the use of smaller rooms make it possible for epidemics to be brought under control more easily. He further suggests the avoidance of waste of space in unnecessarily wide aisles. All of these points have an important bearing on the welfare of animals—the first as they affect health

and the last as it affects the provision of adequate space for each animal. Representatives of the Animal Welfare Institute have often observed large unused areas in animal rooms where the animals themselves were over-crowded and closely confined, to the detriment of their comfort and health.

Among suggestions for economical construction materials for animal quarters, Dr. Carpenter mentions a cupric oxychloride cement known as Hubbellite which can be laid over new or old concrete or wooden floors, as well as over radiant heating. He points out that there is nothing wrong with a plastered wall provided a hard-finish coat is applied. It is worth noting that out of a total budget for animal quarters, more sizeable cages and enclosures for the animals can be provided if practical economies such as these are effected in the overall design and construction.

BETTER ANIMAL HOUSING FOR FEDERALLY SUPPORTED INSTITUTIONS

Federal aid in the construction of facilities for medical research and training has been the subject of widespread editorials and articles in the daily press during the past several months. Several bills were introduced in the 84th Congress: one provided for a five-year \$250,000,000 program for aid in construction of facilities; another provided for a three-year \$90,000,000 similar program.

The Institute believes that when Federal funds are made available through grants to research institutions, some portion of each grant should be set aside for any necessary improvements in the quarters where experimental animals are housed and that Federal grants should be limited to institutions which already provide, or which will provide as part of the new construction, humane and scientific housing for all animals used. This would include runways for all large animals and adequate space, cleanliness, ventilation, light and comfortable resting places for all animals.

The well-designed quarters for dogs, monkeys and other large animals on long-term studies in the big animal breeding and hospital section of the National Institutes of Health, Bethesda, Maryland, could serve as a model for all institutions receiving Federal grants for building. Exercise runways are attached to all kennels and enclosures for large animals.

Proper housing and care of experimental animals is of great importance in the conduct of first-rate medical research involving such animals; however, the animal quarters of many scientific institutions visited by representatives of the AWI do not make adequate provision for the health and well-being of the occupants. In the same city or even in different departments of the same institution,

the visitor may find excellently designed and maintained animal quarters on the one hand, and on the other, cramped, dirty, dark, ill-smelling quarters where communicable diseases among the animals frequently interfere with the scientific observations being made.

Close confinement of the larger species of experimental animals such as dogs and monkeys has been the subject of scientific investigation, and the abnormal physiological effects resulting from such confinement recorded (shrinkage of the adrenal cortex in the monkey, metabolic changes in the dogs). Yet some laboratories confine these animals to small metal cages from which they are never even released for exercise.

Visitors to the type of windowless rooms where a hundred or more dogs are kept in small cages without exercise facilities and with nothing to rest on but the metal grid floor of the cage are met with an almost deafening noise of barking and of shaking of the cages. Not only does this constitute bad animal husbandry which cannot fail to have a deleterious effect on the research, but it is very wrong to inflict this wholly unnecessary suffering on animals. In many cases the experiment in which the animal is used is painful and distressing. It is inexcusable to add to his suffering by depriving him of such basic needs as a place to stretch his legs and a comfortable place to sleep. Yet thousands of laboratory dogs, cats and monkeys throughout the nation are being so deprived. In far too many large laboratories the minimum needs of many different species of animals which they house are not being met.

There is a widespread belief that whenever adequate funds are available for a research building it follows almost automatically that the animal quarters will be well-designed and comfortable. Unfortunately, experience shows that many millions of dollars have recently been spent for the construction of medical research buildings whose animal quarters are entirely inadequate both from the humane and the scientific viewpoint. It is not uncommon to see very substantial waste of space and construction material immediately adjacent to quarters in which each animal has only enough room to turn around.

The Institute's November-December, 1953 Information Report (Vol. 2, No. 5) cited two such examples of retrogression in laboratory animal housing, in newly completed research buildings whose total cost ran into millions of dollars. In each institution, despite the expenditure of vast sums of money, the new quarters for experimental animals were more crowded and provided less exercise than the old. Such poor planning should be avoided when Federal funds are expended by the various research institutions which are grantees.

CONGRESSIONAL INSPECTION OF SLAUGHTERING METHODS

A seven-man sub-committee of the Agriculture Committee of the United States House of Representatives has inspected slaughterhouses to acquaint itself with humane and inhumane slaughtering methods in use in this country. The subcommittee, headed by Congressman Poage (D. Texas), included Carl Albert (D. Oklahoma), W. Pat Jennings (D. Virginia), D. R. Matthews (D. Florida), William S. Hill (R. Colorado), Charles D. Hoeven (R. Iowa) and Ralph Harvey (R. Indiana). The Chairman of the House Agriculture Committee, Harold D. Cooley (D. North Carolina), also made the tour of inspec-

tion which took place early in August.

At the Seitz Packing Plant in St. Joseph, Missouri, two members of Congress themselves used the captive bolt pistol to stun cattle humanely prior to slaughter. They had no difficulty in effecting instantaneous unconsciousness with the pistol which is used at the Seitz plant in conjunction with the bright lights that dazzle the steer as it enters the knocking box causing it to stand perfectly still.

At Fremont, Nebraska, the Congressmen examined the humane carbon dioxide anesthetizing machine for hogs in use at the George A. Hormel plant there. The subcommittee's itinerary also included Kansas City, Missouri, Omaha, Nebraska, and Chicago, Illinois, cities which provide numerous examples of routine inhumane slaughtering methods—the great wheel to hoist pigs, sheep and calves by one hind leg to the sticker who has to thrust a knife into the conscious animal's throat, and, for cattle, the man with the hammer who often has to beat a steer over the head repeatedly before it falls unconscious.

The sub-committee will report its findings to the House of Representatives in the coming Congressional session at which Congresswoman Martha Griffiths (D. Michigan) has announced her intention of reintroducing a compulsory humane slaughter bill. Senator Humphrey will continue the fight for the measure in the Senate.

The Secretary of Agriculture gave an adverse report on the three compulsory humane slaughter bills which were introduced in the past session of Congress, and they failed to be enacted.

Among newspapers which have published editorials urging enactment of such legislation are: Christian Science Monitor (Boston, Mass.), St. Louis (Mo.) Post-Dispatch, Washington (D.C.) Post, Fort Wayne (Ind.) News-Sentinel, Ann Arbor (Mich.) News, Detroit (Mich.) Free Press, New York Mirror, Port Byron (N.Y.) Chronicle, Troy (N.Y.) Record, Willmar (Minn.) Tribune, Buffalo County (Wisc.) Journal, Ticonderoga (N.Y.) Sentinel, Claxton (Ga.) Enterprise, LaPorte (Ind.) Herald Argus, Hackensack (N.J.) Bergen Record, Herkimer-Ilion (N.Y.) Evening Telegram, Louisville (Ky.) Times, St. Petersburg (Fla.) Times, Brewster (N.Y.) Standard, Kentucky Times-Star, Rockland (Me.) Courier Gazette, Santa Rosa (Calif.) Press Democrat, Fort Wayne (Ind.) Journal Gazette, Wichita (Kan.) Beacon, Fayetteville (N.C.) Observer, Summitt (N.J.) Herald, Sunday Times Advertiser (Trenton (N.J.)), San Antonio (Tex.) Light, Albany (N.Y.) Times-Union, Amarillo (Tex.) Daily News, Birmingham (Ala.) News, The Long Islander (N.Y.), Covington (La.) St. Tammany Farmer, Carthage (Mo.) Evening Press, Asbury Park (N.J.) Sunday Press, North Adams (Mass.) Transcript, Los Angeles (Calif.) Herald and Express, Long Island (N.Y.) Traveler, Call Bulletin (San Francisco, Calif.), Gazette & Daily (York, Penn.), Rockport (N.Y.) Union Sun & Journal, Aiken (S.C.) Standard & Review, Ithaca (N.Y.) Journal, South Bend (Ind.) Tribune, Asheville (N.C.) Citizen, Milwaukee (Wisc.) Journal, Florence (Ala.) Times, Sheffield (Ala.) Tri-Cities Daily, Brunswick (Ga.) News, Endicott (N.Y.) Bulletin, Roanoke Rapids (N.C.) Herald, Youngstown (Ohio) Vindicator, The Packinghouse Worker (Ill.), Greenville (Miss.) Delta Democrat-Times, Martinsville (Ind.) Reporter, Prescott (Ariz.) Courier, Southbridge (Mass.) News, Elmira (N.Y.) Star Gazette, Poughkeepsie (N.Y.) New Yorker, Mobile (Ala.) Register, Biloxi-Gulfport (Miss.) Herald, Phoenix (Ariz.) Gazette, Camden (N.J.) Courier Post, Beaumont (Tex.) Enterprise, Canton (Ill.) Ledger, Longview (Wash.) Daily News.

"IF YOU DON'T MIND MY SAYING SO"

Under the above title, Dr. Joseph Wood Krutch writes editorial comment for "The American Scholar", a quarterly published for general circulation by Phi Beta Kappa. Dr. Krutch, a member of the Advisory Committee of the Animal Welfare Institute, has very kindly given his permission to republish part of his remarks which appeared in the Summer, 1956, issue.

Referring to Dr. Albert Schweitzer's concept of Reverence for Life in relation to educational practices, Dr. Krutch speaks of "the near disappearance from the liberal arts curriculum of natural history as a cultural subject."

He continues, "From the mid-eighteenth to the mid-nineteenth centuries, some familiarity with plants, animals and birds was one of the recognized elements in 'The Education of a Gentleman.' Now, except in isolated and more or less accidental cases, even the biological courses, which have replaced the natural history American colleges used to offer, are intended for and taken only by students headed toward medicine or some scientific specialty. They are likely to begin with the dissection of the earthworm or cockroach and then go on to the dissection of the cat. But they rarely have anything to offer the student of, say, literature, who might like to know something about what the nature poets he does study seemed so strangely concerned with.

"Not long ago I spent a week on the campus of one of the older colleges of the Eastern Seaboard which prides itself upon being a liberal arts college and nothing else. Adjoining the campus is a fine stretch of woodland presented by an alumnus and planted with a beautiful array of native and exotic flowering shrubs and trees. When no student or faculty member I had met could tell me the name of one of the most striking, I sought out the one and only member of the botany department. He smiled condescendingly. 'I,' he said, 'am a cytologist. Doubt if I know a dozen plants by sight.' Now cytology is a very important subject. But are the secrets of the cell as essential a part of a liberal education as some nodding acquaintance with plants and animals? Perhaps it was this very college which produced the immortal student of romantic and Victorian literature who thought the 'pimpernel dozing by the lea' was some sort of furry quadruped taking a nap.

"'Nature Study' is now usually relegated to the kindergarten or the elementary grades, and even there it is tending to become more and more a laboratory science. I myself have seen a 'progressive' school where the pupils were being introduced to nature through the old dismal process of worm dissection, probably because that was all the instructor had been trained in. And that is by no means an extreme case. A leading biological supply house boasts of the wide increase in the use of 'nutrition experiments' (grandly so called) in schools, and it offers eight different deficient diets conveniently packaged, as well as the animals whose malnutrition when fed any one of these diets may be observed by the curious. Very recently the head of the National Cancer Institute has urged high-school teachers to teach their pupils how to produce cancer in mice by the transplantation of tumors and in chicks by the injection of enzymes.

"Is it sentimental to ask whether anyone not preparing for the serious study of anatomy is likely to be any the better for the dissecting of a cat or whether anyone, no matter what career he is preparing for, is any the better for having starved a rat or induced cancer in a mouse? However completely experiments up to and including vivisection may justify themselves when there is actually something to be learned from them, is there any possible excuse for repeating them merely by way of a spectacle?

"Forget, if you like, the rights of the mouse—if any. Think only of the attitudes developed in the human child. In his cradle, we read to him of Peter Rabbit. We 'assign' Blake, Wordsworth, Coleridge and Thoreau in college. But what is the use of asking him to explicate 'He prayeth best who loveth best, / All things both great and small' if his only contact with either the great or the small is going to be a demonstration that what Shylock said about Jews is true of animals also—if you prick them they bleed and if you poison them they die.

"Past experience has taught me that the only reaction of at least half those who read, or read at, this disquisition will be a simple 'So what?' 'Ours,' they will say, 'is the age of Man, Machines and Useful Knowledge. We are no longer part of nature either physically or emotionally. To the relatively slight degree that we are still dependent upon natural products, we have learned how to manage their production with maximum efficiency and there is no reason why we should let nature take her course about anything. Animals other than domestic and game are good for nothing except for what we can learn by dissecting or by experimenting upon them. All this fuss about Saving the Parks is merely a sentimental plea for wasting ground that could be grazed and lumber that could be cut. Millions today rarely see anything except concrete and steel and don't know what to make of anything else if they do happen to see it. Their proportionate numbers are bound to increase. Cities are healthier and more convenient anyway, and any regret over man's increasing self-sufficiency is merely what a certain well-known Columbia University professor used to call 'nostalgia for a lower form of civilization.'"

"As for literature and the other arts—if you still insist that they are somehow important—it is already being shown how well they can get along without what you call nature. Why shouldn't a painter paint factories and machines, which most people are familiar with, instead of the trees and beasts that most people are not? Literature has a wide enough field in sociology, psychology, and that purely human nature which is our chief concern. What does a pimpernel dozing by a lea have to do with modern man? As a matter of fact, I'm pretty vague myself as to what it is. And I don't feel any the worse for my ignorance."

"If all this is the truth and the whole truth, then obviously there is nothing more for me to say. If it isn't, then I still think the proposal I once made to offer 'Humanities 313—Nature Study for English majors' at Columbia was a good one. It may even be that Saving the National Parks will have to begin by getting natural history again accepted as part of 'The Education of a Gentleman.'"

WHICH DIRECTION FOR FUTURE SCIENTISTS?

A 17-year-old boy told of putting black widow spiders in the freezing compartment of his mother's refrigerator where one of them accidentally "froze solid." To prove that the fluid coming out of the frozen spider's fangs was venom, he said, "I injected it in some mice. I watched the mice closely. And I observed all the symptoms of black widow poisoning as the mice died." (Atlanta Journal and Constitution, June 4, 1956) This "project" won him entry to the National Science Fair.

How many mice he poisoned was not stated. Another 17-year-old, however, explicitly reports (Utica Observer June 1, 1956) that 254 golden hamsters, 10 rabbits and some guinea pigs were dissected by him after radiations which, he explained, "had the same effect on mammals as the A-bomb had on the human targets in Hiroshima." His mother cleaned the animals' cages and fed them.

According to the news report, there was nothing "stuffy" about this youth: "Contrary to popular belief that scientists in general are stiff and stuffy, John disputes this fact by revealing that his second love is music. To put it bluntly, he's a 'cat' who 'digs' that 'crazy jive' and dances to its blood-pulsating beat.

"John's lab in the cellar of his home attracted many of the neighborhood children who watched his experiments intently, assisting him whenever he gave them the opportunity. He recalled that one nine-year-old boy with scientific leanings took him seriously when John said he may experiment on cats. The boy promptly secured one and brought it to John's home with the owner's permission to carve it up. Thereafter, John said, the neighbors took great pains to keep their cats indoors."

The report did not state whether the neighbors took great pains to keep their children indoors and away from the cellar laboratory, but it is to be hoped that mothers were as concerned with the children's moral welfare as cat owners were with their pets' physical welfare.

Animal experimentation in cellars and other odd spots is highly dubious, to say the very least. When it is carried on by immature youths seeking cash rewards, the questions it raises ought to be pondered far more seriously than they have been to date by the groups whose money and promotional efforts have brought about this peculiarly modern form of moral laxity.

It would be well if they would think clearly of a boy *closely* watching, observing *all* the symptoms, as the mice he has injected die of a painful poison; of a smaller boy hoping to see a cat "carved up" in a laboratory and promptly procuring one for the purpose; of still other children anxious to win a prize, seeing the glowing publicity that experiments which cause suffering and death to animals bring in some newspapers and deciding that this must be the way to success.

What kind of science and what kind of scientists will the United States end up with if this kind of propaganda continues?

ENLARGEMENT OF "COMFORTABLE QUARTERS FOR LABORATORY ANIMALS"

A new supplement to the Animal Welfare Institute's loose-leaf publication, "Comfortable Quarters for Laboratory Animals", will be sent to all laboratories which received the original manual and first supplement. The new pages will include additional suggestions on the housing of dogs, cats, monkeys, rabbits, mice and rats.

Persons planning to remodel or re-equip animal quarters, or to build new ones, are invited to write for a free copy of "Comfortable Quarters for Laboratory Animals". Suggestions for new material are invited.

The Institute also calls attention to other items available from its office:

BASIC CARE OF EXPERIMENTAL ANIMALS. A 36 page illustrated manual available free on request to anyone employed in a scientific institution. It is being translated into German and Japanese and is expected to be available in these languages soon.

HANDLING LABORATORY ANIMALS. A 20-minute sound film produced by MacQueen Films in cooperation with the National Institute for Medical Research, Mill Hill, England, showing expert handling of twelve common species of animals, available at cost price of \$65 (free preview) or, for rental, three dollars per week.

FIRST AID AND CARE OF SMALL ANIMALS. A 46-page illustrated manual, now in its third printing, written by Ernest P. Walker of the Smithsonian Institution. Available free to teachers, 25¢ per copy to others.

A limited number of back issues of the Information Reports and Annual Reports, as well as a booklet giving the aims and purposes of the Animal Welfare Institute, are free 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

OAK RIDGE INSTITUTE OF NUCLEAR STUDIES CAUTIONS AGAINST INHUMANE EXPERIMENTS FOR SCIENCE FAIRS

Important progress has been made toward reversing a trend in science teaching which all humanitarians deplore: the promotion of cruel experiments on animals carried out by primary and secondary school students in their classes or in their homes. The Animal Welfare Institute has been protesting against this educational monstrosity for the past two years,* and its officers were much encouraged recently to receive a statement from the officials of the Oak Ridge Institute of Nuclear Studies on this subject, which adds valuable confirmation to the thinking set forth by Dr. Clive McCay, Professor of Nutrition, Cornell University, in an article published six months ago by the AWI. In that article, Dr. McCay mentioned a cruel nutritional experiment which, as he pointed out, was entirely unsuitable for the high school student who proposed to perform it. "Our own objections to such demonstrations," he said, "are that nothing is illustrated of practical or theoretical importance, and the student gains attention by the suffering and malformation that he inflicts on a lower animal". Then he told with approval of a humanely designed experiment which another high school student had proposed: the comparison of two good athlete's diets by feeding them to rats housed in cages with exercise wheels.

Science Fair authorities and science teachers can quickly bring an end to the cruel experiments by young people which are as detrimental to the character of the young as to the welfare of the animals involved. A major step in that direction is described in the following release from the Information Department of the Oak Ridge Institute of Nuclear Studies, Oak Ridge, Tennessee, Sept. 26, 1956:

"The Oak Ridge Institute of Nuclear Studies, which administers several programs concerned with improvement of science instruction on the pre-college level, has issued a statement concerning its attitude toward the use of animals in student experiments.

"Among the programs of ORINS, a non-profit educational corporation of 34 Southern universities, is a science-fair program, which encourages the development and improvement of science fairs, and is concerned with methods of improving science education and stimulating student interest in science. Students who participate in science

fairs plan and construct exhibits illustrating scientific principles; often some of these studies involve the use of animals to present the results of an experiment.

"ORINS officials have recently reviewed practices of high-school students in using experimental animals, and have inserted the following statement into their manuals for science fairs:

"CAUTION: It is suggested that extreme care be exercised before approving a student project involving the use of animals. There are a number of instructional animal experiments which might be carried out by students, such as nutritional studies which involve no discomfort or inhumane treatment to the animal. But there are also a number of animal experiments which, while possibly necessary and valid when conducted by an experienced technician, are highly invalid and uselessly inhumane when conducted by a student. Perhaps it would be good to withhold approval of any student experiment which might inflict any degree of pain, discomfort or mental anguish on an animal, regardless of the value of such a project as a science-education tool."

SCHWEITZER MEDAL AWARDED TO MAJOR C. W. HUME

The 1956 Albert Schweitzer Award of the Animal Welfare Institute was presented to Major C. W. Hume, founder and Secretary-General of the Universities Federation for Animal Welfare, at a supper in his honor at the Connaught Hotel, London, England, on October 12th. Officers and staff members of UFAW attended the ceremony, which was presided over by the Federation's Chairman and Honorary Artist, Kenneth Bird (Fougasse). Fougasse's drawings are well known to readers of *Punch* which he has edited as well as decorated, and they have won countless adherents to the cause of animal protection through the lively and persuasive pictorial comments they have added to UFAW literature. He is one of the most valuable friends of animals in the world.

OPENING REMARKS BY MR. BIRD

"Everyone who has, either by design or accident, become embroiled in animal welfare affairs must sooner or later have looked round on his colleagues and associates and also on himself and wondered what qualities this rather tricky branch of human activity chiefly demanded. Firstly, of course, it demands the quality of compassion, of neighbourliness—but that is not much use without the quality of courage, to make it join in the struggle, and

*See Information Reports Vol. 4 No. 3, Vol. 5 No. 1, No. 2 and No. 4.

also the quality of determination to make it go on and on with the struggle, in spite of everything.

"These, however, are qualities of the heart; they make up, together, the driving force down in the engine room; and they cannot be effective without intelligence on the bridge above, to direct them—and it is unfortunate that animal welfare enthusiasts should so often have such splendid engines of the heart and yet apparently be so very poorly equipped higher up. No doubt that is why they are so often in collision with one another.

"This is therefore indeed a fortunate occasion: it is very, very seldom that one can be privileged to find so many animal welfare experts in one room, all of whom not only qualify nobly as regards the heart but also pass with high honours as regards the head—and seldom indeed can one be privileged to attend a ceremony in which the two principals embody and symbolise so remarkably all the qualities of both heart and head: Mrs. Christine Stevens, President of the Animal Welfare Institute, and Major Hume, Secretary-General of UFAW . . ."

REMARKS OF MRS. STEVENS IN PRESENTING THE SCHWEITZER MEDAL TO MAJOR HUME

"Major Hume recognized before anyone else the extraordinarily close relationship which was bound to come between science on the massive modern scale and the welfare of animals. Having recognized it, he acted upon it in a wide variety of ways from the most minutely technical to the most broadly ethical.

"With the help of all of you who are here tonight and the other humane and thoughtful people who share his convictions, he has built the Universities Federation for Animal Welfare into a strong force against cruelty, callousness and suffering. He has deprived the opponents of animal protection of their favorite ammunition by providing a reasoned and learned approach to the reduction of cruelty. He has lessened suffering by applying this approach to specific problems. He has exercised wisdom in selecting from the discouragingly vast array of difficult problems those which cause the most severe suffering to the largest number of animals. He has sought total solutions without rejecting partial ones when they help animals.

"These are only a few of the reasons why Major Hume has been asked to accept the Albert Schweitzer Medal of the Animal Welfare Institute. It was created for the purpose of reducing the pain and fear that men inflict on animals, especially laboratory animals. No one could be more deserving of this award than Major Hume. The brilliance of his mind, the wide range of his interest and knowledge, his deep concern with ethics, and, above all, his real and direct sympathy with animals leads to an obvious analogy with Dr. Schweitzer. Different though their lives have been, both exemplify a spirit which is gaining ground. Both have great respect for the scientific method and the knowledge it makes possible. Both are active in putting such knowledge to work for direct aid to suffering creatures whether they are pelicans or rats, rabbits or humans. Both have written lucidly and beautifully on moral questions. Major Hume has made substantial contributions towards the goal of Dr. Schweitzer's plea for 'a broader ethics which will include the animals also' Such a point of view is no longer an unnecessary refinement of civilization. The advancement of scientific knowledge has made it imperative for us in the twentieth

century to develop sympathy and consideration and kindness as never before for the most basic of all reasons—survival of ourselves and of the earth itself as we know it.

"It has been said that human beings usually end up treating each other as they have treated animals. If this is true, and there is considerable historical evidence to show that it is, Major Hume's unflagging efforts in behalf of one of the most unpopular animals in the world should be appreciated by millions. I am glad that a rat, which is a highly intelligent, adaptable, and, when kindly treated, friendly animal, is depicted on the Schweitzer Medal together with a dog, cat and monkey, guinea pig, pigeon and chick. Major Hume has championed the right of rats to humane consideration. He has striven against that sad illogic which suggests that dislike of an animal gives one the right to make it suffer and that if an animal is to be killed it makes no difference what torment it goes through in the process.

"For his unselfish devotion to the protection of all kinds of animals popular and unpopular against unnecessary suffering, for his courage and hard work, imagination and good sense in carrying out the great aim of reducing the pain and fear we inflict, the Albert Schweitzer Medal is presented to Major Hume."

MAJOR HUME'S REPLY IN ACCEPTING THE SCHWEITZER MEDAL

"I accept with the very greatest gratitude the honour which, by presenting this medal to me, you have done to UFAW; that is, to the team in which I have the honour to play centre half. If I can claim any personal credit, it is for having applied to animal welfare the principle which I learned from Sir Richard Gregory when, thirty years ago, he made me Hon. Secretary of the British Science Guild, a body which existed to promote the application of scientific methods and results to public affairs. Ideas are sometimes powerful; and this idea, that the welfare of animals is not a matter for sentimentality but deserves the same kind of systematic study which other social problems receive in the universities, explains the success of UFAW. In particular, this idea has appealed to and attracted the right sort of people; it has attracted able administrators, distinguished scholars and brilliant scientists, who have made and are making their contribution to the work of the team. What one man can do is only a small fraction of what is done by such a team as UFAW now possesses, both in its permanent staff and in its honorary officers and counsellors.

"The high distinction of this medal derives from the quality of the Animal Welfare Institute of America, which presents it. We in our early days had great difficulties to face and grave misunderstandings to resolve. In particular we were bitterly attacked by anti-vivisectionists on one side and by their more extreme opponents on the other. Today both parties in this controversy have become more moderate, so far as Great Britain is concerned, and biologists in particular, except for a few eccentrics who can be ignored, now take UFAW to their heart. But in the United States the position is different. I well know the conditions under which the splendid work of the Animal Welfare Institute has to be carried on, and how much more its efforts are needed in America than ours are here, and to what frantic attacks its personnel have been, subjected from both sides. That the anti-vivisectionists should attack one who refuses to adopt

their policy is only to be expected; but on the other side I have seen statements circulated by men who profess to speak for science, which are equally scurrilous and untruthful. Daughter of a very distinguished physiologist, and brought up from childhood to practise the intellectual integrity which is the life-blood of science, you, Madam, are deprived of all controversial weapons except truth. It is because you are engaged in a task of such magnitude and difficulty, in the teeth of obstacles more vicious than any we in UFAW have had to face, that on behalf of the team with which I work I accept with strong emotion a medal which is, in Mistral's phrase, an *oumourno flourido; une aumône fleurie.*"

* * *

Commenting on Major Hume's great achievements, the London Evening News of October 12th carried the following paragraphs:

"Doughty fighter for the rights of animals to be killed humanely, Major Charles Hume, to-night reaps his reward. For at the Connaught Hotel, Mrs. Christine Stevens, president of the Animal Welfare Institute (New York), will present him with the Albert Schweitzer medal of the institute and 500 dollars in recognition of his services to the welfare of laboratory animals.

"When I told him of the 500 dollars the sprightly 70-year-old Major, veteran Territorial of both World Wars, chuckled, 'I shall spend it on a cycling holiday in France. No sense and disrespectful to hand it straight back to charity.'

"It was in France that cruelty to animals in the markets fired him to found the Universities Federation for Animal Welfare 30 years ago. Largely due to his efforts the gin trap with its cruel steel jaws becomes illegal in 1958.

"The Major, who lives in Regent's Park-road, Finchley, fought to get the electric harpoon adopted for whale-catching instead of the barbarous explosive harpoon. But undoubtedly his greatest triumph is in the education of laboratory staff in the care of animals used for experimental work."

IMPROVING ANIMAL QUARTERS

A new supplement to the Animal Welfare Institute's loose-leaf manual, "Comfortable Quarters for Laboratory Animals", was published in November. This manual, which is sent without charge to scientific institutions which request it, was first printed in 1954 with a view to improving laboratory animal housing by providing the best available information on design and construction of buildings and equipment.

The first supplement was added in 1955. The second, just completed, consists of photographs and floor plans of good quarters with adequate exercise space for monkeys, chimpanzees, dogs, and other large animals at the National Institutes of Health, Bethesda, Maryland, where runways range from 14 to 25 feet in length; a photograph of a new cat room at Albany Medical College, Albany, New York, where the cats are not confined to cages but are allowed to move about freely, sleep on wooden shelves provided with paper bedding, and sharpen their claws on a dead tree; architect's plans for proposed

new dog quarters with outside runways at the University of Pennsylvania; a photograph of a cyprus resting board for laboratory dogs to sleep on at Gaines Kennel, Cornell University, Ithaca, New York; drawings and photographs of three different types of comfortable wooden nest boxes for rabbits and a picture of well-designed outdoor rabbit hutches for warm climates which include floor-boards for the rabbits' comfort and protection (Beacon Milling Co. and University of California Agricultural Experiment Station); a diagram of a five-tier guinea-pig battery which conserves laboratory space while at the same time providing good exercise room for the animals (Plux Company, England); pictures of a cage for small rodents which features a built-in nest box, removable for cleaning with a hinged cover which may be lifted for easy observation without disturbing the animals (Norwich Wire Works, Norwich N.Y.), and a picture of a roomy rabbit cage with removable center partition which permits extra space for individual animals when desired (Frederick Braby & Co., England).

This material has been sent to each of the approximately 350 laboratories from which requests for the manual have been received. It is interesting to note the wide geographical distribution of these laboratories; they are located in 40 of the 48 states and the following foreign countries: Australia, Brazil, Canada, Colombia, England, Finland, Germany, India, Italy, Lebanon, Mexico, the Netherlands, Panama, Switzerland, Venezuela, and Yugoslavia.

Any laboratory desiring a copy of "Comfortable Quarters for Laboratory Animals" may obtain one free by writing to the Animal Welfare Institute.

NEWS ABOUT HUMANE SLAUGHTER

An additional practical and humane device for rendering animals insensible prior to slaughter is now available to American packers. The Schermer stunner, which was on display at the recent convention of the National Independent Meat Packers Association, has been in wide use in Europe for thirty years. The American importers (Alfa International Corporation, New York) state they have it with or without a handle for long range use, that maintenance is easy, that it will stand up under long use, that it operates on the captive bolt principle, weighs five pounds and costs \$150 with ammunition at 2-3/4¢ per animal.

AWI Information Reports have frequently mentioned two other practical, humane slaughtering devices available for immediate purchase by packers: the Cash-X Captive Bolt Pistol distributed by the Koch Supply Company, 2520 Holmes Street, Kansas City 8, Mo., and the carbon dioxide anesthetizing tunnel available from the Allbright-Nell Company, 5323 So. Western Boulevard, Chicago 9, Illinois.

Two additional packing plants, Kingan and Company of Indianapolis and the Tobin Packing Company of Albany, New York, are reported to be in the process of installing these tunnels which put pigs to sleep painlessly before slaughter. They are already in use in all three large plants of the George A. Hormel Company, the inventors.

It is encouraging to observe the increased adoption of humane slaughtering devices since legislation to re-

quire their use was introduced in the United States Senate and House of Representatives in 1955. However, owing to the fact that the legislation was not enacted, the large majority of our food animals are still being killed by crude and painful methods which terrify and torture the animals and endanger the men working on the killing floor. Another compulsory humane slaughter bill is scheduled to be introduced early in the coming Congressional session by the Hon. Martha Griffiths (D. Michigan). Its enactment would result in the substitution of merciful for cruel means of slaughter and would bring our standards up to the level of the ten other nations which have already enacted similar legislation. For further information on humane slaughtering methods and legislation,

readers are invited to write to the Animal Welfare Institute.

TO COMPLETE FILES OF AWI REPORTS

The fifth Annual Report of the Institute was published in October, and a free copy will be sent to any Information Report readers upon request. The Information Report is published five times annually—bi-monthly, with the exception of July-August. Regular readers of the Information Report who may have missed one or more issues during the past year due to change of address or postal errors are invited to write to the Institute's offices for back copies.

ANIMAL WELFARE INSTITUTE
ADVISORY COMMITTEE

Dr. Lee R. Dice Dr. Peter Okkelberg Dr Joseph Wood Krutch David Ricardo

OFFICERS

Christine Stevens, Alfred R. Glancy, Jr., Roger L. Stevens, Estella Draper, Mary M. Richards,
President *Vice-President* *Treasurer* *Executive Secretary* *Assistant Treasurer*

Demands on the Animal Institute increased greatly this year. So many school teachers asked for free copies of "First Aid and Care of Small Animals", so many scientists, technicians and administrators asked for free copies of "Basic Care of Experimental Animals", "Comfortable Quarters for Laboratory Animals", as well as other services, and so much work was done to advance the use of humane slaughtering methods, that the Animal Welfare Institute is urgently in need of funds to carry out an equally effective program in the coming year.

More work and more publications of a high quality are needed if continuing progress is to be made in the welfare and protection of animals. The Institute will continue its work for laboratory animals and meat animals and hopes to be able to extend some help to another large group of animals whose protection has been neglected and on which great suffering is routinely inflicted: those trapped or poisoned for their fur or in predator, rodent and other "control" activities.

All readers of the Information Report are cordially invited to become members of the Animal Welfare Institute or to make a contribution, large or small, to its work. Members and contributors can rest assured that their money will be used promptly for animal welfare. Anyone wishing to designate a particular use for his donation is most welcome to do so. A membership application blank is printed below. Contributions are deductible in computing income tax.

ANIMAL WELFARE INSTITUTE
270 Park Avenue
New York 17, New York

(after Jan. 1: 22 East 17th Street
New York 3, N.Y.)

APPLICATION FOR MEMBERSHIP (Non-voting)

ASSOCIATE MEMBERSHIP, ten dollars
Open to individuals and organizations

CONTRIBUTING MEMBERSHIP, two dollars
Open to individuals only.

Name

Address

City State

96