27.10.1975

Dear Mr Linnit,

I believe the actor Vladek Sheybal has been discussing a play of mine on Gustav Mahler with your client Giorgina Hale. We in this company produced this play about three years ago here in London, and lost £6000 on it. Mr Sheybal played Mahler, and he tells me he would be interested in a revival, and would like to show the script to Miss Hale.

This letter is designed ot put the matter on a professional footing. Until now we have not thought of planning a new production, and indeed if the play were revived, or set up in the States, it would be under another management.

If Miss Hale could visualise herself playing Alma in the play it would be a matter of basing a new production on this most interesting actor-actress combination, for naturally a two-hander would be for today an economically most viable form of theatre.

I simply want Miss Hale, should she choose to read the script, to have a realistic picture of the situation, and I wonder if you would communicate all this to her.

Sincerely,

Maurice Rowdon

49 Waldron Road
S.W.18.

Dear Pat,

Is there any chance of getting a short documentary done on the government's failure to control cruelty to animals in scientific experiments? The last Act on the subject is dated 1876. Animals tortured have increased from 95000 in 1910 to nearly 5 million in 1967 alone, with virtually no inspection or supervision at all. MAN: THE ANIMAL-HATING ANIMAL. The result of a big RSPCA campaign in 1963 showed that most people d didn't know the degree to which quite unnecessary suffering was taking place and there was an outcry. Sixty questions were put down in the House of Commons. The result was the Littlewood Committee. This produced its recommendations in 1965, since when precisely nothing has been done. The programme might fall into three parts covering the laboratories, the RSPCA and the Home Office. There was a press conference at the RSPCA last Novemeber I believe which was covered for TV, and something very tiny did go out. The Home Office feels that the Littlewood recommendations don't need any priority, and we would aim to show that this is horribly untrue. The press officer at the RSPCA tell s me that they have never had a documentary on the subject before. I thought it might do for your early Sunday evening slot.

The Mermaid was the first to react to CARMAGNOLA. They want me to change the second part a little bit. Then Miles has to be brought to the water. Basil Ashmore the literary manager there may send you on my suggestion a tele play on the first day-out of a convict, written by a convict. The BBC turned it down because nothings happens, which is apparently presciely what happens on the first day out. Anyway he sounds a very genuine creature. I believe Ashmore has sold a play of his to Tennents though here wires may have crossed.

On PERSONA NON GRATA John Gibson said we would do much cutting---mostly by eliminating a sentence or two in every speech. I didn't mention this to you at the time.

Don't write back to me on any of this. We can talk it over when we meet again. Letters are too definite.

Yours ever,

Maurice Rowdon

TELEPHONE
TELEGRAMS } 01-930 0971

ROYAL SOCIETY FOR THE PREVENTION OF CRUELTY TO ANIMALS
105 JERMYN STREET, LONDON, S.W.1

Please address letters to Secretary

When replying or telephoning please quote this reference

TR/DJT

7th February, 1969.

M. Rowdon, Esq.,
49, Waldron Road,
S.W.18.

Dear Mr. Rowdon,

It was very good of you to say that you will try to persuade either the B.B.C. or one of the independent companies to mount a programme based on the idea of our pamphlet "The Wasted Years". As promised I am sending you press releases. I am sure they will help you.

If you are able to place the idea, please keep in touch with me.

Yours sincerely,

T. Richardson.
PUBLIC RELATIONS OFFICER.

Enc.

How You Can Help

Many Members of Parliament, who belong to the Animal Welfare Group, are already pledged to fight for the implementation of the Littlewood Report. We are convinced that many other Members would give us their support if they knew the full story and the strength of public opinion. Would you please therefore:

(i) Write in your own words to your Member of Parliament urging him to press the Government to take *immediate* action to implement the Littlewood Report.

(ii) Speak or write to your friends asking them also to write to their M.P.s.

Further supplies of this leaflet are available from R.S.P.C.A., 105 Jermyn Street, London, S.W.1 for distribution to your friends

---

Printed by Wightman & Co. Ltd., 1-3 Brixton Road, London, S.W.9

The Wasted Years

Issued by The Royal Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals
105 Jermyn Street, London, S.W.1.

Over four million experiments a year

The Cruelty to Animals Act was passed in 1876 to control experiments on living animals. It has remained virtually unaltered for ninety-two years, although the whole pattern of scientific and commercial research has changed. Instead of one or two small research units handling under 300 animals a year, there are now over 600 establishments carrying out $4\frac{3}{4}$ million experiments annually.

The R.S.P.C.A. has long been convinced that drastic reforms in both the Law itself, and its administration, are vitally necessary. A major campaign was launched in 1963 to explain the inadequacy of the Act, and the vast amount of unnecessary suffering which was taking place. The public was so alarmed at these disclosures, that great pressure was brought to bear in Parliament, and over 60 questions were asked in the House. There was All Party demand for action.

The Littlewood Committee

The Government appointed a committee of enquiry under the Chairmanship of the late Sir Sydney Littlewood to carry out a thorough investigation, and they decided that the members of the Committee should include not only doctors, but a veterinary

surgeon, two Members of Parliament, and certain very eminent persons, respected throughout the country for their humanity and unbiased judgment. This Committee spent two years making exhaustive enquiries into the working of the Act, and published their 265 page Report in 1965.

Proposed reforms

The Committee's main recommendations for reform were:

★ Amendment of the existing law to apply to ALL experimental procedure liable to cause pain, stress, interference with, or departure from, an animal's normal condition of well being.

★ Improvement and tightening-up of the present system of licensing experimenters, with a closer scrutiny into the purpose of experiments.

★ A widening of the function of the Advisory Committee set up on a recommendation of the 1906-12 Royal Commission on Vivisection, to advise the Home Secretary on administration of the regulations controlling animal experimentation, with a strengthening of its membership to include lay persons.

★ An increase, from ten to twenty-one, in the number of Home Office inspectors appointed under the 1876 Act, to examine the suitability of applicants for licences, to advise on the restrictions to be applied to licencees' work, to examine laboratory records, and to inspect and advise on conditions under which laboratory animals are kept. This inspectorate to be organised on a regional basis, with officers having medical and veterinary qualifications available in each region.

★ The Home Secretary to be empowered to make definite regulations governing the care and accommodation of laboratory animals, and to make regulations governing their transport.

★ Members of the public, by means of official publications, to be kept more fully informed on the subject of animal experimentation generally.

An unreasonable delay

The Government promised early action. At each subsequent Session of Parliament, questions were asked on the subject, and it was assumed that the delay in implementing the Report was due to the usual problems in drafting suitable legislation.

Now, after three wasted years, we are told the bitter truth —that the Home Office consider that the 1876 Act worked 'reasonably well' and that all the vital reforms suggested by the Littlewood Committee do not justify any priority.

In other words, the Government says that the paper work involved in preparing what should be a non-controversial Bill outweighs the obvious and urgent need to give protection to the millions of living animals used for experiment.

The R.S.P.C.A. view

The R.S.P.C.A. has never been an anti-vivisection society—it accepts that a certain amount of experimental work on animals is unavoidable, but it does believe that the vast increase in experiments—95,731 in 1910, 3,701,184 in 1960, and 4¾ millions in 1967—shows that the matter is now completely out of control.

It is convinced that permission for experiments should be subject to much more vigorous supervision, and the basic control should be placed in the hands of a new Advisory Body, containing unbiased, responsible persons. It is utterly wrong that scientists and the commercial laboratories should be given virtually a free hand to pursue their personal aspirations and theories at the expense of suffering inflicted on tens of thousands of animals.

The R.S.P.C.A. is convinced that 95 per cent of the public support this commonsense and humanitarian approach, and that the demands so clearly indicated in Parliament in 1963 have been frustrated by the evasion and stonewalling tactics of the Home Office. In the meantime, vast numbers of animals continue to suffer quite needlessly.

Royal Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals,

105, Jermyn Street, London, S.W.1.

TELEPHONE } 01-930 0971
TELEGRAMS }

14th August, 1968.

EXPERIMENTS ON ANIMALS

Grave disappointment characterizes the reaction of the R.S.P.C.A. to the latest Government return on experiments on living animals, released yesterday. This return shows that the rising tendency in the volume of experiments has once again been resumed to such an extent that the number of experiments for 1967 (4,755,680) tops those for 1965 when the figure of 4,751,060 was the highest ever reached. The R.S.P.C.A. recalls that last year when the 1966 figures were released, they showed a drop of no less than 136,037 from the 1967 figures. It had been the constant and regular increase in the annual number of experiments that was advanced as an argument by the R.S.P.C.A. for an enquiry into the administration of the Cruelty to Animals Act, 1876.

Last year the R.S.P.C.A. addressed a letter to the Home Secretary expressing the hope that the check on the increase in the number of experiments - reflected in the 1966 figures - was the result of policy decisions in his department, and that the downward tendency was to be maintained. It is in the light of this observation that the Society is so disturbed by this year's return showing the high increase in the number of experiments during 1967. The R.S.P.C.A. recalls that thanks in a large measure to agitation by this Society the Departmental Committee on Experiments on Animals, under the Chairmanship of Sir Sydney Littlewood, was appointed by the Home Secretary in 1963. The Committee's report was published in 1965 and the R.S.P.C.A. is appalled at the tardiness of the Government in implementing the recommendations of its own Committee. A demand for action on these recommendations has been the constant theme of questions in Parliament. The last question was asked as recently as 26th July, when the spokesman for the Home Secretary said that there was nothing to add to the answer given on 4th July, when it had been stated that "at this stage" the Home Secretary could not say when it would be possible to implement the recommendations of the Littlewood Committee.

The R.S.P.C.A. finds these delays intolerable and proposes to agitate for the earliest possible action. The seriousness with which the R.S.P.C.A. regards this delay will be clearly understood when it is remembered that about 87 per cent of experiments are still under Certificate A, which applies to experiments carried out without anaesthetics, and almost 10 per cent of the experiments are under Certificate B, which applies to experiments carried out under anaesthesia, where the animal is not killed before it recovers from the influence of the anaesthetic.

TR/SAB

Royal Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals,
105, Jermyn Street, London S.W.1.

TELEPHONE
TELEGRAMS } 01 - 930 0971

14th June, 1968.

EXPERIMENTS ON ANIMALS

In a letter dated 12th June, 1968, Major R.F. Seager, Secretary of the R.S.P.C.A., has asked the Home Secretary, on behalf of the Council of the R.S.P.C.A., for an assurance that the Ministry of Defence establishments at Porton Down, Wiltshire, are regularly visited by the inspectors appointed under the Cruelty to Animals Act, 1876, which regulates experiments on animals. The R.S.P.C.A.'s letter draws attention to the very considerable disquiet and anxiety caused by recent television and press disclosures about experiments on animals at Porton Down and asks also for an assurance that every effort is made to reduce animal suffering to a minimum.

In his letter to the Home Secretary the R.S.P.C.A. Secretary expresses the grave concern of the R.S.P.C.A. that no action has yet been taken by the Government towards implementing the recommendations of the Littlewood Committee, set up in 1963 to enquire into the existing regulations governing animal experimentation. The report of that committee was published as long ago as April, 1965, and, whilst fully rec gnising the complexity of the subject and the necessity for new legislation, the R.S.P.C.A. and other interested organisations feel that the long delay in government action is deplorable. There is undoubted public concern about animal experimentation and, as the committee's report made abundantly clear, there is urgent need for reform.

TR/SAB

EXPERIMENTS ON ANIMALS
HOME OFFICE RETURN FOR 1965

PRESS STATEMENT

The alarming increase of over a quarter of a million in the number of experiments on animals last year by comparison with the previous year gives added support to the R.S.P.C.A. argument for stricter control over the licensing of experiments. It was the year-by-year increase in the number of such experiments that prompted the R.S.P.C.A. to demand an investigation into the administration of the Cruelty to Animals Act, 1876, under which vivisection is authorised.

The latest figures (total, 4,751,060, against 4,494,931 for 1964) appear in the Home Office return of experiments for the year 1965, which has just been published.

For years Home Secretaries resisted R.S.P.C.A. pressure for an enquiry into the administration of the Cruelty to Animals Act, but finally in 1963 a Departmental Committee was appointed under the Chairmanship of Sir Sydney Littlewood to consider the present control over experiments on living animals and to consider whether and if so what changes are desirable in the law or its administration.

As well as expressing publicly its alarm at the latest increase in the numbers of experiments, the R.S.P.C.A. is writing to the Home Secretary urging speedy implementation of the recommendations of the Littlewood Report.

TR/YC 25:8:66 Read to P.A. a.m.

Copies to :
Mr. Lloyd
Mr. Joiner
Mr. Girdwood
Editor
Editorial II
File
Correspondence
Parade Room
Overseas
Night Staff
Magazine
Mr. Kornell
Mr. White
Clinics
Supts.
Parliamentary
Branch

Royal Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals,
105, Jermyn Street, London, S.W.1.

TELEPHONE } WHITEHALL 7177
TELEGRAMS }

EXPERIMENTS ON ANIMALS
THE LITTLEWOOD COMMITTEE'S REPORT.

In order to understand the report it is necessary to recall how the Act under which experiments are conducted came into being and the history of the need for reforms in its administration.

In 1863 it became known that veterinary students in France were being required to perform, as part of their training, operations on live horses without anaesthetic, a series of operations on each horse. This aroused in England concern about the suffering of animals in experiments among leading persons in various walks of life. The British Association and the British Medical Association took the matter up. In 1874 a memorandum to the R.S.P.C.A. was signed by a number of the most eminent, not only in science and medicine, but also in other of the various walks of life referred to above. In 1875 there was a Royal Commission on Vivisection and the Home Office was asked to produce a bill embodying its recommendations. The original intention was to prohibit experiments on animals entirely, but when the bill was drawn up, its sponsors came to the view that this would drive experiments underground and experimenters abroad. The bill was entitled the Cruelty to Animals bill. It became an Act in 1876 and has covered experiments on animals ever since.

The main provision is that a person shall not perform on a living animal any experiment calculated to give pain except subject to restrictions imposed by the Act. The experiment must be performed with a view to the advancement of new discovery of physiological knowledge or of knowledge which will be useful for saving or prolonging life or alleviating suffering. Experiments can be conducted only under licence from the Home Secretary. Whilst the main provisions of the Act leave little to be desired, it allows that certificates (in addition to licences) may be issued for experiments without anaesthetic if insensibility cannot be produced without frustrating the experiment; the animal need not be killed if this would frustrate the experiment; experiments may be made not for some new knowledge but to test discoveries already made; and for illustration of lectures as to the use of anaesthetics. All these exceptions, however, are governed by the overruling condition that they are absolutely necessary for the acquiring of knowledge which will be useful for saving or prolonging life or alleviating suffering.

The Home Secretary appoints inspectors. When the Act was passed, very few experiments were expected. Every application for a licence must be signed by the president of one of the leading scientific societies concerned with medical or veterinary research and also by a professor of the subject concerned. A whole section of the Act is given to penalties, providing for fines up to £100 and imprisonment for three months.

As time went on, criticism of experiments on animals was made. In the 1900's there was another Royal Commission. One of the results of its report in 1912 was that the Home Secretary from then on attached to certificates the condition that if the experimenter found that the animal was in severe suffering that was likely to endure, it must be killed. The Commission advised the setting up of an Advisory Committee to give advice on issues that might arise, and that it should include persons in touch with public opinion. The Advisory Committee that was set up consisted of distinguished medical men, and ~~included lay persons~~.
the latter suggestion was not accepted.

The number of experiments, which, for the first year after the Act came into force was 300, went up by leaps and bounds. By 1930, the total number was 450,822. By 1950, it was 1,779,215.

The British Veterinary Association on two occasions, the second in 1957, asked for the appointment of veterinarians as inspectors. This had the complete support of the R.S.P.C.A. and the Universities Federation for Animal Welfare. It was refused.

In 1957 the R.S.P.C.A. appointed a committee to look into the Act and its administration. In 1959 was published The Principles of Humane Experimental Technique by W. M. S. Russell and R. L. Burch, research workers for U.F.A.W. They emphasised mental distress, admitted that suffering on a large scale was inflicted on animals in experiments, that in many of them scientific accuracy was sadly to seek; that many experiments are unnecessary; that unnecessarily large numbers of animals are used; that many tests could be performed on preserved organs and through other means.

In 1959 the R.S.P.C.A. sent a letter to the Home Secretary. It urged that the inspectors should include veterinarians, that the existing number of five inspectors was quite inadequate, that their time was largely absorbed in administration as distinct from inspecting (the inspectors did not inspect or supervise 1% of the experiments); that although a whole section of the Act is given to penalties, there has not been one single prosecution under the Act; that the Advisory Committee should include veterinarians and one or two representatives of animal protection societies and that it should be required to meet regularly; that random experimentation was not consistent with moral responsibility involving the suffering of animals; associated itself with findings of Russell and Burch; and asked the Home Secretary to receive a deputation. He replied that he had no legislation in mind and therefore did not think that a discussion would be useful. The R.S.P.C.A. replied that the majority of its recommendations did not require legislation, and repeated its request for veterinarians to be both on the inspectorate and on the Advisory Committee. The Home Secretary again refused to receive a deputation and said that since 1951 there had been a veterinarian on the Advisory Committee. The R.S.P.C.A. then wrote saying that it would be obliged to resort to publicity. It did so. It sent letters to the Members of both Houses of Parliament and spent thousands of pounds on a leaflet entitled, "Cruelty Within the Law" and advertisements inviting applications for it.

The annual reports issued by the Home Office reported that 90% of the experiments were without anaesthetics, saying that they were mostly inoculations, external applications or stimuli, modifications of diet and the like. "Cruelty Within the Law" pointed out that many animals are inoculated with virulent diseases, involving prolonged pain, sometimes inoculated in the eyes; feeding experiments include starvation, paralysis and convulsions; animals are deprived of sleep to an excessive degree and so on. Of animals anaesthetized during experiments only one-seventh were killed before coming round.

The Home Secretary eventually received a deputation from the R.S.P.C.A. but the only concession was to appoint a sixth inspector - a medical man.

In a publication, experimenter after experimenter testified that he never had the slightest difficulty in getting a licence. No application was refused in a year.

The response to the publicity was great. As a direct result of the publicity, a number of Members of Parliament, asked relevant questions in the House of Commons. Mr. F. F. A. Burden, M.P., a member of the R.S.P.C.A. Council, was particularly active in that respect. In 1962 the Home Secretary asked the Chairman of the Advisory Committee to report on the issues. The Committee favoured an enquiry by persons with medical and veterinary and scientific knowledge. It admitted that some improvements were possible and that the inspectors did not observe many experiments. It recommended an increase in their number, one to have veterinary qualifications. Facilities should be given for visits to laboratories by persons competent to judge. The Advisory Committee had met only twice in four years.

The new Home Secretary, Mr. Brooke, accepted these views of the Advisory Committee but went further. The number of inspectors was increased from six to eight, the two new ones having veterinary as well as medical qualifications. He appointed a departmental committee to inquire into the issues. It had as chairman Sir Sydney Littlewood, a distinguished solicitor. It was not limited to persons with medical, veterinary and scientific knowledge but included also persons representing wider interests. It had as its secretary Mr. P. Beedle of the Home Office. It did its work very thoroughly. The R.S.P.C.A. submitted a comprehensive memorandum. The Committee asked a number of questions on it and invited the R.S.P.C.A. to send a deputation. The interview lasted a whole day. In it the deputation held that the principles embodied in the Act were of permanent value. It had been hoped that Dr. Fraser, a medical man who is a member of the R.S.P.C.A. Council, would be one of the deputation: he was unable to attend but the Committee agreed to receive a memorandum from him and to interview him. Permission was given to him to confer with the Home Office inspectors. In his memorandum Dr. Fraser suggested that for adequate inspection 21 inspectors were required and proposed higher salaries.

The report of the Committee was published in April, 1965. It says:-

> "One feature common to the evidence we received both from those who oppose all forms of animal experiment and from those who regard such experiments as an essential and socially valuable method has been the recognition that anyone who makes use of an animal in research incurs a moral responsibility to justify his action and a duty to avoid or at least to limit pain and give proper care. This recognition has governed our approach throughout and underlies the whole of our report."

> "The general principles governing the use of living animals for scientific research should remain unchanged. The Act has been generally effective but in recent years its provisions have not matched up to modern scientific and technological requirements and administration has not kept pace with recent scientific advance "

> "Stricter supervision over the granting of licences and the day to day control of experiments should be imposed."

"The Committee recommends that 'all animals in laboratories, whether used for experiments or for other scientific purposes, should be protected against severe pain that endures, discomfort that is likely to endure, and avoidable pain of any kind". The Act should be amended so as clearly to apply to any experimental procedure liable to cause stress or interference with, or departure from, an animal's normal condition of well-being."

"Anaesthetics should be given by trained staff and more attention paid to analgesics. There should be a statutory power for inspectors to order the immediate destruction of an animal in considerable pain."

The Committee lays much emphasis on the need for veterinary supervision and the contribution that veterinary science can make to the operation of animal laboratories. It recommends that the Home Secretary should have power to make regulations governing the care, accommodation and transport of laboratory animals. It also urges that the Home Office should issue an interim code of standards.

Inspection.

The Committee recommends that the number of inspectors should be increased to 21 (the number suggested by Dr. Fraser). As to salaries, "a witness from the R.S.P.C.A. proposed that the basic grade should be equated with that of a consultant in the National Health Service (2,910 - £4,445, with an additional special allowance for the chief inspector)." The Committee recommends that inspectors and superintending inspectors should receive £3,000 and the chief inspector £4,700 fixed; and that half of the inspectorate should be veterinarians.

Licensing.

The licensing provisions of the Act are found to require drastic revision. It is recommended that:-

"(i) application for a licence should be supported by two signatories;

(ii) one signatory should be qualified in the same discipline as that in which the applicant proposed to experiment;

(iii) the first signatory should have personal knowledge of the applicant and his capabilities and work, and be in a position to take personal responsibility for ensuring that he was properly trained for the work proposed and to see that it was properly carried out

(iv) the second signatory should be a professor either in a department with knowledge of the laboratory in which the work was to be performed or with personal knowledge of the first signatory.

The sponsors should take responsibility for certifying that, in their opinion:-

(i) the applicant is suitably qualified by training, knowledge and skill, to perform

(a) the procedure(s) proposed,
(b) any other procedures for which under the proposals we make in chapter 19 the licence will be a standing authority (control of usages, see below)

and, if the applicant is to perform experiments, that

(ii) the research is such as may lead to the advancement of biological knowledge or knowledge that will be useful in saving life or alleviating suffering;

(iii) the work does not, to their knowledge, unnecessarily repeat work of which the findings have been confirmed.

(iv) the experiments have been designed so as not to be wasteful of animals."

It is to be noted that the Committee substitutes "biology" for "physiology" in the Act.

New Controls.

The Committee pays particular attention to the inadequacy of the present law to regulate experiments that begin with a trivial procedure yet may lead to severe pain and suffering. Control of usages (referred to above) means that before a licence is issued the Home Office states the number of animals, the species that might be used, the procedure proposed, the number of staff and the qualifications of those who will deal with the animals. The Advisory Committee should be asked to advise upon each such scheme. The Home Office should make special enquiry if the animals reported to have been used by any licensee in a year is apparently excessive, and should satisfy itself that no wastage occurred and that adequate statistical guidance was both available and used. For certain experiments the licensee should submit a detailed application setting out the purpose in view, procedures, species and number of animals. Standard laboratory records are suggested to facilitate inspection.

Advisory Committee.

It should be reconstituted to include lay persons. It should advise on general matters of policy as well as on proposed experiments of a novel or controversial character. It should be empowered to advise on its own initiative on matters relevant to the usage and care of laboratory animals, and should make an annual report on its own activities.

Publicity.

The objects of the law would be served better if the facts were more readily ascertainable. The committee recommends a more informative annual report. The new Advisory Committee should immediately consider what information should be collected and published and should publish its own comments on the Home Office report. The law should be amended to permit laboratory authorities to invite members of the public to visit laboratories and animal houses.

Supply of animals.

The report recommends that the prohibition of the handing over of strays for experiments by the Dogs Act, 1906 should be retained. Breeding units that are not part of registered laboratories should be made statutorily subject to separate registration, requirements for husbandry and inspection. It should be a condition of registration that the breeder should notify the Home Office of the species and strains he is producing, so that the department may review the need for safeguards, e.g., against a particular susceptibility to pain or distress. Inspection should be carried out by Home Office inspectors - but in the case of breeders accredited by the Laboratory Animals Centre, visits should be made in consultation or jointly with a representative of that Centre. Consideration should be given to a scheme for controlling the collection of unwanted dogs and cats directly from persons who breed such animals for non-laboratory purposes by requiring that collectors approved for this activity should hold a licence and be subject to Home Office inspection.

The main recommendation is that laboratory authorities should be required to obtain their cats and dogs either by breeding for themselves or by purchase from breeders as controlled under the above regulations or from approved collectors. The problems of central co-ordination of supply and control of quality and the provision of funds should be the subject of urgent inquiry by the interests concerned.

The R.S.P.C.A. in its memorandum to the Committee drew attention to "psychological" experiments being carried out on an extensive scale not covered by the Act. The Committee recommends that experimentation to induce stress should require prior approval by the Home Office of particulars of purpose, procedures, species and numbers duly endorsed by sponsors.

When the deputation from the R.S.P.C.A. appeared before the Committee, it emphasised the need for methods of inquiry other than experimentation on live animals to be sought vigorously, giving as an example that the use of computers had been found to be equally efficient in appropriate investigations. In its report the Committee points out that this lay outside its terms of reference, but one of its members, Mrs. Joyce Butler, M.P., added to its report a memorandum supporting the need for methods of inquiry other than experimentation on live animals to be explored.

In the light of history it may be claimed that the reforms inaugurated by Mr. Brooke were brought about almost entirely by the R.S.P.C.A. U.F.A.W. has made a great contribution in care for laboratory animals, especially on behalf of rats and mice.

The R.S.P.C.A. urges that the recommendations of the Littlewood Committee, of whom and its secretary it expresses high appreciation, should be carried into effect as soon as ever possible.

Royal Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals,
105, Jermyn Street, London, S.W.1.

TELEPHONE } 01 - 930 0971
TELEGRAMS }

ANIMAL EXPERIMENTATION

PRESS CONFERENCE - 22ND NOVEMBER, 1968

The R.S.P.C.A. accepts that some animal experimentation involving the use of living animals is necessary in the interests of human and animal welfare, but is opposed to all experiments which cause pain to animals. The Society is not seeking to shew that there is widespread deliberate cruelty in connection with animal experimentation in this country, where the safeguards imposed are far in advance of those, for example, in the United States of America, Russia and Japan. BUT IT DOES STRONGLY CONTEND THAT THERE IS NEED SUBSTANTIALLY TO REDUCE THE NUMBER OF EXPERIMENTS AND TO INTRODUCE NEW LEGISLATION TO CONTROL THEM MORE ADEQUATELY. Also to discover and apply new techniques and procedures which do not require the use of living animals.

Today, the total number of experiments performed on living animals in this country approaches 5 MILLION in every year, and it is obvious that the Cruelty to Animals Act, 1876 - which governs animal experimentation and which has remained virtually unchanged - is now out-dated.

About ninety per cent of experiments performed under the Act are performed without an anaesthetic. Not all inflict pain or suffering, but many do. "Simple inoculation" experiments can result in very severe suffering. The investigation of the effect of drugs, as distinct from their testing and standardisation, can give rise to extreme suffering. Diagnostic tests cause suffering, the degree of which depends on the nature of the disease that is being investigated. Feeding experiments, which sound innocuous enough, can produce suffering. Experimental medicine involves the infliction on animals of the whole vast complex of human suffering, including disease, injury and even psychological states. Many present-day experiments, too, are of a "commercial" nature - the testing of cosmetics etc. Recently, in that connection, the Home Office confirmed that experiments are permitted which involve the application of possible irritants to the eyes of animals. There has been a great increase in "stress" experiments, where animals are subjected to fear, hunger or frustration. Such experiments are used in connection with research into human mental illness and maladjustment. At present, it is far from clear whether many of these "stress" experiments are covered by existing regulations.

In 1963, the R.S.P.C.A. campaigned for reform. In that year, the Home Secretary appointed a Committee of Inquiry, under the chairmanship of the late Sir Sydney Littlewood. Its Report was published in APRIL, 1965, and contained a number of proposals for reasonable and ameliorative reform, some of them suggestions the R.S.P.C.A. had put forward in written and oral evidence to the Committee.

SINCE 1965, THE GOVERNMENT HAS TAKEN NO STEPS TOWARDS IMPLEMENTING THE LITTLEWOOD COMMITTEE'S RECOMMENDATIONS, beyond inviting the views of interested bodies and appointing two additional Home Office inspectors, bringing the total up to 10, to cover the entire country.

Cont/...

Over 60 Questions have been asked in Parliament - some at the Society's instigation - urging that action be taken. On the 16th July last, a spokesman for the Home Office informed the Society that "as regards implementation of the recommendations of the Littlewood Committee, the Home Secretary recognises the disirability of replacing the Cruelty to Animals Act, 1876, by legislation more suited to present-day requirements and he appreciates your Society's concern that this should not be delayed indefinitely. I am sorry to say, however, that at this stage we cannot justify according the matter priority among the many other pressing demands on the Government's legislative programme. We regret that we cannot hold out any hope of early steps to produce new legislation on this subject." THE R.S.P.C.A. CONTENDS THAT THIS MATTER, AFFECTING MILLIONS OF ANIMALS IN EVERY YEAR, DOES JUSTIFY PRIORITY AND THAT A DELAY OF OVER THREE YEARS IS UNREASONABLE AND UNJUSTIFIED.

The main recommendations of the Littlewood Committee were:-

* Amendment of the existing law to apply to ALL experimental procedure liable to cause pain, stress, interference with, or departure from, an animal's normal condition of well being.

* Improvement and tightening-up of the present system of licensing experimenters, with a closer scrutiny into the purpose of experiments.

* A widening of the function of the Advisory Committee set up on a recommendation of the 1906-12 Royal Commission on Vivisection, to advise the Home Secretary on administration of the regulations controlling animal experimentation, with a strengthening of its membership to include lay persons.

* An increase, from ten to twenty-one, in the number of Home Office inspectors appointed under the 1876 Act, to examine the suitability of applicants for licences, to advise on the restrictions to be applied to licencees' work, to examine laboratory records, and to inspect and advise on conditions under which laboratory animals are kept. This inspectorate to be organised on a regional basis, with officers having medical and veterinary qualifications available in each region.

* The Home Secretary to be empowered to make definite regulations governing the care and accommodation of laboratory animals, and to make regulations governing their transport.

* Members of the public, by means of official publications, to be kept more fully informed on the subject of animal experimentation generally.

AJ/DJT
22/11/68.

Royal Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals,

105, Jermyn Street, London, S.W.1.

TELEPHONE 01-930 0971
TELEGRAMS News Editor,

15th November, 1968.

EXPERIMENTS ON ANIMALS

R.S.P.C.A. ATTACKS GOVERNMENT LASSISTUDE

PRESS CONFERENCE: 11 A.M. FRIDAY NOVEMBER 22, 1968.

R.S.P.C.A., 105, Jermyn Street, London, S.W.1.

You are invited to send a representative to R.S.P.C.A., 105, Jermyn Street, London, S.W.1., at 11 a.m. on Friday 22nd November, 1968, when Mr. F.F.A. Burden, M.P., and Mr. J.S. Hobhouse, both members of the R.S.P.C.A. Council, will give details of the campaign launched by the R.S.P.C.A. urging the government to give effect to the recommendations of the Littlewood Committee.

Mrs. Joyce Butler. M.P., who was a member of the committee will be present.

The Littlewood Committee was appointed in 1963 to go into the administration of the Cruelty to Animals Act, 1876, under which animal experiments are authorised. It reported in 1965, and the R.S.P.C.A. has repeatedly urged that the committee's recommendations should be implemented. Members of both Houses of Parliament have also made frequent appeals for action on the report: all to no avail.

With this conference, the R.S.P.C.A. embarks on a campaign in support of its appeal for action and is, through its branches and direct from headquarters, placing in the hands of the public a pamphlet setting out the facts and outlining the help that everyone is able to give. Copies of this pamphlet will be available at the press conference.

The R.S.P.C.A. is hoping to have the full support of the press, the B.B.C. and the I.T.V. in forcing action on a report, which the government spent taxpayers' money on between 1963 and 1965, and now, over three years later, is still refusing to implement.

This is a vital issue. Last year 4,751,060 experiments were performed on living animals.

Any questions you wish to ask will be answered at this conference.

Yours faithfully,

RFS/TR/SAB

R.F. Seager
Secretary.

Cut here

I shall be attending the press conference at the R.S.P.C.A. Headquarters at 11 a.m. on Friday, 22nd November, 1968.

Signed .....

Name of paper,
agency or broadcasting authority .....

Address .....

Please return to: P.R.O., R.S.P.C.A., 105, Jermyn Street, London, S.W.1.

have been chosen for preparing polio vaccines and more recently developed vaccines". Dr. Hilleman also stated that Human Diploid Cells permit the growth of viruses that cannot now be grown in animal cells: "This could pave the way", he said, "for development of killed and live virus vaccines, especially the rhinoviruses, which are a principal cause of the common cold and for which there is no specific control". See also "Science" 24/2/64, Vol. 143, No. 3609.

LOWER ORGANISMS: Protozoa: Studies on unicellular organisms have been in progress for some years. At a symposium held during the 15th Annual Meeting of the American Institute of Biological Sciences on the industrial uses of protozoa, it was explained that certain protozoa whose internal chemistry is remarkably similar to that of humans have proved useful in the screening of drugs for side effects, for measuring the amount and quality of vitamins and proteins in foods and for detecting the cancer-causing ability of certain chemicals. (Reported "New York Times" 26/8/64.) Dr. Seymour H. Hutner at Haskins Laboratories, New York, a specialist in this field, says in his published papers that the use of the "little animals" (protozoa) would spare the "big animals".

*It is thought at Haskins Laboratories that research on **Euglena** may provide answers for important nutritional questions related to pernicious anaemia and leukemia-type disorders, to name just two possible applications.

***Ochromonas** is now widely used at this Laboratory as a replacement for rats and chickens in biological testing and several pharmaceutical companies are using it as a screening method for anti-cancer agents.

***Sea Urchin Eggs:** According to Dr. Ross F. Nigrelli, director of the Laboratory of Marine Biochemistry and Ecology at the New York Aquarium: "In testing drugs we use sea urchin eggs because the fertilization cycle is well known and results are available within forty-eight hours. The eggs may be stimulated to develop without fertilization . . . or there may be deviations in cell division. We could have told them about thalidomide very quickly, had we tested it on sea-urchin eggs".

***Water Mould:** Drs. E. S. Beneke and Y. Lingyappa, University of Michigan, have found that a certain water mould is an excellent test object for potential anti-cancer drugs.

*References from "Green Medicine" by Margaret B. Krieg by permission of publishers, George G. Harrap & Co., Ltd., London.

ANAESTHETICS: A recent theory on general anaesthetics, based on their reactions with water, suggests that they may compete with brain cells for available water in the brain. The properties of

dough depend on its water content and Dr. M. V. Tracey of the Bread Research Institute, Sydney, New South Wales, has shown that the addition of anaesthetics to dough makes it tougher, whilst the addition of stimulants makes it more crumbly. It is suggested that if this technique were developed potential anaesthetics or stimulants could be screened in this way instead of on animals.

THE "PLASTIC" MAN: The first of a series of "Plastic Man" (instrumented in its head and chest to respond to various "stresses" applied during operations) has been developed at the University of Southern California School of Medicine for training anaesthetists. Further developments in other directions could eventually replace the need for animals.

DUMMIES: General Motors of America have developed a dummy to be used in car-crash tests which will make possible more precise studies of what actually happens to car occupants in accidents. The dummy, "Sophisticated Sam", has simulated anatomical features such as a fracturable skull and flesh and muscle structures that will indicate lacerative and other damage resulting from crashes. These dummies will be able to replace animals used in car-crash tests.

‡**PREGNANCY TESTS:** It is no longer necessary to use live animals in routine tests since pregnancy determinations can now be made chemically with comparable accuracy within minutes.

‡**OESTROGENS:** Used in medicine and cosmetics, these can be produced from human urine and human placentae which makes it quite unnecessary to obtain these hormones from animal sources.

VIRUS IDENTIFICATION: A relatively new technique has been more fully developed by Winthrop Biologicals Ltd., St. Marks Hill, Surbiton, U.K. This does not directly require animals for testing suspect viruses but uses antibodies that are labelled with a fluorescent dye. The antibody to which the dye is attached is still produced in animals but even this may eventually be replaced by antibody produced in tissue culture. Other advantages of the method are the speed of diagnosis (two hours as against weeks by older techniques) and the straight-forward equipment used.

RADIO-IMMUNO-ASSAYS are techniques for evaluating the presence, quantities or reactions of, for instance, hormones, vitamins, enzymes and chemicals produced in response to infection (antisera) by the use of radio-active substances similar to those present in the body. They do not require the direct use of live animals. Such an assay kit for estimating insulin has been produced by the Radiochemical Centre, Amersham, Bucks., in conjunction with Burroughs Wellcome.

SUMMARY OF THE SITUATION AND SUGGESTIONS FOR SPEEDING UP RESEARCH IN THESE DIRECTIONS

It is clear that experts in this highly technical field of research are all too few and the subject is little understood by those outside its sphere. Researchers trained in animal technology should lose no time in widening their outlook in order that they keep abreast of the times. There is increasing scope for use of the most modern computers, especially for those capable of dealing with simulation models.

The field of virology has developed new advanced scientific techniques which are applicable to nearly every field of medical research and teaching, yet these techniques are not being applied except by a handful of scientists.

Students at all levels are being deprived of most of this basic knowledge and reform will need to commence at the text-book level.

In the interests of progress the training of pathologists and technicians in the prompt procurement, processing and preserving of human tissues is essential. **Tissue Banks** should be established so that human and animal tissues, etc., could be readily obtained for research and teaching purposes (suggested sources: hospitals and slaughter houses).

Tissue cultures are produced commercially by such firms as Flow Laboratories Ltd., Victoria Park, Heatherhouse Road, Irvine, Scotland; Microbiological Associates, Bethesda Avenue, Bethesda, Maryland 20014, U.S.A.; and Roswell Park Memorial Institute, Buffalo, N.Y., U.S.A.

In the past it has been claimed that the use of animals in medical research was essential to progress. It can now be argued that the continued use of these creatures is in fact a hindrance in view of the enormous potential that lies in the further development of the new methods.

It is essential that more funds be directed towards these very positive channels of research as speedily as possible and that every incentive be given to those researchers working on these projects.

‡Information obtained with kind permission from UAA Reports, 509 Fifth Avenue, New York, N.Y. 10017.

The Shamrock Press Ltd. 57, Church Road, Wimbledon S.W.19.

Is the laboratory animal obsolete ?

FEBRUARY 1969

It PAYS to be Humane

Technologies which promise to replace vast numbers of animals in medical research are fast becoming available and there would seem to be little doubt that these methods are the trend of the future.

However, despite their undeniable advantages, it would appear that these techniques are not being employed and developed as widely as they might be —particularly in the fields of toxicity testing and in the manufacture of vaccines where millions of animals are still used.

It should be realised that as long as the present methods of drug testing and vaccine manufacture continue, many people are likely to be injured or even killed as a result of side effects.

Advantages to be gained with the use of alternative methods in speed, economy and safety factors alone must surely be a sufficient incentive to warrant their early adoption and no really progressive scientist would wish to continue working with such an outdated tool as the laboratory animal is becoming.

It should be noted that scientists who use these techniques claim that they are scientifically, economically and ethically superior to those involving animals. Whilst some of the methods have been known for a number of years, others are however relatively new.

It is therefore very much in the interests of both humans and animals alike that the public be kept informed of the latest developments taking place in this very positive field of research and details of some of the latest advances are given in this leaflet.

AN APPEAL: We will be glad to supply further copies of this leaflet upon request, and donations would be much appreciated in order to enable us to continue circulating the valuable information contained in this leaflet to researchers and others throughout the world.

For further copies please apply to:

PROMOTERS of ANIMAL WELFARE

Scientific Adviser and Treasurer
Dr. C. E. Foister,
18, Manor Close,
Great Horkesley,
Colchester, Essex.

Organiser
Mrs. D. Hegarty,
35 Wool Road,
Wimbledon,
London, S.W.20

REPLACEMENTS for ANIMALS in MEDICAL EXPERIMENTS

COMPUTERS: Improvements in the design and programming of both digital and analog computers are leading to their greater use in basic research such as in the simulation of physiological processes and biochemical reactions. These studies are carried out using mathematical models, that is mathematical equations which represent the processes or reactions involved. The use of computers in these ways has wide application in such fields as nerve cell studies, the dynamics of circulation, biochemical reaction kinetics, and homeostatic and neuromuscular simulations. In addition, complex biochemical experiments can be performed without using animals, patients or laboratory analyses. Other advantages are saving in time, the avoidance of laboratory error and the possibility of exploring biochemical frontiers for which no satisfactory methods of laboratory analysis exist. The application of the latest computer techniques opens a new era of clinical research, diagnosis, treatment and training. Computers are also used in car crash studies (New Scientist 9/1/69).

Sources: Electronic Associates, Inc., West Long Branch, New Jersey: Rand Corp., Santa Monica, Cal. Some examples of the techniques now made possible are given below.

‡**Conditioned Reflex.** Pavlov's salivating dog experiment has been simulated on a computer and the data obtained agree well with the physiological data; in addition this mathematical model even measures the different degrees of responses, and by altering the equipment it would be a simple task to extend this model to other physiological experiments of higher order. (Steadman J., 1965, AHCL Rept. No. 7).

‡**Kidney Function.** In his book "The Coming Revolution in Medicine" (MIT Press, 1967) Dr. David D. Rustein points to the many fragmented experiments on the kidney "with disjointed results" and says that most of the important functions of this organ can be defined and analysed by the electronic computer, leading to a computer simulation of total kidney function. This has application in both pure and applied research.

‡**Heart Disease.** In an article (IEEE Trans. on Biomed.Engineering, July 1967) a mathematical model is described in which a complete heart block (acute heart attack), as well as relative delays, duration and amplitude of pulses, can be simulated.
Electronic Associates, Inc., advertises that the whole cardiovascular system can be simulated on a computer. In a publication (Medical Electronics News, March 1968) this firm describes some of its equipment as follows: "Using a hybrid computer, it is possible to simulate the cardiovascular system, cause the 'patient' to have a heart attack, observe the results and automatically relate the simulation to real EKC [electrocardiogram] data in memory storage."

Two papers presented in the Proceedings of the 18th Annual Conference on Engineering in Medicine and Biology, 1965, confirm that live animals are not needed to study the heart. One author states: "The cardiovascular system is approximately described by mathematical equations." Another paper describes a mathematical model of the heart arteries. The authors state that the effect of certain defects such as constriction or narrowing of the main heart artery can be readily introduced into their simulation.

Biomedical Engineering: First started in Britain at Strathclyde University in 1964, this new science will provide answers for the surgeon and others, and **in vitro** studies are already being carried out thus saving the use of live animals.

TISSUE AND ORGAN CULTURE: Prof. S. T. Aygun of Turkey (University of Ankara) claims that a very large proportion of animal experiments could be replaced by tissue culture and has tried for a number of years to interest the universities of the world in adopting his tissue culture methods in toxicology and pharmacology. These methods, he feels, possess all the advantages and none of the acknowledged disadvantages of the use of animals for a variety of purposes—physiological, immunological, dosage assessment and so on. In his view it is also the best way to investigate cancer. He says that such tissue cultures yield results more quickly than animal experiments, are cheaper, more accurate, and can be applied to disease causes which may occur in certain animals or humans and not in others.

Organ Culture: Amongst many other whole organ studies, one using human foetal lung in culture has shown results which "suggest that the hydrocarbons in cigarette smoke play an essential role in the development of human lung cancer" (I. Lasnitzki: Cancer Research 28,510-516, 1968, U.K.). See also "Organ Culture in Experimental Medicine", a Review by Prof. Lauri Saxen in Duodecim 9, 1967, and "Processing & Storage of Viable Human Tissues" by T. Malinin, 1966, U.S.A.

Cell Culture Devices: The following extract is from a paper published by the U.S. Office of Naval Research which leaves no doubt of the value of tissue culture: "During the period of this Nonr Contract (5/1/61-10/31/64) we have developed, and employed in related research problems, three different cell culture devices which enable us to simulate **in vivo** conditions under rigid control". Describing the chemostat device, this paper states: ". . . this instrument is a valuable tool for studying the effects of drugs, hormones, etc. on a cellular level".

‡**Pain Killing Drugs:** Can be tested without the direct use of animals. One method, developed in the laboratories of Ciba, Ltd., U.S.A. (Helv. Physiol. Acta 23:156, 1965), is to study the effect of drugs on the contraction of isolated guinea pig gut in tissue

culture induced by the application of a "pain" producing chemical (the use of human gut is being investigated). The second method is to study the effect of drugs on the slow developing pain produced in human volunteers by tourniquets. (Dr. H. Beecher, U.S.A., "Science", 151:Feb. 18, 1966).

Chick Embryo: Drugs like thalidomide can now be tested for teratogenic effects on chick embryos at the egg stage: Dr. De Bock & Dr. Peters say "it might be of value to include this kind of test before clinical trials of drugs are started" (see Nature 199: Sept. 21, 1963).

Pesticides: Toxicity tests of pesticides in human cells—see Proc.Soc.Exper.Biol.Med. V.120: 163-168, 1965. The authors have conducted similar chronic toxicity tests in tissue culture with interesting results. Dr. Jean-Pierre Marliac, an FDA researcher, U.S.A., reports that the chick embryo method is of "considerable value" in screening of pesticides.

Human Diploid Cells: In Britain and America monkey kidney tissue is used for the purpose of making polio and other vaccines and large numbers of animals are constantly required for this purpose. Contamination of the vaccine is always possible despite the precautions taken to prevent this. (The Simian SV40 virus which causes tumours in animals and the green monkey fever virus are two of forty or so contaminants already found in these tissues.) One alternative in the manufacture of vaccines is the use of Human Diploid Cell Strains. Techniques originally developed by Prof. L. Hayflick, previously of the Wistar Institute, Philadelphia, have shown that a small piece of human embryonic lung obtained from an aborted foetus can be grown in tissue culture continuously for approximately one year without acquiring properties of malignant cells. It has been calculated that cells derived from this single human diploid cell strain called WI-38 can be used to grow sufficient virus to immunise the entire population of the world against many virus diseases including polio. See also "New Scientist" 16/2/67 and "Scientific American", March 1968.

Britain now has her own stocks of WI-38 strain which are produced and distributed to various countries abroad on behalf of the World Health Organisation by the M.R.C. Division of Immunological Products Control National Institute For Medical Research (Hampstead Laboratories), Holly Hill, London, N.W.3.

Dr. Maurice R. Hilleman, director of virus and biology research at the Merck Institute (U.S.A.), stated in the "American Review of Respiratory Diseases" 90:683, 1964: "Another advantage of diploid cells is their freedom from contamination by undesirable viruses, naturally present in many animal cultures". "In fact" he said, "had such cells been available in the earlier period, it is problematical whether monkey-kidney cells would