



Animal Welfare Information Center Bulletin

Summer 2007
Vol. 13, No. 1-2
ISSN: 1522-7553

CONGRESS IN SESSION

From the 110th Congress

- H.R.137 To amend title 18, United States Code, to strengthen prohibitions against animal fighting, and for other purposes.

Introduced on January 4, 2007, by Elton Gallegly (R-California) and referred to the House Committee on the Judiciary, and in addition to the Committee on Agriculture. This act was signed by the President on May 3 and became Public Law 110-022. This act may be cited as the "Animal Fighting Prohibition Enforcement Act of 2007." See also House Report 110-027.

From Congressman Gallegly's remarks upon introduction of the legislation: "This legislation makes violations of federal animal fighting law a felony punishable by up to three years in

(Legislation cont'd p. 15)

ALSO IN THIS ISSUE...

Alternative Methods Retrieval	p. 3
Farm Animal Stewardship Act	p. 13
Alternatives News	p. 14
Announcements	p. 26
Upcoming Meetings & Workshops	p. 26
New Information Resources	p. 26
On the Web	p. 27
USDA News	p. 29
Animal Fighting Bill	p. 30
ARS Animal Welfare News	p. 31
International News	p. 33
AWIC and USDA Publications	p. 39
AWIC Workshops	p. 40

Comparison Between the American "Animal Welfare Act" and the German "Law on Protecting Animals"

by
Karin Kolbe
Universität Konstanz
Konstanz, Germany

Ms. Kolbe spent 4 weeks with the Animal Welfare Information Center as part of a work-study project for her final year at the Universität Konstanz.

Introduction

The "Animal Welfare Act" of the United States of America regulates the way in which animals are transported, purchased, sold, housed, cared for, handled, and treated. Next to the Animal Welfare Act, the "Guide for the Care and Use of Laboratory Animals" is widely accepted as a primary reference on animal care and use.

The German "Law on Protecting Animals" regulates the way in which animals are kept, killed, used in science, treated, bred, transported, and traded. The regulations provided in this law are formulated in a general manner and therefore prone to different forms of interpretation.

The following text will focus on the use of animals in scientific research.

The American "Animal Welfare Act" and the German "Law on Protecting Animals" are very similar in many respects on treatment of laboratory animals and animal testing.

This text will therefore focus on the differences between the two laws.

Theoretical differences

The authors of the Animal Welfare Act state that:

The Animal Welfare Act regulates the commerce of animals for three reasons.

These are:

- to ensure that animals intended for use in research facilities or for exhibition purposes or for use as pets are provided humane care and treatment;
- to assure the humane treatment of animals during transportation in commerce; and
- to protect the owners of animals from the theft of their animals by preventing the sale or use of animals which have been stolen.

The German law for the protection of animals states in article one:

"The aim of the law is to protect the lives and well-being of animals, based on human beings' responsibility for their fellow creatures. No one may cause an animal pain, suffering or harm without any reasonable reason."

In the German law on protecting animals, "Experiments on animals" is defined as anything that might cause the animal pain, suffering, or harm. Genetic modification of animals is included even if it is unlikely that the result will cause pain, suffering, or harm for the modified animals. This is because genetic modification might yield (directly or indirectly)



NATIONAL
AGRICULTURAL
LIBRARY

Animal Welfare Information Center, Room 410, 10301 Baltimore Avenue, Beltsville, MD 20705
Phone (301)504-6212 Fax (301)504-7125 E-mail awic@nal.usda.gov

these disadvantages for the animals. The German law states that animal experiments need to have a "reasonable reason" to justify the use of sentient beings.

The German law for the protection of animals follows to some extent a more utilitarian approach. Not only does it require a minimization of pain caused to the animals but also a balancing of animal "costs" against the probable "benefits" for research. This, it is believed, can minimize the ethical conflicts which arise from experimentation on animals. "Costs" are normally characterized as pain, suffering, or harm. Death is not necessarily included in these "costs" unless it is a painful death. "Benefits" are normally defined in terms of happiness and health for either humans or animals.

Practical differences

The American Animal Welfare Act has a strong emphasis on appropriate handling and caring for animals. Research facilities, dealers, and exhibitors that use live animals as defined in the law for experimentation are regularly inspected. This ensures a humane treatment and a minimization of suffering for animals.

One important issue which has to be provided is "environmental enrichment" for the animals. It's not just an "environment which promotes the well-being of primates" which is very important but also "exercises for dogs" and similar forms of environmental enrichment.

The Animal Care Inspection Reports of USDA licensed or registered facilities are accessible on the Web.

The Animal Welfare Act also requires that every research facility appoint an Institutional Animal Care and Use Committee (IACUC). This committee consists of at least 3 people who have to assess the "research facility's animal program, facilities and procedures" [Section 13, (8)]. Furthermore, the committees have to attest that there are no alternatives available for a proposed experiment on animals, that the experiment does not duplicate a previous experiment, and that the 3Rs (Reduce-Refine-Replace) are met during the proposed experiment.

The IACUCs therefore carry a lot of responsibility. Their work is supported by the Animal Welfare Information Center at the National Agricultural Library. This information service provides researchers and committees with information on available alternatives, appropriate treatment of animals, animal welfare, laboratory animal care, etc.

Such a superior information center does not exist in Germany. Therefore, many inconsistencies exist between different research facilities in Germany.

The German law defines the potential benefits as one of the most vital conditions for being allowed to cause pain, suffering, or harm to an animal. Just desirable benefits of the experiment can be a "reasonable reason" to cause animals these unpleasant conditions.

Researchers who wish to carry out an experiment on animals in Germany have to consider the ethical dimensions of their work. This is done through an "animal use protocol form," which is very similar to the one which has to be completed prior to animal experiments in America. The main difference between the German form and the American one is that German researchers have to provide a "reasonable reason" to harm animals. This reason has to justify the ethical costs of the use of animals. Furthermore, researchers have to explain in which way the experiment is unique and of a special importance to humans and/or animals.

Some reasons, however, are not acceptable to cause pain or distress in animals. These reasons are thought to be of less importance for humans than the wish of well-being is for the laboratory animals. It is therefore prohibited to use animals to "develop or test weapons, ammunition, and the associated equipment." Furthermore, it is prohibited to "use animals for testing tobacco products, washing powders and cosmetics" [Article 7, (4) and (5)]. When Article 7 was written, the general belief was that the justification for inflicting pain for these reasons wears thin compared to the interests and the well-being of the animals.

The German law regulates that randomly sourced animals are not allowed in animal experiments. Excluded from this regulation are farm animals and livestock such as horses, cattle, pigs, sheep, goats, chickens, doves, turkey hens, ducks, geese and fish [Article 9, (7)].

Limitations of the law

A concern that many people express about the Animal Welfare Act is the omission of mice of the genus *Mus*, rats of the genus *Rattus* and birds [bred for research]. These groups were excluded because of the alleged problems involved in regulating these species. However, these species are covered in the "Guide for the Care and Use of Laboratory Animals."

Another concern is that there are about 50 Veterinary Medical Officers to inspect more than 1,000 research facilities and the inspection of these facilities is very costly.

The Animal Welfare Act provides the reader with a good definition of pain:

"Painful procedure as applied to an animal means any procedure that would reasonably be expected to cause more than slight or momentary pain or distress in a human being to which that procedure was applied, that is, pain in excess of that caused by injections or other minor procedures." However, a definition of distress is not supplied.

The German law does not provide any definition of "pain," "suffering," or "harm." It has therefore often been discussed how to classify possible damages to animals. Researchers have to classify the expected pain and damage to the animal prior to the experiment. These classifications are rather prone to misjudgments.

Experiments on vertebrates may only be carried out "if the pain, suffering or harm which they can be expected to inflict on the animal is ethically justifiable in relation to the purpose of the experiment" [Article 7, (3)]. Hence, these experiments may just be carried out if there is a "reasonable reason." Unfortunately, the law does not define what a "reasonable reason" is. These two words are therefore often interpreted in a very non-specific context.

The German committees which review the "animal use protocol forms" of a proposed experiment have a purely advisory function. There are hardly ever any experiments which are not allowed to be carried out. Nonetheless, the committees can observe if the concepts of the 3Rs are met. If the committee should decide that the experiment is not ethically justifiable, the experiment can normally still be done, because the German constitution guarantees in Article 5, Section (3), Freedom of Expression, that "Art and science, research and teaching are free. Freedom of teaching does not absolve from loyalty to the constitution."

In 2002, the situation was complicated, when the "protection of animals" became a national objective. Since 2002, Article 20a of the German constitutional law reads: "The state takes responsibility for protecting the natural foundations of life and animals in the interest of future generations." Until now, the introduction of this article has not had any major impacts on animal treatment or experimentation on animals.

Conclusion

The German law on animal protection might be more utilitarian than the American law. The legislators obviously tried to meet the needs of the animals. However, its poor definitions of main concepts such as "pain," "suffering," "harm," and "reasonable reason" lead to

Comparison of Laws cont'd on p.30

The Report and Recommendations of the Workshop "Retrieval Approaches for Alternative Methods to Animal Experiments"

by
Barbara Grune¹, Michael Fallon², Carol Howard³, Vera Hudson⁴, Jodie A. Kulpa-Eddy⁵, Jean Larson⁶, Sue Leary⁷,
Annett Roi⁸, Jan van der Valk⁹, Mary Wood¹⁰, Antje Dörendahl¹, Dorothea Köhler-Hahn¹, Rainer Box¹

¹Center for Documentation and Evaluation of Alternative Methods to Animal Experiments, Federal Institute for Risk Assessment, Diederdsdorfer Weg 1, 12277 Berlin, Germany; ²Department of Veterans Affairs, Veterans Affairs Medical Center B Atlanta, 1670 Clairmont Road, Decatur, Georgia 30033, USA; ³The Johns Hopkins Center for Alternatives to Animal Testing, 111 Market Place, Suite 840, Baltimore, Maryland 21202, USA; ⁴Specialized Information Services Division, National Library of Medicine, 6707 Democracy Blvd., Suite 510, Bethesda, Maryland 20892-5467, USA; ⁵U.S. Department of Agriculture-Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service-Animal Care, 4700 River Road, Unit 84, Riverdale, Maryland 20737-1234, USA; ⁶U.S. Department of Agriculture, Animal Welfare Information Center, 10301 Baltimore Avenue, Beltsville, Maryland 20705-2351, USA; ⁷Alternatives Research & Development Foundation, Noble Plaza Suite 316, 801 Old York Road, Jenkintown, Pennsylvania 19046, USA; ⁸ECVAM Scientific Information Service (SIS), European Commission, JRC, Institute for Health & Consumer Protection, ECVAM Unit, TP 580, 21020 Ispra (VA), Italy; ⁹Netherlands Centre Alternatives to Animal Use (NCA), Dept. Animals Science and Society, Fac. Veterinary Medicine, Utrecht University, Yalelaan 17, NL-3584 CL UTRECHT, The Netherlands; ¹⁰UC Center for Animal Alternatives, School of Veterinary Medicine, University of California, Davis, California 95616, USA

This article originally appeared in ALTEX 2004 (3) and is reproduced with the kind permission of the journal editor, Dr. Franz Gruber. ALTEX can be found at <http://www.altex.ch/index.htm>

[Editor's note: Website addresses have been updated when necessary.]

Zusammenfassung: Bericht und Empfehlungen des internationalen Workshops „Suchstrategien für Informationen über Alternativmethoden zu Tierversuchen“, der 2003 in Berlin bei ZEBET im BfR (Bundesinstitut für Risikobewertung) stattfand. Auf der Grundlage der Vorschriften der Tierschutzgesetzgebung sind Wissenschaftler verpflichtet, die Unerlässlichkeit von Tierversuchsvorhaben zu prüfen. Ein Tierversuch darf nicht durchgeführt werden, wenn andere wissenschaftlich anerkannte Methoden zur Verfügung stehen. Zur Erfüllung dieser Verpflichtung recherchieren Wissenschaftler in Literaturdatenbanken und anderen relevanten Informationsquellen über Alternativmethoden. Dabei ist es dem Wissenschaftler selbst überlassen, die geeignetsten Datenbanken und Suchstrategien auszuwählen. Fachinformationsdienste bieten Unterstützung bei der Suche nach Alternativmethoden für Tierversuche an. Auf dem Berliner Workshop im November 2003, trafen sich die Vertreter verschiedener internationaler Informationsdienste für Tierschutzfragen und Alternativmethoden und diskutierten über das gegenwärtige Informationsangebot über Alternativmethoden, Indexierungsbegriffe für Alternativmethoden und Suchstrategien, die diese Begriffe verwenden. ZEBET stellte eine eigene Untersuchung über Indexierungssysteme von Alternativmethoden in etablierten Literaturdatenbanken vor. Die Studie befasste sich mit der Frage, wie Suchergebnisse zu Alternativmethoden in internationalen Datenbanken durch die Art und Weise der Indexierung von Publikationen beeinflusst werden. Die Untersuchungsergebnisse wurden anhand einer Beispielrecherche vorgestellt. ZEBET kam dabei zu dem Schluss, dass die gegenwärtigen Indexierungssysteme nicht ausreichend alle relevanten Publikationen zu Alternativmethoden erfassen. Die Teilnehmer des Workshops entwickelten Themenvorschläge für Arbeitsgruppen und

zukünftige Projekte, um die Entwicklung geeigneter Suchstrategien über Alternativmethoden zu verbessern.

Keywords: alternative methods, in vitro methods, database, information, publications, searching, retrieval, Internet, index terms, thesaurus, workshop, 3Rs concept, ZEBET, BfR

Introduction

In assuring public and regulatory authorities that animal research is both ethical and in compliance with the law, scientists and institutional review committees of the member states of the EU and of the USA must provide evidence that the use of animals is justified for each project under review. The overall concept of "alternatives" has emerged as the primary ethical framework to determine whether the use of experimental animals is required to achieve scientific objectives and whether less stressful or less painful procedures can be used as substitutes for those initially proposed. In particular, the 3Rs concept of Russell and Burch (1959), to refine, reduce and replace animal experiments, has proven very useful for scientists and review committees in evaluating alternatives to animal experiments.

Among the efforts to implement the 3Rs concept during the past decades, database retrieval approaches on alternative methods to animal experiments have become a key issue. In 1985, the Animal Welfare Information Center (AWIC) of the U.S. Department of Agriculture (USDA) was established as one of the first information centres on alternative methods. Information services, including the development of specialised databases and websites on alternative methods, were discussed critically during the 1980s. More recently the discussion has focused on the problem of information retrieval in the heterogeneous environment of the World Wide Web. Adamczak and Nase (2002) emphasised that in the era of electronic networks, the problem lies not in dispersing the information but rather in finding the right information within an appropriate time frame.

In 1996, at the workshop "Current Status and Future Developments of Databases on Alternative Methods" organised by the European Centre for the Validation of Alternative Methods (ECVAM), specific issues were discussed that arise when searching for information on alternatives in bibliographic databases (Janusch et al., 1997). Problems identified included the variety of information sources, different types of alternatives, as

well as different indexing systems used by individual databases. Furthermore, in many databases the contents of abstracts do not contain the information required to indicate that the article contains information on alternative methods. It was recommended to define a list of preferred terms to be used by bibliographic and factual databases to index publications covering alternative methods. At the 3rd World Congress on Alternatives and Animal Use in Life Science in 1999, the need for an easier and more successful approach to retrieve information on alternatives was stressed again (Janusch-Roi et al., 2000).

It became apparent at the 4th World Congress on Alternatives and Animal Use in the Life Sciences in 2002 that improvement of information services for alternative methods should not only include consideration of the content of databases and websites but also the development of suitable retrieval methods. Representatives of European and

U.S. American information centres decided to continue the discussion in order to improve information retrieval on alternative methods, including both practical proposals that may be applied immediately and long-term tasks for research projects (Libowitz, 2002).

On 2nd-5th November 2003, this discussion was continued at the Berlin Workshop hosted by the National German Centre for Documentation and Evaluation of Alternative Methods to Animal Experiments (ZEBET) at the BfR, the German Federal Institute for Risk Assessment in Berlin. The workshop "Retrieval Approaches for Alternative Methods to Animal Experiments" encouraged and supported the discussion on improving search strategies and indexing systems.

The governmental requirements and animal welfare legislation of the EU and the USA form the basis for information service systems supporting the search for alternative methods. Scientists are obliged not to conduct experiments on animals if another scientifically reliable method to obtain the desired information is available (Council Directive 86/609/EEC, United States Department of Agriculture, 1997 and 2000). In particular, consideration must be given to methods that either avoid animal experiments altogether or minimise pain and suffering of the animals or reduce the number of animals used. Scientists are generally required to consult literature and other relevant sources for alternatives prior to any experimental study

Information Resources and Search Strategies

To meet the legal obligation to use alternatives to experimental animals, scientists have access to information on alternatives to animal studies via a variety of printed and online sources, including web-based bibliographic databases and specialised websites. Scientists expect to obtain accurate, complete and relevant information within a short time frame. Although it is ultimately the responsibility of each scientist to select the most appropriate database and search strategies depending on research goals and methods employed, the following general questions are also important:

- Are the available information resources sufficient to fulfil the demands of animal welfare legislation?
- Can the information be retrieved appropriately?

At the Berlin Workshop, representatives of animal welfare information centres discussed the information sources currently available, practical solutions as well as proposals for ad hoc working groups and further research projects. The workshop focused on information retrieval on alternative methods applied in biomedical research rather than in education and teaching.

ECVAM Scientific Information Service on Advanced Alternative Methods to Animal Experiments in Biomedical Sciences a Project of the European Commission

<http://ecvam-sis.jrc.it>

The ECVAM Scientific Information Service (SIS) is part of ECVAM, which was established by a Communication of the European Commission and Parliament in 1991 in response to Directive 86/609/EEC on the protection of animals used for experimental and other scientific purposes (SEC(91)1794). Directive 86/609/EEC requires that the Commission and Member States should actively support the development, validation and acceptance of methods, which could reduce, refine or replace the use of laboratory animals and encourage research into the development and validation of alternative techniques.

SIS was established in 1996 to achieve one of the principal objectives of ECVAM required by the European Commission and Parliament, i.e. to establish, maintain and manage a database on alternative procedures to animal experimentation. SIS, therefore, provides scientific knowledge on the use of alternatives in biomedical sciences and serves Commission Services and national policy-makers, as well as scientists and the animal welfare movement. SIS is responsible for the SIS databases, the ECVAM thesaurus and the ECVAM website.

• **SIS Databases**

The SIS databases provide factual and evaluated (ready-to-use) information on various aspects of advanced non-animal methods in the biomedical sciences. The focus is on toxicological methods at any stage of development and validation. Currently, the SIS databases cover 21 topics in the area of toxicity testing of chemical compounds with the following spectrum of information: methods (summary descriptions and/or protocols, such as the INVITTOX protocols), inter-laboratory evaluations, test results and formal validation studies.

The core application of SIS, the methods database, provides information on the rationale for method development, e.g. the scientific principle, special endpoints and the test systems used for the data analysis and the status of development and/or validation. This information is based on extensive literature reviews. Currently, this sector covers 39 method summary descriptions and a collection of 130 protocols, the INVITTOX protocols, which provide step-by-step descriptions for each in vitro method.

Furthermore, 2479 references are currently stored in a database. To date there are 2500 registered SIS users from 65 countries in academia (41%), industry (34%) or governmental (17%).

• **ECVAM Thesaurus**

In 1999, SIS started the ECVAM Thesaurus project. The ECVAM Thesaurus on Advanced Alternative Methods (TAAM) focuses on the creation of a systematically ordered collection of harmonised terms on animal alternatives in the biomedical sciences. ECVAM SIS co-operates in this project with the Fund for the Replacement of Animals in Medical Experiments (FRAME, UK), ZEBET, and the National Library of Medicine (NLM, USA). A "bottom-up approach" was used to develop a thesaurus based on actual phrases in 2000 scientific documents. The first classification scheme contains 1000 unique terms.

In 2004, an open source list of the thesaurus will become available online to promote discussion among end-users. The follow-up will depend on the acceptance by the scientific com-

munity. The ECVAM Thesaurus is designed as a "tree structure". Every term is sorted in a hierarchy containing approximately 11 main topics with individual identification numbers and individual "tree branch" numbers. The objective of the ECVAM Thesaurus is to improve the retrieval of information on animal alternatives in databases and is limited so far to the SIS databases.

• **ECVAM website**

In 2002, a new ECVAM website (<http://ecvam.jrc.it>) was established and made available on the Internet. It is designed to keep the customers and collaborators of ECVAM, as well as the general public updated on alternatives to testing in animals. The website provides details on in-house and external collaborative activities, in addition to general information about ECVAM. Information on validation studies carried out with the involvement of ECVAM is provided, including the list of validated methods and major ECVAM publications. The website also provides access to statements of the ECVAM Scientific Advisory Committee and cross-references to the online version of the ECVAM SIS databases.

Recently, registration facilities of the ECVAM mailing list were installed to provide external users with regular updates on ECVAM. Links are offered to international and federal organizations, e.g. the service of the European Commission services and to ICCVAM (Interagency Coordinating Committee on the Validation of Alternative Methods, USA).

Verifying and understanding user requirements has been a major emphasis of the SIS databases since 2001. A new integrated Internet version of the SIS has been under development since 2001. It is designed to provide access to the entire information content of SIS. This new version is expected to come online in 2004. Furthermore, it is intended to provide an interactive training tool for validated methods and to extend the SIS databases by a section on in silico methods.

Altweb—the Internet Clearinghouse on the Three Rs

<http://altweb.jhsph.edu>

In 1997 the Johns Hopkins Center for Alternatives to Animal Testing (CAAT, USA) launched Altweb, the Alternatives to Animal Testing Website. Altweb was created to serve as a central reference point for information on alternatives, publications, databases, itineraries, and other resources on the Internet.

Altweb is managed by CAAT on behalf of an international project team, which acts as the steering committee for the site. Currently, the project team includes representatives from 25 organizations in industry, academia, the animal welfare community, and government agencies from the United States, Canada, and Europe. Team participants include the Animal Welfare Information Center of the US Department of Agriculture (USDA), the US Food and Drug Administration, the Procter & Gamble Company, ECVAM and ZEBET.

Altweb serves multiple audiences from many backgrounds, including biomedical researchers, industry, the international alternatives community, the international regulatory community, authorities that review animal protocols, the animal welfare community, individuals and groups who work with laboratory animals (technicians, veterinarians, etc.), teachers, students, and the general public.

Resources available on the Altweb site include:

- A database on pain management (analgesia and anesthesia)
- A new database on humane endpoints
- Abstracts from the primary journals in the alternatives field
- Relevant reports, proceedings, articles, and newsletters

- Full text of the classic Russell and Burch book, "Principles of Humane Experimental Technique" and of the book "Animals and Alternatives in Testing: History, Science, and Ethics"
- Regular news updates in the alternatives field
- A calendar of meetings in the alternatives field
- A directory of funding sources for alternatives research
- Links to websites from relevant organizations and institutions worldwide
- A list of acronyms commonly used by the international alternatives community
- A special section on alternatives to animals in monoclonal antibody production
- FAQs, or frequently asked questions, that address a broad range of alternatives-related issues
- A regulations page that provides links to important documents describing the laws, policies, and guidelines pertaining to animal care and use in the United States, various European countries, Australia, and New Zealand (future plans call for expanding this section to cover regulations from South American countries and other parts of the world as well)

Altweb usage has grown steadily over the last seven years. In 1998, Altweb's first full year of existence, the site logged more than 80,000 users. Figures for 2003 show nearly half a million visitors over the course of the year. About two thirds of the users were from the United States; the other third represents some 120 countries around the world. The average user session time ranged from 12 minutes to more than 18 minutes in any given month - a considerable length of time in the fast-paced world of the Internet. These statistics indicate that Altweb provides much-needed information and is effectively serving as a searchable global information resource.

ALTBIB—NLM's Alternatives to Animal Testing Database on the Web

<http://toxnet.nlm.nih.gov/altbib.html>

[Editor's note—ALTBIB was completely revamped in August 2005 and now provides access to archived and up-to-date materials.]

In 1992, the Bibliography on Alternatives to the Use of Live Vertebrates in Biomedical Research and Training (ALTBIB) was established as a part of the Specialised Information Services (SIS) Division of the NLM within the National Institute of Health (NIH), U.S. Department of Health & Human Services.

Currently, ALTBIB contains 7,595 relevant citations from 1992 to 2002 which were selected by searching Pub-Med and TOXLINE and which have been combined into one easily searchable database. The citations relate to methods, tests, assays and procedures that may prove useful in establishing alternatives to the use of animals.

ALTBIB offers special search features, for example:

- Relevancy Ranking, i.e. references are sorted according to relevancy
- Chemical synonyms searching
- Medical Subject Headings (MeSH) mapping, i.e. queries are based on MeSH terms
- Searching by category. Queries can be limited to one of the following 15 categories: carcinogenesis, cytotoxicity, dermal toxicity, ecotoxicity, genotoxicity and mutagenesis, hepatic and renal toxicity, immunotoxicity, neurotoxicity, ocular toxicity, pharmacokinetic and mechanistic studies, pulmonary toxicity, quantitative structure activity relationships, reproductive and

developmental toxicity, tissue and organ toxicity, and miscellaneous

- Searching by date
- Searching by author

ALTBIB is embedded in the services of the NLM. Its future updates will be based on:

- a list of key journals, for example: "Toxicology", "Toxicology in vitro", and "Food and Chemical Toxicology" and
- a link to LocatorPlus (NLM's online catalogue) to search for books at the NLM.

In the near future ALTBIB users will be able to automatically launch a search in PubMed, retrieving publications relevant to the 3Rs by using predefined strategies, which include key terms and MeSH terms. [Editor's note: This feature is now available.]

AnimAlt-ZEBET—An Internet Database on Alternatives to Animal Experiments

<http://www.bfr.bund.de>

In 1989, the Centre for Documentation and Evaluation of Alternative Methods to Animal Experiments (ZEBET) at the German Federal Institute for Risk Assessment (BfR) was established to provide an information service and to create a database on alternative methods to animal experiments. ZEBET makes available its information primarily to scientific and animal welfare committees that regulate the use of laboratory animals at the state and community levels of the Federal Republic of Germany. ZEBET's information service is responding to inquiries from universities, individual scientists, the press, and the general public.

In 2000, ZEBET introduced AnimAlt-ZEBET, an Internet database on alternatives to animal experiments. AnimAlt-ZEBET can be accessed free of charge on the Internet via the German Institute for Medical Documentation and Information (DIMDI), the official host of biomedical databases within the German Federal Ministry of Health, <http://www.dimdi.de> (Grune et al., 2000). One of the special features of DIMDI is that searches in AnimAlt-ZEBET may be combined with searches in well-established databases such as MEDLINE.

AnimAlt-ZEBET is an English full-text database on alternative methods to animal experiments. It covers alternative methods in many fields of the biomedical sciences and related disciplines and also contains information extracted from approximately 800 scientific journals, books, monographs, guidelines, and congress proceedings. As of November 2003, AnimAlt-ZEBET contained 115 documents. Each document consists of several data fields, e.g. title of method, keywords, evaluation according to the 3Rs principle, abstract and bibliographic references. The number of references within these documents is approximately 6000. ZEBET's Activity Report shows an average of about 23,000 visits per annum (for the years 2000 to 2003).

The basic concept of AnimAlt-ZEBET is to provide documents that have been evaluated by ZEBET's staff according to the 3Rs principle developed by Russell and Burch (1959). AnimAlt-ZEBET also provides an assessment of the current stage of development, validation and acceptance of a method for either scientific or regulatory purposes. Each AnimAlt-ZEBET document is characterised by specific keywords. ZEBET's index terms correspond to those of MeSH, the controlled vocabulary thesaurus of the NLM. However, ZEBET's list of terms is not a controlled thesaurus. In general, each document is indexed using "animal welfare", "animal experiments", and "animal testing alternative" as the first terms. These are followed by terms giving more specific technical details for each method.

The Web-based Animal Research Training Programmes of the U.S. Department of Veterans Affairs

<http://www.researchtraining.org>

[Editor's note: From the website—This website closed on May 11, 2007. On May 12th, the site reopened for Veterans Administration institutions only. All stock coursework is being transferred to both the AALAS (www.aalaslearninglibrary.org) and CITI (www.citiprogram.org) websites. If your institution developed custom coursework, it can also be transferred to either website. Both AALAS and CITI have agreed to provide a trial period of free site access.]

In January 2001, the Office of Research and Development of the U.S. Department of Veterans Affairs (VA) opened a comprehensive website at <http://www.researchtraining.org> to support medical and scientific institutions with training mandates. The VA intends to intensify training in animal science topics. Its web courses and exams are freely accessible 24 hours a day at home or at work and the web server keeps records and training documents to minimise local administrative burden. The animal research courses were developed in collaboration with the

U.S. Office for Laboratory Animal Welfare (OLAW, USA) and the American Association for Laboratory Animal Science (AALAS, USA).

Currently, the VA web-based training programmes contain lessons for research staff and members of the Institutional Animal Care and Use Committees (IACUC, USA). Self-exams are available to document compliance with mandatory training requirements. Research staff can access a comprehensive course entitled "Working with the IACUC", and species-specific courses are also available. The VA also offers a comprehensive course for IACUC members entitled "Essentials for IACUC Members."

In May 2004, the VA site had over 27,000 registered users on its training website, with over 20,000 passed exams. Currently, the VA is working on the following projects:

- "Searching for Alternatives: Value, Use and Interpretation of Results": a course and exam to educate researchers on database searches for alternatives, produced in collaboration with the Animal Welfare Information Center (USDA AWIC, USA) and OLAW.
- "Justifying Animal Use: Application and Use of Statistical Concepts": a course and exam to educate researchers on power analyses, including the use of an online animal research statistics calculator, produced in collaboration with the OLAW. An online power analysis calculator specifically designed for animal research will be created as part of this initiative.

The course on database searches will cover three main topics: 1. search for alternatives, 2. additional benefits of a database search for alternatives and 3. using Boolean logic. The goals of this course are to explain the legal and ethical mandates for database searches for alternative methods, to help investigators perform more effective database searches for alternatives, and to help IACUC members evaluate database searches for alternatives during protocol review. At first, the fundamental principles of U.S. Animal Welfare Regulation and Public Health Service Policy are examined in detail (United States Department of Agriculture, 1997 and 2000). The quotations are linked to the original documents in text or PDF format. Furthermore, the principles of using Boolean logic are explained. To perform effective database searches, an investigator must have an understanding of Boolean logic ("OR", "AND", and "NOT" functions), which is utilised by software to detect the requested information in a database.

The course on statistical analysis is designed for:

- investigators to learn to use the web-based power analysis calculator developed specifically for animal research,

- investigators and staff responsible for completing IACUC protocol forms with a need to understand how to properly use statistical concepts to justify animal use, and
- IACUC members who must evaluate justifications for animal use by employing statistical concepts.

For example, the course covers parametric and non-parametric tests, censored data, interpretation of p values, paired and unpaired data, type 1 and type 2 errors, and the meaning and use of power calculations in experiments.

The "Literature Search for Alternatives Worksheet" of the Animal Welfare Information Center

<http://www.nal.usda.gov/awic/alternatives/searches/worksheet.htm>

AWIC is part of the USDA's National Agricultural Library (NAL) in Beltsville, Maryland, U.S. The centre was established in 1986 as mandated by Congress in the 1985 amendments to the Animal Welfare Act (AWA) to serve the information requirements and needs regulated under the AWA, e.g. using animals in painful procedures for biomedical research, product testing, higher education, zoos, circuses and marine mammals in aquaria. The focus of the centre's information products, services and activities is to help the regulated community address the 3Rs of Russell and Burch. The information provided by the centre is also directed at "refinement" via anaesthetics, analgesics, and improved methodologies.

The NAL also produces the bibliographic database AGRICOLA. Literature dealing with animal welfare issues and related topics is indexed for AGRICOLA in support of the AWIC program.

The AWIC staff has developed the "Literature Search for Alternatives Worksheet" to support scientists in conducting a search for alternatives. This worksheet was designed as an aid to researchers, information specialists, and IACUC members, as they begin to develop a multi-database search algorithm to determine whether alternative methods exist and to avoid duplication of previous research. The worksheet is based on many years of experience of the AWIC staff in conducting literature searches, especially in selecting and combining keywords to search multiple databases simultaneously (Allen, 1997). Information and advice on this subject is contained in explanatory notes and recommendations for every step outlined in the worksheet.

The worksheet is divided into two parts. The first part addresses details of the planned investigations to develop a search strategy and run a multi-database literature search. It contains 12 data fields to be completed. In addition a search summary and three sample search algorithms are given.

The worksheet starts by identifying who the investigator is. Next, information on the area of study, proposed animal study, proposed animal species, protocol objectives and endpoints is asked. A list of keywords and a selection of databases is prepared based on this information. The actual search strategy consists of a reduction and refinement search and a replacement search using the selected keywords and databases. For example, the replacement search should include keywords for potential alternatives such as "vitro", "culture", or "simulation". The worksheet recommends a minimum of at least two databases to secure access to most of the relevant available information. The years of publication covered are also recorded on the worksheet so that the search can be updated periodically.

At the end of the worksheet an Alternative Search Summary is requested. The researcher should explain in short form the search profile and the search results.

Furthermore, the AWIC provides three sample literature searches for alternatives to explain how to structure a search.

The AWIC Literature Search for Alternatives Worksheet works like a checklist, helping to ensure that the requirements of animal welfare legislation are met and to prove the necessity of performing the scientific experiments using animals.

The Search for Alternatives Website of the UCCAA

http://www.vetmed.ucdavis.edu/Animal_Alternatives/main.htm

The UC Center for Animal Alternatives (UCCAA) acts as a co-ordinating office for the University of California (UC) on improved and alternative methods. UCCAA has a central mission to support scientists in gaining convenient access to alternative methods. In addition, the centre places special emphasis on disseminating information concerning models, computer programmes, and other animal alternatives in education. The UCCAA librarian serves the nine campuses of the UC. Studies at the UC range from applied biomedical research to exploratory biology, and species used include rodents, companion animals, farm animals, primates, marine mammals, and reptiles. Each particular campus has a unique context that affects the methods and types of protocols that shape their need for bibliographic searches for alternatives (Hart et al., 2000). The campus

Table 1: Use of the UCCAA web resources; estimated daily use based on 28-day rolling averages from July 2000 through March 2004

Date	Number of users (daily average)
July - December 2000	27
January - June 2001	53
July - December 2001	66
January - June 2002	106
July - December 2002	133
January - June 2003	239
July - December 2003	318
January - February 2004	795
March 2004	928

programmes include undergraduate studies, graduate research, and medical and veterinary education.

The AWA and federal regulatory authorities, such as the USDA, and expert bodies such as the Association for Assessment and Accreditation of Laboratory Animal Care (AAALAC) require laboratories and research facilities to maintain a high level of involvement with animal care. The UCCAA supports the scientists in this effort by making information on alternatives to animal experiments more easily accessible via the Internet.

As indicated by the data in Table 1, the use of the UCCAA web resources has increased dramatically, especially over the past year. Such statistics provide evidence that research scientists are in search of timely, relevant information, and, as a result, are visiting this website.

Currently, the UCCAA website is divided into several main topics, which are then further divided into relevant subtopics. The following are most relevant to the scientists' search for information on alternative methods:

- Alternatives in Education Alternatives in Education
- Comprehensive search strategies for animal research protocols

Comprehensive Search Strategies for Animal Research Protocols

The layout and search topics of these eight search grids are based on the eight AALAS tutorials "Preparing an Animal Protocol for Research", <http://www.aalaslearninglibrary.org/courses.asp?str KeyID=2532077318075438162940>.

This approach is based on the premise that scientists commonly work according to guidelines, with the ultimate goal of completing and submitting a protocol that is readily approved. The search grids combine research topics with search templates, using a variety of databases and/ or websites. The research topic itself is divided into relevant sub-topics, which should then be checked for animal welfare legislation as well as the 3Rs; for example, a study protocol using animals must consider analgesics, sedatives, and anaesthetics. The search grid connects the concepts "anaesthesia" and "analgesia" with an embedded search in AGRICOLA, allowing users to click and initiate a new search in real time, retrieving the latest relevant citations. The embedded searches are limited to the free databases PubMed and AGRICOLA; search strategies are provided for proprietary databases, i.e. BIOSIS, with instructions on how to copy and paste, thereby facilitating an effective search. These comprehensive search strategies illustrate that alternatives are just one part of a thorough search, which includes multiple databases and multiple search strategies.

Alternatives in Education

The USDA requires principal investigators to consider alternatives to veterinary medicine teaching protocols containing procedures that may cause more than momentary or slight pain or distress to the animals. In response, the UCCAA developed search grids for protocols of alternative methods for veterinary medicine instruction. These grids make use of the same comprehensive searching approach advised for all protocols, emphasising the consideration of the 3Rs, and using multiple databases. Teaching protocols require searches in several of the traditional bibliographic databases, such as MEDLINE, CAB Abstracts, and AGRICOLA, but also in alternatives' databases such as NORINA and AVAR. The alternatives databases specifically catalogue and provide live links to products on alternatives, such as life-like models, videos and software.

Indexing Systems for Alternative Methods

As reported in the literature, one important prerequisite for adequate information retrieval is an appropriate information indexing system (Allen, 1997; Bottrill, 1999; Firestein et al., 2000; Salton et al., 1986; Huggins, 1994; Bottrill et al., 2000; Nelson, 2002). Indexing is used to highlight database content or other information sources, e.g. websites, to facilitate a search. According to the British indexing standard (BS3700: 1998), an index is a systematic arrangement of terms (keywords) designed to enable users to locate information. In a thesaurus, these terms are grouped hierarchically and according to related groups of terms. In comparison, keyword lists are organised in alphabetic order. Indexing assigns publications with representative terms to narrow search options. Indexing is either conducted by an indexer or an automatic indexing programme. The existing indexing systems are database-specific, e.g. indexing information on alternative methods is different in each database.

The NAL Agricultural Thesaurus (NALT): A Tool for Information Organisation and Retrieval

<http://agclass.nal.usda.gov/agt/agt.htm> A thesaurus intends to arrange terms in a structured format to help find terms of possible interest. It provides a common language that can be used for compatibility across systems. The aim is to call up all related items by a retrieval system and to allow the user find the relevant information by limiting unnecessary search results.

The NAL Agricultural Thesaurus (NALT) was developed by the NAL (USA) to meet the needs of the Agricultural Research Service (ARS) of the USDA for modern agricultural terms. The first edition of the NALT was released in 2001. In 2003, the NAL implemented the thesaurus as a controlled vocabulary of NAL's bibliographic database AGRICOLA. NALT is used as a supplement to the CAB Abstracts thesaurus, which is the original AGRICOLA indexing system.

The Food Safety Research Information Office (FSIRO) and the Agricultural Network Information Center (AgNIC) use the NALT as the controlled vocabulary in their information systems. NALT is used to browse the ARS and AgNIC websites, and to index USDA research projects. Furthermore, it is used to set up metadata on the NAL websites.

In January 2004, the third edition of the NALT was published containing approximately 62,000 terms. The terms used for the NALT are chosen from reference works, databases, other thesauri, and Internet sites. The NALT will be updated yearly in January. Thesaurus staff reviews potential new terms. Selected terms are defined and placed in the thesaurus structure. About 5000 terms are scheduled for addition to the 2004 edition. About half of these terms are taxonomic terms. Suggested terms are selected for inclusion according to their frequency of use and importance in agriculture. Terms are verified using a variety of authorities. Until now, there has been a retroactive conversion of 3 million AGRICOLA records.

The structure of NALT is based on ANSI/ISO Z39.19 "Guidelines for the Construction, Format, and Management of Monolingual Thesauri" published by the National Information Standards Organisation (NISO, USA), which is equivalent to the international standard ISO 2788. The use of the international standard makes it compatible with other systems using ISO.

The NALT is structured poly-hierarchically, which means that terms may be used in several places; for example "forestry law" can be found under "forestry" and under "law". The thesaurus is organised into 17 subject categories that include hierarchical, equivalence and associative relationships among the terms. Hierarchical relationships are indicated by "Broader Terms" and "Narrow Terms" designations. Equivalence relationships are defined by "Use" and "Use for" cross-references. Associative relationships are designated by "Related Terms". Each single term is assigned to one concept only. For example, "animal models" is only used for animal models of human diseases. In addition, scope notes and definitions have been included to clarify the meaning of the terms.

NALT includes terms that are used to index documents relating to alternatives to animal experiments. The subject category "Animal Science and Animal Products" in the thesaurus is subdivided into 10 terms, one of which is named "Animal Welfare". Animal Welfare is defined here as "The sum or integration of an animal's past and present state of well-being as it attempts to cope with its environment; and human value concerning the social or ethical aspects of providing that environment." "Animal Use Alternatives" is listed under the term "Animal Welfare" as one of the related terms. At the next level the NALT breaks down the term "Animal Use Alternatives" into the terms "Animal Use Reduction", "Animal Use Refinement", and "Animal Use Replacement". These terms correspond with the definition of the 3Rs of Russell and Burch (1959).

Indexers at NAL index the alternatives literature in the NAL database AGRICOLA using this vocabulary. Materials indexed for the database include peer reviewed journal articles, conference proceedings, books, audiovisuals, and all AWIC-produced publications that address the broad spectrum of research relating to the 3Rs and other areas of animal welfare such as care of pet, zoo and farm animals.

As in taxonomy, a thesaurus is never "complete" (Milstead, 1998). Maintaining the usefulness of the NALT requires ongoing commitment to updating. New alternative terminology must be added, existing terms changed, and occasionally deleted. The NALT staff invites suggestions and changes to the thesaurus and / or suggestions for new terms using a form available at <http://agclass.nal.usda.gov/agt/contact1.htm>. Furthermore, the NALT staff will become more active in investigating the following issues:

- mergers of vocabularies that already exist,
- feasibility and usefulness of translation to other languages,
- needs of comprehensiveness,
- collaboration with international groups to expand the body of terms, and
- enhancement of the search engine to rank search results.

Indexing Systems for Alternative Methods—A ZEBET Investigation

ZEBET's Investigation on Indexing Systems on the Internet

Currently, a wide range of information resources, e.g. databases and websites offer scientific information on alternative methods. Based on their experience in documentation, indexing and searching for alternative methods, the ZEBET staff is evaluating whether the information available in the database resources is sufficient to fulfil the demands of animal welfare legislation, and whether scientists can retrieve the required information.

In 2002, ZEBET began its investigations on indexing systems of alternative methods in established literature databases. The goal was to determine how alternative methods are indexed and how search results for alternatives are influenced by different procedures of indexing information. ZEBET presented the first results of the study at the workshop in 2003.

Results of ZEBET's Investigations

Meissner compared different database indexing systems for alternative methods in co-operation with ZEBET in 2002 (Meissner, 2002). The databases MEDLINE, EMBASE, AGRIS, CAB Abstracts and AGRICOLA use a variety of terms for alternative methods as illustrated in Table 2.

For example, the MeSH term "Animal Use Alternatives" is defined by the NLM (2003) as follows: "Alternatives to the use of animals in research, testing, and education. The alternatives may include reduction in the number of animals used, replacement of animals with a non-animal model or with animals of a phylogenetically lower species, or refinement of methods to minimise pain or distress of animals used."

Taking into account Meissner's evaluation, ZEBET developed a search approach according to the following criteria:

- **Databases searched**

- In order to allow comparison of relevant database contents, the following databases were selected: MEDLINE (ME83), established in 1983
- (7.8 million documents) EMBASE (EM83), established in 1983
- (6.9 million documents) AGRIS (AG86), established in 1986
- (2.0 million documents) CAB Abstracts (CV72), established in 1972 (4.3 million documents) AGRICOLA (file "Books" and "Articles"), established in 1970 (3.7 million documents)

- **Search terms used**

ZEBET searched a total of 44 terms including eight general search terms for alternative methods in the selected databases

Table 2: Index terms for alternative methods used by MEDLINE, EMBASE, AGRIS, CAB Abstracts and AGRICOLA databases in 2002

Database	Subject	Thesaurus	Relevant Terms
MEDLINE National Library of Medicine (NLM), USA http://www.nlm.nih.gov	Biomedicine and Related Fields	Medical Subject Headings (MeSH)	Animal Testing Alternative Animal Use Alternatives
EMBASE Elsevier Science, NL http://www.elsevier.nl	Biomedicine and Related Fields	EMTREE	Animal Testing Reduction Animal Testing Alternatives Animal Testing Refinement Animal Testing Replacement
AGRIS United Nations Food and Agriculture Organisation (FAO) http://www.fao.org/agris	Agricultural Sciences and Related Fields including Veterinary Sciences	AGROVOC	Animal Testing Alternatives
CAB Abstracts Commonwealth Agricultural Bureau International (CAB), UK http://www.cabi.org	Agricultural Sciences and Related Fields including Veterinary Sciences	CAB Thesaurus	Animal Testing Alternatives
AGRICOLA National Agricultural Library (NAL), USA http://www.nal.usda.gov	Agricultural Sciences and Related Fields including Veterinary Sciences	CAB Thesaurus; NALT	Animal Testing Alternatives Animal Use Alternatives Animal Use Reduction Animal Use Refinement Animal Use Replacement

identified by Meissner (2002), 15 search terms for specific alternative methods, e.g. acute toxic class method, and 21 search terms on other relevant topics, e.g. acute oral toxicity. These specific search terms were taken from the AnimAlt-ZEBET keyword list according to their relevance to alternative methods. The study was conducted in 2002.

Access to MEDLINE, EMBASE, AGRIS, and CAB Abstracts databases was obtained via DIMDI. AGRICOLA was accessed directly via <http://www.nal.usda.gov> and searched in free text search mode to find all available documents containing information on alternative methods in any accessible data field of the documents. A phrase search was used via DIMDI and "any keyword search" was used for AGRICOLA. In AGRICOLA the search terms needed to be combined by the operator "AND". The first search used only the eight index terms for alternative methods. In Table 3, search results from the five databases are summarised. The number of records retrieved indicates that MEDLINE, EMBASE, AGRIS, CAB Abstracts, and AGRICOLA index alternative methods at varying frequencies. 2263 references were found in AGRICOLA and 1056 in MEDLINE. In EMBASE, AGRIS, and CAB Abstracts less than 500 references each were found. It may be concluded that AGRICOLA allocates the terms more frequently compared to the other databases, regardless of the specific modus used in AGRICOLA.

In the next step, the search for alternative methods was combined with evaluated search terms for specific alternative methods and terms for relevant topics. The search for publications on "monoclonal antibodies" is presented as an example in Table 4. The in vitro production of monoclonal antibodies is important to replace the in vivo procedure employing the ascites tumour mouse model. During the past decade, in vitro techniques have been developed, which allow production of monoclonal antibodies in mouse hybridoma tumour cells without using mice at all. These include the culture of hybridoma cells in dialysis tubing and hollow fibre bioreactors, e.g. the Technomouse™.

In Table 4 the combination of the search results for alternative methods to produce monoclonal antibodies shows a significant decrease in the number of hits recorded. The search for this topic

retrieved only 11 records in MEDLINE and in AGRICOLA. In AGRIS and CAB Abstracts less than 10 references were found and EMBASE did not yield any references at all. The results illustrated in Table 4 represent a typical example of a search result. A comprehensive report of the results of ZEBET's investigation is currently being prepared.

Discussion of the Results of ZEBET's Investigation

When databases were compared, the preliminary search results indicated that AGRICOLA identified more publications on alternative methods than other databases. This result should be examined more closely and confirmed by a more extended search. A strong decrease in the number of publications retrieved was observed when search terms for alternative methods were combined with search terms for a given alternative method and more specific search terms.

Compared to the number of references quoted in the documents of AnimAlt-ZEBET, the low number of hits scored in a search with only three search steps showed an even more dramatic failure of information retrieval. AnimAlt-ZEBET contained 115 documents with approximately 6000 bibliographic references in November 2003. The highest number of indexed publications retrieved from a search was from AGRICOLA with approximately 2500 records. Furthermore, a search in AnimAlt-ZEBET provided four documents relating to in vitro methods of producing monoclonal antibodies with 79 bibliographic references. The search for this topic in both MEDLINE and AGRICOLA provided only 11 records each.

The results of the study show that none of the existing databases completely covers all alternative methods and that this may lead to a loss of relevant information due to deficits in indexing, since not all relevant publications could be retrieved. At the same time, our Anim-Alt-ZEBET database covers only a limited number of alternative methods.

Thus, ZEBET puts forward the following hypothesis to be discussed by information retrieval professionals:

Indexing systems are not (yet) used to their full potential since not all of the relevant information is indexed as "alternative

Table 3: Numbers of publications retrieved on alternative methods in MEDLINE, EMBASE, AGRIS, CAB Abstracts, and AGRICOLA in October 2002

Search Terms	MEDLINE 7.8 Mio documents	Embase 6.9 Mio documents	Agris 2 Mio documents	CAB Abstracts 4.3 Mio documents	AGRICOLA 3.7 Mio documents
animal testing alternatives	1,023*	0	418*	213*	968*
animal testing reduction	0	27*	0	0	88
animal testing refinement	0	19*	0	0	45
animal testing replacement	0	21*	0	0	439
animal use alternatives	33*	0	1	1	345*
animal use reduction	0	0	0	1	213*
animal use replacement	0	0	0	0	112*
animal use refinement	0	0	0	0	253*
Total Hits	1,056	67	419	215	2,463

* Indexed Terms

Table 4: Numbers of publications retrieved on alternative methods and the subject of monoclonal antibodies in MEDLINE, EMBASE, AGRIS, CAB Abstracts, and AGRICOLA in 2002

Search Terms	MEDLINE 7.8 Mio documents	Embase 6.9 Mio documents	Agris 2 Mio documents	CAB Abstracts 4.3 Mio documents	AGRICOLA 3.7 Mio documents
animal testing alternatives	1,023	0	418	213	968
animal testing reduction	0	27	0	0	88
animal testing refinement	0	19	0	0	45
animal testing replacement	0	21	0	0	439
animal use alternatives	33	0	1	1	345
animal use reduction	0	0	0	1	213
animal use replacement	0	0	0	0	112
animal use refinement	0	0	0	0	253
Total Hits	1,056	67	419	215	2,463
Monoclonal antibod?*	109,535	125,467	5,532	17,332	5,188
Monoclonal antibod?* AND Total Hits for alternative methods	11	0	3	6	11

*The term "monoclonal antibodies" was truncated to include singular and plural forms of the word antibody.

methods". As a consequence, not all of the relevant literature on alternative methods is covered by the search terms "Animal Testing Alternatives" or "Animal Use Alternatives".

This deficit may result from the current indexing rules. Nelson (2002) explains, that publications are indexed according to content but not according to their potential relevance to alternatives to animal experiments. If the text of an article does not specifically indicate that its content relates to an alternative method, i.e. the terms for alternative methods are not used in the text, it cannot be indexed under the terms covering alternatives to animal experiments.

ZEBET's Suggestions for the Way Forward

Taking into account the results of the investigation on indexing systems on the Internet, ZEBET proposes the following topics for further discussion and investigation:

- **Development of "Good Searching Practices" for alternative methods**

"Good Searching Practices" for alternative methods should allow the use of the most specific search profile reflecting the type of research for which alternative methods are applied. Currently, searches using the keywords "animal testing alternative" and/or "animal use alternative" can only serve as supplements. Searching in a super-base mode (multi-database searching technique) should become the accepted standard.

- **Establishing specialised databases and websites**

Databases and websites on alternative methods, e.g. ECVAM-SIS, ALTBIB, AWIC, Altweb, UCCAA, and Anim-Alt-ZEBET, have the advantage of providing selected information on specific subjects. These sources of specific information should be incorporated into regular searches for alternative methods.

- **Improving the Current Indexing Systems**

The indexing systems should include an evaluation whether the bibliographic references encompass alternative methods. In addition, limitations and advantages of automatically processed indexing systems should be investigated.

Conclusions and Recommendations of the Berlin Workshop

The workshop showed that a huge amount of information on alternative methods is available on the Internet. However, the existing sources of information differ in content, structure, quality of information and search tools. Established bibliographic databases, e.g. MEDLINE and AGRICOLA, offer comprehensive documentation on scientific publications. Specialised databases, e.g. ALTBIB, ECVAM-SIS and AnimAlt-ZEBET, provide pre-selected information and present accessible, relevant information on a single website.

It is in the highest interest of information providers to ensure that the relevant information is reliably accessible, especially considering that according to U.S. Animal Welfare Regulation and Public Health Service Policy (United States Department of Agriculture, 1997 and 2000) and European Directive 86/609/EEC, scientists should conduct a complete search for literature and other relevant information on alternatives to avoid unnecessary animal experiments, unnecessary pain or distress to the animals and unnecessary duplication of animal experiments.

The participants of the workshop developed the following recommendations and work proposals to improve the information retrieval on alternative methods on the Internet.

- **Development of web-based search strategies**

Web-based search tools should be developed to enable scientists to conduct and document a complete search for literature on alternatives to animal experiments.

Search tools should include search algorithms with suitable search terms. Search profiles including search steps, the use of Boolean operators and limitations should be explained in a user-friendly manner. In addition, searches based on multi-database formats, as well as recommendations for databases supporting appropriate search strategies should be discussed.

The application of web-based search strategies will depend on their acceptance by scientists as well as authorities, for example the IACUCs in the USA and the Animal Protection Officers in Europe.

- **Development of the AWIC "Literature Search for Alternatives Worksheet"**

The workshop members discussed how to improve the acceptance of the AWIC worksheet by the scientific community. AWIC invited recommendations for revision of the forms, emphasising consideration of user-friendly accessibility and comprehensibility. Translating the worksheet into common European languages, e.g. German, was also recommended.

- **Improvement of indexing of alternative methods by the authors and/or editors of scientific journals**

By using appropriate keywords when indexing publications related to alternative methods, authors and/or editors of scientific journals can play a crucial role in making alternatives available to the scientific community. Scientific journals such as "Alternatives to Laboratory Animals" (ATLA, UK) and "Alternativen zu Tierexperimenten" (ALTEX, Germany) are good examples for appropriate indexing of alternative methods.

The workshop members recommended that the application of index terms such as "Animal Testing Alternatives", "Animal Use Alternatives", "Animal Use Reduction", "Animal Use Refinement", and/or "Animal Use Replacement" by authors and editors should follow the definition used by the NLM's MeSH and the NAL's AGRICOLA Thesaurus. Practical instruction should be prepared and discussed by scientific authorities including animal welfare information services in co-operation with the editors of scientific journals.

- **Improving current indexing systems**

Every database has its own indexing system, including stringent procedures to add new terms, to change or to delete existing terms and/or hierarchies. The expertise of the information centres for alternative methods should be taken into account when updating or extending a thesaurus.

For example, as mentioned above, the NALT staff (AGRICOLA) invites suggestions and changes to the thesaurus using a form that is available at <http://agclass.nal.usda.gov/agt/contact1.htm>.

- **Search training programmes**

There are a number of established training programmes on searching for alternative methods in databases. For example, AWIC (NAL, USA) regularly offers workshops entitled, "Meeting the Information Requirements of the Animal Welfare Act". This is a free one-and-a-half-day workshop intended for biomedical scientists, members of IACUCs, and information providers. The use of existing databases and information networks is covered in the AWIC workshops. (<http://www.nal.usda.gov/awic/awicworkshops/awicworkshops.htm>).

The Berlin Workshop members recommend increasing and extending training opportunities, following the AWIC model. Scientists, IACUC members (USA), Animal Protection Officers and representatives of the ethics committees and the local authorities of the states (EU), who are trained in developing appropriate search strategies, will be able to improve their search results,

identify weak points, inefficiencies, and/or discrepancies in the submitted protocols.

The workshop also concluded that when new tools for searching and manipulating search results are developed, emphasis should be placed on making them as convenient as possible for scientists and review committees. Given the ethical and legal importance of compliance, limitations to utilising search tools should be minimised.

- **Development of research programmes**

The development of search strategy programmes that are able to convert a simple search question into a suitable complex search protocol should be discussed in an interdisciplinary dialogue between biomedical and information scientists. It is a challenge to develop an intelligent "search engine" that will translate inquiries of biomedical scientists into a professional search on alternative methods. Due to the rapid pace of advances in database search technology, the group was optimistic that web-based aids for conducting searches for alternatives will become more feasible.

For many years the information centres for alternative methods, both in the US and Europe, have developed and refined their search strategies. They have gained experience in all aspects of information searching. The knowledge of these experts on information searching should, therefore, be used when new research strategies on alternatives are established.

Acknowledgements

The workshop was funded by the German Federal Institute for Risk Assessment (BfR). The authors are grateful to Professor Dr. Dr. Andreas Hensel, President of the BfR, and Mrs. Christel Zimmermann, Scientific Coordinator of the BfR, for their support.


References

- Adamczak, W. and Nase, A. (2002). Gaining Insight from Research Information. 6th International Conference on Current Research Information Systems, p9. Kassel University Press.
- Allen, T. (1997). On-line database and the World-Wide Web: What is available? What is missing? In L. F. M. van Zutphen and M. Balls (eds.), *Animal Alternatives, Welfare and Ethics* (483-490). Elsevier Science.
- Bottrill, K. (1999). Searching for Information on Non-animal Replacement Alternatives. A Guide to Search Techniques, Databases and Specialised Resources, 52 pp. FRAME, RUSSEL & Burch House, Nottingham, UK.
- Bottrill, K. and Huggins, J. (2000). Keywords for use with alternatives. In M. Balls, A.-M. van Zeller and M. E. Halder (eds.), *Progress in the Reduction, Refinement and Replacement of Animal Experimentation (1737-1739)*. Elsevier Science.
- British indexing standard (BS3700:1988). In American Society of Indexers (ed.), *Frequently Asked Questions About Indexing*. Available from: <http://www.asindexing.org/site/indfaq.shtml>.
- Council Directive 86/609/EEC of 24 November 1986 on the approximation of laws, regulations and administrative provisions of the member States regarding the protection of animals used for experimental and other scientific purposes. *Official Journal L 358*, 18/12/1986 P. 0001-0028.
- Firestein, K. and Hart, L. (2000). Unobtrusive study of animals in the wild: database search strategies. In M. Balls, A. M. van Zeller and M. E. Halder (eds.), *Progress in the Reduction, Refinement and Replacement of Animal Experimentation (1239-1246)*. Elsevier Science.
- Grune, B., Herrmann, S., Dörendahl, A. et al. (2000). Die ZEBET-Datenbank über Alternativen zu Tierversuchen im

Internet - ein konkreter Beitrag zum Tierschutz von Versuchstieren. ALTEX 17 (3), 127-133.

- Huggins, J. (1994). Communication by Keyword: Enhanced Distribution and Retrieval of Information about Alternatives to Animal Testing. *In Vitro Toxicology* 7 (4), 369-375.
- Hart, L. A. and Wood, W. W. (2000). Facilitating compliance in bibliographic searching for alternatives: a model programme for developing local support. In M. Balls, A.-M. van Zeller and M. E. Halder (eds.), *Progress in the Reduction, Refinement and Replacement of Animal Experimentation* (14091414). Elsevier Science.
- Janusch, A., van der Kamp, M. D. O., Bottrill, K. et al. (1997). Current Status and Future Developments of Databases on Alternative Methods. *ATLA* 25, 411-422.
- Janusch-Roi, A., Libowitz, L., Grune, B. and Kreger, M. (2000). Alternative method databases - specialised information sources on alternatives to support scientists and authorities responsible for granting project licences. In M. Balls, A.-M. van Zeller and M. E. Halder (eds.), *Progress in the Reduction, Refinement and Replacement of Animal Experimentation* (1731-1736). Elsevier Science.
- Libowitz, L. (2002). Proposals for International Recognition, Support and Cooperation with the Internet Clearinghouse on the Three R's (AltWeb). Fourth World Congress on Alternatives and Animal Use in the Life Science, August 11 - 15, 2002, New Orleans, USA. Program and Abstracts, p. 166.
- Meissner, M. (2002). Vergleichende Untersuchung von Thesauri, Schlagwortlisten und Klassifikationen im Hinblick auf ihre Anwendung für die Indexierung von Informationen zur Thematik "Alternativmethoden zu Tierversuchen" und auf angrenzenden Gebieten. Fachhochschule Potsdam, Fachbereich Informationswissenschaften.
- Milstead, J. L. (1998). NISO Z39.19: Standard for Structure and Organization of Information Retrieval Thesauri. Available from: <http://research.calacademy.org/taf/proceedings/milsteadtaf.html> (Accesses 7th February 2004)
- National Library of Medicine (2003). Medical Subject Headings. U.S. National Library of Medicine, Bethesda, USA. Available from: <http://www.nlm.nih.gov/mesh/meshhome.html>.
- Nelson, S. J. (2002). The Alternative Project. Available from: <http://www.nlm.nih.gov/mesh/presentations/public/ppframe.htm>.
- Russell, W. M. S. and Burch, R. L. (1959). *The principles of humane experimental technique*. 238 pp. London: Methuen & Co. Ltd.
- Salton, G. and McGill, M. J. (1986). *Introduction to Modern Information Retrieval*, McGraw Hill College Div., pp 448.
- SEC(91)1794. Communication of the European Commission to Council and the European Parliament, October 1991.
- United States Department of Agriculture, Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service. Animal Care Policy Manual, Policy #11 - Painful/Distressful Procedures - April 14, 1997. Available from: <http://www.aphis.usda.gov/ac/policy/policy11.pdf>.
- United States Department of Agriculture, Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service. Animal Care Policy Manual, Policy #12 - Written Narrative for Alternatives to Painful Procedures - June 21, 2000. Available from: <http://www.aphis.usda.gov/ac/policy/policy12.pdf>.

Correspondence to:

Dr. Barbara Grune ZEBET at the BfR Diederichs Weg 1
D-12277 Berlin Germany phone: +49-1888-412 2271 fax:
+49-1888-412-2958 e-mail: grune.zebet@bfr.bund.de 

The Farm Animal Stewardship Act: Humane Treatment of Farm Animals

(Congressional Record-House of Representatives - July 26, 2006, page H5940)

[Editor's Note: These are remarks made by Connecticut Representative Christopher Shays introducing this legislation.]

Mr. SHAYS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 5 minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the gentleman from Connecticut is recognized for 5 minutes.

There was no objection.

Mr. SHAYS. Mr. Speaker, on June 29, 2006, the Friends of Animals Caucus held a groundbreaking event on farm animal welfare. Members of the caucus were joined by a distinguished and diverse panel of speakers: representatives of three major animal protection organizations, a noted legal scholar, a family farmer, and representatives of the religious and environmental communities.

The way a society treats its animals speaks to the core values and priorities

of its citizens. Peter DeFazio [Representative from Oregon] and I recently introduced legislation, H.R. 5557, the Farm Animal Stewardship Act, which we hope will lead to more humane treatment of farm animals raised for consumption. Additionally, I am developing bills to address the issues of labeling and animal cruelty that exists in America.


Some species have become our companions, some play important roles in sensitive ecosystems, and some are raised for food. It is our duty to protect and care for all of these animals.

Matthew Scully, former special assistant and deputy director of speechwriting to President George W. Bush, was unable to attend, but he submitted his article *Fear Factories: The Case for Compassionate Conservatism—for Animals*, which was published in the May 23, 2005, issue of the *American Conservative*. He asked that it be included as a summary of his views on this subject.

Before ending my comments, let me highlight some of the views expressed by Matthew Scully because it expresses what I believe. Mr. Scully states: "..... the persistent animal welfare questions of our day center on institutional cruelties on the vast and systematic mistreatment of animals that most of us never see." "..... all of factory farming proceeds by a massive denial of reality, the reality that pigs and other animals are not just production units to be endlessly exploited but living creatures with natures and needs."

He continues: "Conservatives are supposed to revere tradition. Factory farming has no tradition, no rules, no codes of honor, no little decencies to spare for a fellow creature. The whole thing is an abandonment of rural values and a betrayal of honorable animal husbandry."

He further continues by saying: "..... we cannot just take from these creatures; we must give them something in return. We owe them a merciful death and we owe them a merciful life. And when human beings cannot do something humanely, without degrading both creatures and ourselves, then we should not do it at all."

The importance of this issue is evident, as over 100 people attended the hearing to examine the issue of the humane treatment of farm animals. The Friends of Animals Caucus will continue to work on a bipartisan basis to help protect animals at the Federal level. 

Alternatives News...

National Toxicology Program (NTP) Interagency Center for the Evaluation of Alternative Toxicology Methods (NICEATM)

- **Development of ICCVAM/NICEATM 5-Year Plan**

Congress has requested of NIEHS that NICEATM and the Interagency Coordinating Committee on the Validation of Alternative Methods (ICCVAM) in partnership with the relevant federal agencies develop a 5-year plan that addresses (1) research, development, translation, and validation of new and revised non-animal and other alternative assays for integration into federal agency testing programs and (2) the identification of areas of high priority for new and revised non-animal and alternative assays for the replacement, reduction, and refinement (less pain and distress) of animal tests. As part of the activities associated with development of the plan NICEATM/ICCVAM sought public input through a notice published in Federal Register (71FR66172; November 2006) and discussed it at a recent meeting on November 30 of the Scientific Advisory Committee on Alternative Toxicological Methods (SACATM). Public comments received are posted on the 5-year plan website at: <http://iccvam.niehs.nih.gov/docs/5yearplan.htm>

- **Alternative Methods to Replace the Mouse LD50 Assay for Botulinum Toxin Potency Testing Workshop**

On November 13 and 14, 2006, NICEATM, ICCVAM, and the European Centre for the Validation of Alternative Methods (ECVAM) co-sponsored a public workshop in Silver Spring, MD on Alternative Methods to Replace the Mouse LD50 Assay for Botulinum Toxin Potency Testing. Over 110 participants from nine countries attended including scientists from governmental and academic institutions, national and international regulatory authorities, industry, and the animal welfare community. A poster session with a multinational collection of 10 posters addressed alternative methods for testing botulinum toxin. Workshop presentations and other information can be found at: <http://iccvam.niehs.nih.gov/methods/biolodocs/biolowkshp/wkshpinfo.htm>

Botulinum toxin, the most poisonous substance known, causes paralysis by acting on the nervous system. Botulism has been a public health and ecological hazard for centuries and botulinum toxin is a significant bioterrorism threat. Recently, the toxin has been used to treat many serious and painful medical conditions and as a personal care treatment. The most frequently used method for detecting or assessing the potency of botulinum toxin requires a test called the mouse LD50 assay. This assay involves dosing mice with dilutions of the toxin and identifying the dilution at which 50% of the mice die. The workshop goals were to (a) review the state-of-the-science and current knowledge of alternatives that may reduce, replace, and/or refine (less pain and distress) the use of mice for botulinum toxin testing and (b) identify priorities for research, development, and validation efforts to advance the use of alternative methods.

The LD50 assay has been in use for many years and is currently accepted as the method-of-choice by all U.S. and European regulatory agencies. However, recent advances are affording opportunities for alternative methods that may be faster and

more accurate and also may refine, replace, or reduce the use of mice for testing botulinum toxin.

- **Final Background Review Documents for In Vitro Ocular Test Methods**

NICEATM announces availability of final background review documents (BRDs) for four ocular toxicity test methods: (1) the Bovine Corneal Opacity and Permeability [BCOP] test, (2) the Isolated Chicken Eye [ICE] test, (3) the Isolated Rabbit Eye [IRE] test, and (4) the Hen's Egg Test - Chorioallantoic Membrane [HET-CAM] (NIH Publications 06-4512, 06-4513, 06-4514, and 06-4515, respectively). The BRDs provide the data and analyses used to assess the current validation status of these test methods for identifying ocular corrosives and severe irritants. Electronic copies of the four BRDs are available on the NICEATM/ICCVAM website at http://iccvam.niehs.nih.gov/methods/ocudocs/ocu_brd.htm



- **ECVAM Database Service on Alternative Methods to Animal Experimentation (DB-ALM) Now Online**

The European Centre for the Validation of Alternative Methods (ECVAM), part of the Institute for Health and Consumer Protection (IHCP), has the pleasure to announce the Internet availability of the ECVAM database service on alternative methods to animal experimentation (DB-ALM) on occasion of the 15th anniversary of ECVAM.

The establishment of DB-ALM finds its origin in a Communication from the European Commission to Council and European Parliament SEC (91)1794. The service provides factual information presented as evaluated data-sheets (ready-to-use information) on various aspects of advanced and alternative techniques for toxicology assessments. This includes method-summary descriptions and protocols for their performance, evaluation studies, details on formal validation studies and individual test results. The target user group includes National authorities in addition to the scientific community and the animal welfare movement.

With the online availability of DB-ALM, ECVAM, as a core activity of the IHCP, has fulfilled, together with the validation of alternative methods, a duty assigned to the Institution. Making it now public to a large and international audience will further advance Europe's activities to promote alternatives to animal testing. Please visit the new site at <http://ecvam-dbalm.jrc.cec.eu.int/>

- **Report of Carbon Dioxide Euthanasia Meeting Published**

The UK National Centre for the Replacement, Refinement and Reduction of Animals in Research has recently made available a report developed from a meeting held at the University of Newcastle. The meeting was held to determine best practices when using carbon dioxide as a euthanasia agent in rodents and to develop guidelines to ensure the humane use of carbon dioxide in laboratories. The report is available at <http://www.nc3rs.org.uk/news.asp?id=292>



prison, makes it a felony to transport an animal across state or international borders for the purpose of animal fighting, and prohibits the interstate and foreign commerce in knives and gaffs designed for use in cockfighting.”

According to the Congressional Research Service, this law amends the federal criminal code to prohibit: (1) sponsoring or exhibiting a bird in a fighting venture in a state where it would not otherwise be in violation of the law, only if the person knew that any bird in the venture was knowingly bought, sold, delivered, transported, or received in interstate or foreign commerce for such purpose; or (2) knowingly sponsoring or exhibiting in an animal fighting venture any other animal that was moved in interstate or foreign commerce.

Prohibits knowingly: (1) selling, buying, transporting, delivering, or receiving, for purposes of transportation in interstate or foreign commerce, any dog or other animal to participate in an animal fighting venture; (2) using interstate mail service for commercial speech promoting an animal fighting venture except as performed outside the limits of the states (with an exception for bird fights in states whose laws allow them); or (3) selling, buying, transporting, or delivering in interstate or foreign commerce a knife, gaff, or other sharp instrument to be attached to the leg of a bird for use in an animal fighting venture.

Increases the penalties to a fine and up to three years' imprisonment for violations.

SEC. 2. ENFORCEMENT OF ANIMAL FIGHTING PROHIBITIONS.

(a) In General- Chapter 3 of title 18, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following:

Sec. 49. Animal fighting prohibition

(a) Sponsoring or Exhibiting an Animal in an Animal Fighting Venture-

(1) IN GENERAL- Except as provided in paragraph (2), it shall be unlawful for any person to knowingly sponsor or exhibit an animal in an animal fighting venture, if any animal in the venture was moved in interstate or foreign commerce. (2) SPECIAL RULE FOR CERTAIN STATES- With respect to fighting ventures involving live birds in a State where it would not be in violation of the law, it shall be unlawful under this subsection for a person to sponsor or exhibit a bird in the fighting venture only if the person knew that any bird in the fighting venture was knowingly bought, sold, delivered, transported, or received in interstate or foreign commerce for the purpose of participation in the fighting venture.

(b) Buying, Selling, Delivering, or Transporting Animals for Participation in Animal Fighting Venture- It shall be unlawful for any person to knowingly sell, buy, transport, or deliver, or receive for purposes of transportation, in interstate or foreign commerce, any dog or other animal for purposes of having the dog or other animal participate in an animal fighting venture.

(c) Use of Postal Service or Other Interstate Instrumentality for Promoting Animal Fighting Venture- It shall be unlawful for any person to knowingly use the mail service of the United States Postal Service or any instrumentality of interstate commerce for commercial speech promoting an animal fighting venture except as performed outside the limits of the States of the United States.

(d) Violation of State Law- Notwithstanding subsection C), the activities prohibited by such subsection shall be unlawful with respect to fighting ventures involving live birds only if the fight is to take place in a State where it would be in violation of the laws thereof.

(e) Sharp Instruments- It shall be unlawful for any person to knowingly sell, buy, transport, or deliver in interstate or foreign commerce a knife, a gaff, or any other sharp instrument attached, or designed or intended to be attached, to the leg of a bird for use in an animal fighting venture.

(f) Penalties- Any person who violates subsection (a), (b), (c), or (e) shall be fined under this title or imprisoned for not more than 3 years, or both, for each such violation.

(g) Definitions- For purposes of this section—

(1) the term “animal fighting venture” means any event which involves a fight between at least two animals and is conducted for purposes of sport, wagering, or entertainment except that the term “animal fighting venture” shall not be deemed to include any activity the primary purpose of which involves the use of one or more animals in hunting another animal or animals, such as waterfowl, bird, raccoon, or fox hunting; (2) the term “instrumentality of interstate commerce” means any written, wire, radio, television or other form of communication in, or using a facility of, interstate commerce; (3) the term “State” means any State of the United States, the District of Columbia, the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, and any territory or possession of the United States; and (4) the term “animal” means any live bird, or any live dog or other mammal, except man.

(h) Conflict With State Law- The provisions of this section do not supersede or otherwise invalidate any such State, local, or municipal legislation or ordinance relating to animal fighting ventures except in case of a direct and irreconcilable conflict between any requirements thereunder and this section or any rule, regulation, or standard hereunder.

(b) Clerical Amendment- The table of contents for chapter 3 of title 18, is amended by inserting after the item relating to section 48 the following: 49. Animal fighting prohibition.

(c) Repeal of Criminal Penalty in the Animal Welfare Act- Section 26 of the Animal Welfare Act (7 U.S.C. 2156) is amended by striking subsection (e).

- **H.R.249 To restore the prohibition on the commercial sale and slaughter of wild free-roaming horses and burros.**

Introduced on January 5, 2007, by Nick J. Rahall, II (D-West Virginia) and referred to the House Committee on Natural Resources. The committee ordered the bill to be reported to the House. The bill was passed by the House on April 26 and sent to the Senate where it was referred to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

Amends the Wild Free-Roaming Horses and Burros Act to: (1) prohibit the sale or transfer for commercial product processing of any free-roaming horse or burro on U.S. public lands; and (2) repeal the provisions permitting the sale of certain excess animals or their remains, and excluding from criminal fine or imprisonment a person who processes or permits the processing of such animals' remains.

- **H.R.465 To reauthorize the Asian Elephant Conservation Act of 1997.**

Introduced on January 12, 2007, by Jim Saxton (R-New Jersey) and referred to the House Committee on Natural Resources. This act may be cited as the “Asian Elephant Conservation Reauthorization Act.”

Amends the Asian Elephant Conservation Act of 1997 to authorize appropriations to the Multinational Species Conservation Fund for FY2008-2012.

- **H.R.503 To amend the Horse Protection Act to prohibit the shipping, transporting, moving, delivering, receiving, possessing, purchasing, selling, or donation of horses and other equines to be slaughtered for human consumption, and for other purposes.**

Introduced on January 17, 2007, by Janice D. Schakowsky (D-Illinois) and referred to the House Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on Agriculture. Related bill: S. 311

Amends the Horse Protection Act to prohibit the shipping, transporting, moving, delivering, receiving, possessing, purchasing, selling, or donation of horses and other equines to be slaughtered for human consumption.

Authorizes the Secretary of Agriculture to detain for examination, testing, or the taking of evidence: (1) any horse at any horse show, horse exhibition, or horse sale or auction which is sore or which the Secretary has probable cause to believe is sore; and (2) any horse or other equine which the Secretary has probable cause to believe is being shipped, transported, moved, delivered, received, possessed, purchased, sold, or donated in violation of such prohibition.

- **H.R.661 To amend the Humane Methods of Livestock Slaughter Act of 1958 to ensure the humane slaughter of nonambulatory livestock, and for other purposes.**

Introduced on January 24, 2007, by Gary L. Ackerman (D-New York) and referred to the House Committee on Agriculture. This act may be cited as the "Downed Animal and Food Safety Protection Act."

States that it is U.S. policy that all nonambulatory livestock in interstate and foreign commerce be immediately and humanely euthanized when such livestock become nonambulatory.

Amends the Humane Methods of Slaughter Act of 1958 to direct the Secretary of Agriculture to promulgate regulations providing for the humane treatment, handling, and disposition of nonambulatory livestock by a covered entity, including a requirement that nonambulatory livestock be humanely euthanized.

Requires an entity to: (1) humanely euthanize nonambulatory livestock (while not limiting the Secretary's ability to test nonambulatory livestock for disease, such as bovine spongiform encephalopathy); and (2) not move nonambulatory livestock while such livestock is conscious, and ensure that such livestock remains unconscious until death.

Prohibits an inspector at an establishment covered by the Federal Meat Inspection Act to pass nonambulatory livestock, carcass, or carcass parts through inspection. Requires an inspector or other employee at such establishment to label such material as "inspected and condemned."

Defines "covered entity," "nonambulatory livestock," and "humanely euthanize."

- **H.R.808 To establish a Department of Peace and Nonviolence.**

Introduced on February 5, 2007, by Dennis J. Kucinich (D-Ohio) and referred to House Committee on Oversight and Government Reform, and in addition to the Committees on Foreign Affairs, the Judiciary, and Education and Labor. This

act may be cited as the "Department of Peace and Nonviolence Act."

(b) Domestic Responsibilities- The Secretary shall... (4) develop policies to address violence against animals;

- **H.R.1006 To amend the provisions of law relating to the John H. Prescott Marine Mammal Rescue Assistance Grant Program, and for other purposes.**

Introduced on February 13, 2007, by Don Young (R-Alaska) and passed by the House on March 19. Received in the Senate and referred to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation. This act may be cited as the "Marine Mammal Rescue Assistance Amendments of 2007."

Amends the Marine Mammal Protection Act of 1972 to require the collection and updating of existing practices and procedures for rescuing and rehabilitating stranded or entangled (currently, only stranded) marine mammals. Authorizes entanglement response agreements.

- **H.R.1405 To establish a wildlife global animal information network for surveillance internationally to combat the growing threat of emerging diseases that involve wild animals, such as bird flu, and for other purposes.**

Introduced on March 8, 2007, by Rosa L. DeLauro (D-Connecticut) and referred to the Committee on Foreign Affairs, and in addition to the Committees on Energy and Commerce, Natural Resources, and Agriculture. On March 27, the Committee on Foreign Affairs ordered the bill to be reported in the nature of a substitute.

SEC. 3. PURPOSE.

The purpose of this Act is to establish a Wildlife Global Animal Information Network for Surveillance—

(1) to more rapidly and efficiently detect, verify, and report on the presence of infectious diseases, such as highly pathogenic avian influenza, in birds and other wildlife around the world;

(2) to use information on pathogens found during surveillance of wildlife to better delineate potential threats to domestic animals, humans, as well as wildlife itself;

(3) to use information on when and where HPAI and other pathogens of concern are identified in wildlife—(A) to better guide preparedness in the United States and around the world; and (B) to carry out a strategic wildlife health surveillance initiative that will provide regions, countries, and specific locations with early warning information that will help target resources toward enhancement of agribiosecurity, surveillance, public health vigilance, and related areas;

(4) to create an open access database within which information on HPAI and other pathogens of interest identified in wild birds and other wildlife can be shared as close to real time as possible;

(5) to protect the health and safety of United States citizens and officials traveling or living abroad; and

(6) to protect the economic interests of the United States and its partners from threats to health, agriculture, and natural resources, including wildlife itself.

- **H.R.1464 To assist in the conservation of rare felids and rare canids by supporting and providing financial resources for the**

conservation programs of nations within the range of rare felid and rare canid populations and projects of persons with demonstrated expertise in the conservation of rare felid and rare canid populations.

Introduced on March 9, 2007, by Tom Udall (D-New Mexico) and referred to the House Committee on Natural Resources' Subcommittee on Fisheries, Wildlife, and Oceans. This act may be cited as the "Great Cats and Rare Canids Act of 2007."

SEC. 2. FINDINGS.

Congress finds the following:

(1) Many wild populations of felids and canids, once considered common, are in decline, and many have declined to the point that their long-term survival in the wild is in serious jeopardy.

(2) Of the 37 wild felid species worldwide, all are currently recognized as species in need of protection under the IUCN Red List, the lists of species in CITES appendices I, II, and III, or the Endangered Species Act of 1973. Of the 35 wild canid species worldwide, nearly 50 percent are recognized as in need of such protection.

(3) In addition to their intrinsic value, felids and canids are important aesthetic, economic, and ecological global resources that need to be conserved.

(4) Large felids and canids are considered both umbrella and indicator species. Healthy populations of these species act as an important indicator of the integrity of entire ecosystems and, because they require large wild spaces to persist, benefit entire ecosystems and a large number of other species. Measures taken to benefit these keystone species will ultimately benefit a great number of other species.

(5) Rare felids and rare canids face an array of threats, including loss of habitat and natural prey, intentional and unintentional takings by humans, disease transmission, and a vast number of other threats. These threats need to be addressed in a coordinated fashion.

(6) Conservation of rare felid and rare canid populations requires global commitment. Adequate funding for conservation is sorely lacking, and many range countries for those species do not have adequate infrastructure to protect species of concern. Those countries that do provide assistance to threatened populations need further assistance in implementing effective conservation strategies.

(7) In particular, in developing nations with limited resources, poverty, population growth, and habitat loss all present significant challenges to conservation of rare felids and rare canids.

(8) Although some protections and initiatives exist to conserve rare felid and rare canid populations and their habitat, those efforts can be significantly strengthened and enhanced by increased coordination and the infusion of targeted funding to benefit species of concern.

SEC. 3. PURPOSES.

The purposes of this Act are to provide financial resources and to foster international cooperation—(1) to restore and perpetuate healthy populations of rare felids and rare canids in the wild; and (2) to assist in the conservation of rare felid and rare canid populations worldwide.

- **H.R.1691 To end the use of conventional steel-jawed leghold traps on animals in the United States.**

Introduced on March 26, 2007, by Nita M. Lowey (D-New York) and referred to the House Committee on Energy and

Commerce, and in addition to the Committees on Ways and Means, Foreign Affairs, and the Judiciary. This act may be cited as the "Inhumane Trapping Prevention Act."

SEC. 2. DECLARATION OF POLICY.

It is the policy of the United States to end the needless maiming and suffering inflicted upon animals through the use of conventional steel-jawed leghold traps by prohibiting the import or export of, and the shipment in interstate commerce of, such traps and of articles of fur from animals that were trapped in such traps.

SEC. 3. PROHIBITED ACTS AND PENALTIES.

(a) Prohibited Acts- It shall be unlawful for any person—

(1) to import, export, or transport in interstate commerce an article of fur, if any part or portion of such article is derived from an animal that was trapped in a conventional steel-jawed leghold trap; (2) to import, export, deliver, carry, or transport by any means whatever, in interstate commerce, any conventional steel-jawed leghold trap; (3) to sell, receive, acquire, or purchase any conventional steel-jawed leghold trap that was delivered, carried, or transported in violation of paragraph (2); or (4) to violate any rule made by the Secretary under this Act.

(b) Penalties- Whoever knowingly violates subsection (a) shall, in addition to any other penalty that may be imposed—(1) for the first such violation, be imprisoned for not more than 5 days or fined under title 18, United States Code, or both; and (2) for each subsequent violation, be imprisoned for not more than two years or fined under title 18, United States Code, or both.

Other provisions of the act relate to rewards for identification of violators, enforcement provisions, and definitions of terms used in the act.

- **H.R.1913 To assist in the conservation of great cats by supporting and providing financial resources for the conservation programs of nations within the range of great cats and projects of persons with demonstrated expertise in the conservation of great cats.**

Introduced on April 18, 2007, by Henry E. Brown Jr. (R-South Carolina) and referred to the House Committee on Natural Resources' Subcommittee on Fisheries, Wildlife, and Oceans. This act may be cited as the "Great Cats Conservation Act of 2007."

Related Bills: H.R.1464, S.1033

Defines "great cat" to mean any lion, leopard, jaguar, snow leopard, clouded leopard, cheetah, or Spanish lynx.

Establishes the Great Cats Conservation Fund as a separate account in the Multinational Species Conservation Fund. Directs the Secretary of the Interior to use amounts in such Fund to provide assistance for projects for the conservation of great cats. Authorizes the Secretary to convene an advisory group of individuals representing public and private organizations actively involved in the conservation of great cats.

- **H.R.2108 A bill to amend the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act with respect to the safety of food for humans and pets; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.**

Introduced on May 2, 2007, by Rosa L. DeLauro (D-Connecticut) and Referred to the House Committee on Energy and Commerce. This act may be cited as the "Human and Pet Food Safety Act of 2007." Related bill: S.1274,

S.AMDT.1022 [Editor's note: This amendment to S.1082, "An act to amend the Federal Food, Drug, and cosmetic Act and the Public Health Service Act to reauthorize drug and device user fees and ensure the safety of medical products, and for other purposes," was agreed to by the Senate on May 2; S.1082 was passed by the Senate on May 9 and sent to the House of Representatives. According to its sponsor, Senator Richard Durbin (D-Illinois), "[this] amendment establishes an early warning and notification system for human food, as well as pet food, establish fines for companies that don't promptly report contaminated products, improves inspections/monitoring of imports, and provides better, more uniform pet food safety standards. Durbin's amendment was accepted today as part of the FDA Reauthorization bill, S.1082.

"With the passage of this amendment, we will make our nation's food safety system stronger on several fronts. We have strengthened regulation of imported food; instituted a better record keeping, tracking and inspection process for human and pet food; put in place an early warning system when outbreaks of contaminated food occur; set uniform standards for pet food; and instituted fines for companies that fail to report problems," said Durbin. "There is more work to be done to fix our food safety system, but today we have moved forward to address the growing concerns across our nation."]

SEC. 5. SENSE OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

(a) Findings- Congress finds that—

(1) the safety and integrity of the United States food supply is vital to the public health, to public confidence in the food supply, and to the success of the food sector of the Nation's economy;

(2) illnesses and deaths of individuals and companion pets caused by contaminated food—

(A) have contributed to a loss of public confidence in food safety; and

(B) have caused significant economic losses to manufacturers and producers not responsible for contaminated food items;

(3) the task of preserving the safety of the food supply of the United States faces tremendous pressures with regard to—

(A) emerging pathogens and other contaminants and the ability to detect all forms of contamination; and

(B) an increasing volume of imported food, without adequate monitoring and inspection;

(4) the United States is increasing the amount of food that it imports such that—

(A) from 2003 to the present, the value of food imports has increased from \$45,600,000,000 to \$64,000,000,000; and

(B) imported food accounts for 13 percent of the average Americans diet, including 31 percent of fruits, juices, and nuts, 9.5 percent of red meat, and 78.6 percent of fish and shellfish; and

(5) the number of full-time equivalent Food and Drug Administration employees conducting inspections has decreased during the period between 2003 and 2007.

(b) Sense of the House of Representatives- It is the sense of the House of Representatives that— (1) it is vital for Congress to provide the Food and Drug Administration with additional resources, authorities, and direction with respect to ensuring the safety of the food supply of the United States;

(2) additional Food and Drug Administration inspectors are required if we are to improve Food and Drug Administration's ability to safeguard the food supply of the United States; and

(3) because of the increasing volume of international trade in food products the Secretary of Health and Human Services should make it a priority to enter into agreements, including

memoranda of understanding, with the trading partners of the United States with respect to food safety.

• **H.R.2193 To amend the Animal Welfare Act to increase the penalties for violations of such Act, to prohibit the use of animals for marketing medical devices, and for other purposes.**

Introduced on May 7, 2007, by Steve Israel (D-New York) and referred to the House Committee on Agriculture. This act may be cited as the "Animal Protection Accountability Improvement Act."

"SEC. 2. PROHIBITION ON USE OF ANIMALS FOR MARKETING OF MEDICAL DEVICES.

The Animal Welfare Act (7 U.S.C. 2131 et seq.) is amended by inserting after section 17 the following new section:

PROHIBITION ON USE OF LIVE ANIMALS FOR MARKETING MEDICAL DEVICES

Sec. 18. (a) In General- No person may use a live animal to—(1) demonstrate a medical device or product to a sales representative for the purpose of marketing such medical device or product; (2) train a sales representative to use a medical device or product; (3) demonstrate a medical device or product in a workshop or training session for the purpose of marketing a medical device or product; or (4) create a multimedia recording (including a video recording) for the purpose of marketing a medical device or product.

(b) Exception- Subsection (a) shall not apply to the training of medical personnel for a purpose other than marketing a medical device or product.

(c) Device Defined- In this section, the term "device" has the meaning given the term in section 201(h) of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act (21 U.S.C. 321(h)).

SEC. 3. FINES FOR VIOLATIONS OF THE ANIMAL WELFARE ACT.

Section 19(b) of the Animal Welfare Act (7 U.S.C. 2149(b)) is amended—(1) in the first sentence by striking "not more than \$2,500 for each such violation" and inserting "not more than \$10,000 for each such violation"; and (2) by striking the second sentence and inserting the following: "Each violation, each day during which a violation continues, and, in the case of a violation with respect to animals, each animal that is the subject of such a violation shall be a separate offense."

SEC. 4. REPORTS ON ACTIVITIES UNDER THE ANIMAL WELFARE ACT.

The Animal Welfare Act (7 U.S.C. 2131 et seq.) is further amended by striking section 25 and inserting the following new section:

ANNUAL REPORT

Sec. 25. Not later than March 1 of each year, the Secretary shall submit to Congress a report containing—(1) an identification of all research facilities, exhibitors, and other persons and establishments licensed by the Secretary under section 3 and section 12; (2) an identification of all research facilities, intermediate handlers, carriers, and exhibitors registered under section 6; (3) the nature and place of all investigations and inspections conducted by the Secretary under section 16, and all reports received by the Secretary under section 13; (4) recommendations for legislation to improve the administration of this Act or any provisions of this Act; and (5) recommendations and conclusions concerning the aircraft environment as it relates to the carriage of live animals in air transportation."

- **H.R.2491 To amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to treat charitable remainder pet trusts in a manner similar to charitable remainder annuity trusts.**

Introduced on May 24, 2007, by Earl Blumenauer (D-Oregon) and referred to the House Committee on Ways and Means.

From introductory remarks by Representative Blumenauer in the Congressional Record: "Representative Ramstad and I are introducing legislation that revises the Internal Revenue Code to treat pet trusts in a similar manner as charitable remainder annuity trusts, CRATs. It will allow estates and donors with CRATs with a pet, or its guardian as a beneficiary, to receive a charitable deduction for the remainder interest when the trust is established. The bill provides a tax incentive for people to arrange for long-term care of their pets, which will result in a reduction of society's burden in caring for "unwanted" dogs and cats after the guardian dies.

Currently 39 States and the District of Columbia allow pet trusts, which is a specific legal arrangement providing for the care of companion animals in the event of the guardian's death or incapacitation. When the pet passes, the remainder of the trust is then distributed to one or more pre-designated charities. Recognition of these trusts by the Federal Tax Code will allow for long-term planning of care for pets, as well as encourage people to engage in charitable giving. The legislation bears no cost burden for the Federal Government and brings relief to animal lovers and shelters alike."

- **S.261 A bill to amend title 18, United States Code, to strengthen prohibitions against animal fighting, and for other purposes.**

Introduced on January 11, 2007, by Maria Cantwell (D-Washington) and referred to the Senate Committee on the Judiciary. On March 26, it was reported out of committee with an amendment and placed on the Senate Legislative Calendar under General Orders. On June 13, it was indefinitely postponed by the Senate by Unanimous Consent. For further action, see H.R.137, which became Public Law 110-22 on May 3. This act may be cited as the "Animal Fighting Prohibition Enforcement Act."

From the floor statement of Senator Cantwell in introducing the legislation: "The Animal Fighting Prohibition Enforcement Act will strengthen current law by making the interstate transport of animals for the purpose of fighting a felony and increase the punishment to three years of jail time. This is necessary because the current misdemeanor penalty has proven ineffective—considered a "cost of doing business" by those in the animal fighting industry which continues unabated nationwide. These enterprises depend on interstate commerce, as I evidenced by the animal fighting magazines that advertise and promote them.

Our bill also makes it a felony to move cockfighting implements in interstate or foreign commerce. These are razor-sharp knives known as "slashers" and ice pick-like gaffs designed exclusively for cockfights and attached to the birds' legs for fighting. Cockfighting magazines and websites contain hundreds of advertisements for mail-order knives and gaffs, revealing a thriving interstate market for the weapons used in cockfights.

...The U.S. Department of Agriculture (USDA), in endorsing the Animal Fighting Prohibition Enforcement Act, noted that strengthening current Federal law on the inhumane prac-

tice of animal fighting would enhance the agency's ability to safeguard the health of U.S. poultry against deadly diseases such as avian influenza and exotic Newcastle disease (END). The USDA has stated that cockfighting was implicated in an outbreak of END that spread through California and the Southwest in 2002 and 2003. That outbreak cost U.S. taxpayers nearly \$200 million to eradicate and cost the U.S. poultry industry many millions more in lost export markets. The costs of an avian influenza outbreak in this country could be much higher—with the Congressional Budget Office estimating losses between 1.5 and 5 percent of GDP (\$185 billion to \$618 billion)."

- **S.272 A bill to amend Public Law 87-383 to reauthorize appropriations to promote the conservation of migratory waterfowl and to offset or prevent the serious loss of important wetland and other waterfowl habitat essential to the preservation of migratory waterfowl, and for other purposes.**

Introduced on January 11, 2007, by Norm Coleman (R-Minnesota) and referred to the Senate Committee on Environment and Public Works.

The first section of Public Law 87-383 (16 U.S.C. 715k-3) is amended—

(1) by striking "That in" and inserting the following:
SECTION 1. AUTHORIZATION OF FUNDS FOR CONSERVATION OF MIGRATORY WATERFOWL HABITAT.

(a) In General.—In";

(2) by striking "for the period" and all that follows through the end of the sentence and inserting "\$400,000,000 for the period of fiscal years 2008 through 2017."; and (3) by adding at the end the following:

"(b) Advance to Migratory Bird Conservation Fund.—Funds appropriated pursuant to this Act shall be treated as an advance, without interest, to the Migratory Bird Conservation Fund.

"(c) Repayment to Treasury.—(1) IN GENERAL.—Effective beginning July 1, 2008, funds appropriated pursuant to this Act shall be repaid to the Treasury out of the Migratory Bird Conservation Fund. (2) AMOUNTS.—Repayment under this subsection shall be made in annual amounts that are equal to the funds accruing annually to the Migratory Bird Conservation Fund that are attributable to the portion of the price of migratory bird hunting stamps sold that year that is in excess of \$15 per stamp."

SEC. 2. SENSE OF CONGRESS REGARDING THE USE OF CERTAIN FUNDS.

It is the sense of Congress that—

(1) the funds provided pursuant to the amendments made by this Act—(A) should be used for preserving and increasing waterfowl populations in accordance with the goals and objectives of the North American Waterfowl Management Plan; and (B) to that end, should be used to supplement and not replace current conservation funding, including funding for other Federal and State habitat conservation programs; and

(2) this Act and the amendments made by this Act should be implemented in a manner that helps private landowners achieve long-term land use objectives in a manner that enhances the conservation of wetland and wildlife habitat.

- **S.540 A bill to require the Food and Drug Administration to permit the sale of baby turtles as pets so long as the seller uses proven methods to effectively treat salmonella.**

Introduced on February 8, 2007, by David Vitter (R-Louisiana) and referred to the Senate Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry. This act may be cited as the "Domestic Pet Turtle Market Access Act of 2007." Related Bills: H.R.924

Prohibits the Food and Drug Administration (FDA) from restricting the sale by a turtle farmer or other commercial retail seller of a turtle that is less than 10.2 centimeters in diameter as a pet if: (1) the turtle is raised, shipped, and sold using methods proven to keep the turtle free of salmonella, using salmonella safety standards comparable to standards for other animals allowed for sale as pets or animal products allowed for sale as food products; (2) the FDA has approved a plan submitted by the turtle farmer or seller relating to compliance with this Act; and (3) the farmer or seller makes certain disclosures to the buyer. Sets forth required disclosures, which include: (1) information regarding the dangers that could result if the turtle is not properly handled and safely maintained, the proper handling of the turtle, and the proven methods of treatment that keep the turtle safe from salmonella; (2) a detailed explanation of how to properly treat the turtle to keep it safe from salmonella; and (3) a statement that buyers of pet turtles should not abandon the turtle or abandon it outside, but should instead return them to a commercial retail pet seller or other organization that would accept turtles no longer wanted as pets.

Requires the turtle farmer or seller to submit a plan to the FDA that includes use of non-antibiotic compounds that suppress or eliminate the presence of salmonella in turtle hatchlings. Directs the FDA to accept or reject such a plan within 30 days.

- **S.549 A bill to amend the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act to preserve the effectiveness of medically important antibiotics used in the treatment of human and animal diseases.**

Introduced on February 12, 2007, by Edward M. Kennedy (D-Massachusetts) and referred to the Senate Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions. This act may be cited as the "Preservation of Antibiotics for Medical Treatment Act of 2007." Related Bills: H.R.962

Amends the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act to require the Secretary of Health and Human Services to deny an application for a new animal drug that is a critical antimicrobial animal drug unless the applicant demonstrates that there is a reasonable certainty of no harm to human health due to the development of antimicrobial resistance attributable to the nontherapeutic use of the drug. Defines "critical antimicrobial animal drug" as a drug intended for use in food-producing animals that contains specified antibiotics or other drugs used in humans to treat or prevent disease or infection caused by microorganisms.

Requires the Secretary of Health and Human Services to withdraw approval of a nontherapeutic use of such drugs in food-producing animals two years after the date of enactment of this Act unless certain safety requirements are met.

Authorizes the Secretary of Agriculture to make payments to livestock or poultry producers to defray the costs of reducing

the use of such drugs, with priority given to family-owned or small farms and ranches.

Amends the Farm Security and Rural Investment Act of 2002 to direct the Secretary of Agriculture to award grants to colleges and universities to establish programs to phase out the nontherapeutic use of such drugs in livestock or poultry.

Requires the manufacturer of such a drug or an animal feed for food-producing animals containing such a drug to report sales information to the Secretary of Health and Human Services.

- **S.714 A bill to amend the Animal Welfare Act to ensure that all dogs and cats used by research facilities are obtained legally.**

Introduced on February 28, 2007, by Daniel K. Akaka (D-Hawaii) and referred to Senate Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry. This act may be cited as the "Pet Safety and Protection Act of 2007." Related Bills: H.R.1280

Amends the Animal Welfare Act to list permissible sources of dogs and cats used by research facilities to include dogs and cats obtained: (1) from a licensed dealer; (2) from a publicly owned and operated pound or shelter that meets specified requirements; (3) by donation from a person who bred and raised the dog or cat and owned it for not less than one year; or (4) from a research facility licensed by the Secretary of Agriculture. Sets forth additional monetary penalties for related violations.

Prohibits federal facilities from purchasing or otherwise acquiring dogs or cats for exhibition purposes except from: (1) the operator of an auction that comports with legal requirements; or (2) a person holding a valid dealer or exhibitor license.

Prohibits dealers from selling or otherwise providing a research facility with random source dogs or cats unless specified certification requirements are met.

- **S.1498 A bill to amend the Lacey Act Amendments of 1981 to prohibit the import, export, transportation, sale, receipt, acquisition, or purchase in interstate or foreign commerce of any live animal of any prohibited wildlife species, and for other purposes.**

Introduced on May 24, 2007, by Barbara Boxer (D-California) and referred to the Committee on Environment and Public Works. This act may be cited as the "Captive Primate Safety Act."

From introductory remarks by Senator Boxer in the Congressional Record: "This bipartisan bill amends the Lacey Act to prohibit transporting monkeys, great apes, lemurs, and other nonhuman primates across State lines for the pet trade, much like the Captive Wildlife Safety Act, which passed unanimously in 2003, did for tigers and other big cats.

This bill has no impact on trade or transportation of animals for zoos, medical and other licensed research facilities, or certain other licensed and regulated entities. The prohibitions in the Lacey Act only apply to the pet trade.

I am proud that this legislation is supported by the Humane Society of the United States, the American Zoo and Aquarium Association, the American Veterinary Medical Association, Defenders of Wildlife and the Wildlife Conservation Society and many other organizations."

- **S.RES. 115 A resolution urging the Government of Canada to end the commercial seal hunt.**

Introduced on March 21, 2007, by Carl Levin (D-Michigan) and referred to the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations.

RESOLUTION

Urging the Government of Canada to end the commercial seal hunt.

Whereas on November 15, 2006, the Government of Canada opened a commercial hunt for seals in the waters off the east coast of Canada;

Whereas an international outcry regarding the plight of the seals hunted in Canada resulted in the 1983 ban by the European Union of whitecoat and blueback seal skins and the subsequent collapse of the commercial seal hunt in Canada;

Whereas the Marine Mammal Protection Act of 1972 (16 U.S.C. 1361 et seq.) bars the import into the United States of any seal products;

Whereas in February 2003, the Ministry of Fisheries and Oceans in Canada authorized the highest quota for harp seals in Canadian history, allowing nearly 1,000,000 seals to be killed over a 3-year period;

Whereas more than 1,000,000 seals have been killed over the past 3 years;

Whereas harp seal pups can be legally hunted in Canada as soon as they have begun to molt their white coats at approximately 12 days of age;

Whereas 95 percent of the seals killed over the past 5 years were pups between just 12 days and 12 weeks of age, many of which had not yet eaten their first solid meal or taken their first swim;

Whereas a report by an independent team of veterinarians invited to observe the hunt by the International Fund for Animal Welfare concluded that the seal hunt failed to comply with basic animal welfare regulations in Canada and that governmental regulations regarding humane killing were not being respected or enforced;

Whereas the veterinary report concluded that as many as 42 percent of the seals studied were likely skinned while alive and conscious;

Whereas the commercial slaughter of seals in the Northwest Atlantic is inherently cruel, whether the killing is conducted by clubbing or by shooting;

Whereas many seals are shot in the course of the hunt, but escape beneath the ice where they die slowly and are never recovered, and these seals are not counted in official kill statistics, making the actual kill level far higher than the level that is reported;

Whereas the commercial hunt for harp and hooded seals is a commercial slaughter carried out almost entirely by non-Native people from the East Coast of Canada for seal fur, oil, and penises (used as aphrodisiacs in some Asian markets);

Whereas the fishing and sealing industries in Canada continue to justify the expanded seal hunt on the grounds that the seals in the Northwest Atlantic are preventing the recovery of cod stocks, despite the lack of any credible scientific evidence to support this claim;

Whereas 2 Canadian government marine scientists reported in 1994 that the true cause of cod depletion in the North Atlantic was over-fishing, and the consensus among the international scientific community is that seals are not responsible for the collapse of cod stocks;

Whereas harp and hooded seals are a vital part of the complex ecosystem of the Northwest Atlantic, and because the

seals consume predators of commercial cod stocks, removing the seals might actually inhibit recovery of cod stocks;

Whereas certain ministries of the Government of Canada have stated clearly that there is no evidence that killing seals will help groundfish stocks to recover; and

Whereas the persistence of this cruel and needless commercial hunt is inconsistent with the well-earned international reputation of Canada: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate urges the Government of Canada to end the commercial hunt on seals that opened in the waters off the east coast of Canada on November 15, 2006.

From the 109th Congress

[Editor's Note: With the completion of the 109th Congress, all legislation introduced in that Congress that did not become Public Law expires.]

- **H.R.3858 To amend the Robert T. Stafford Disaster Relief and Emergency Assistance Act to ensure that State and local emergency preparedness operational plans address the needs of individuals with household pets and service animals following a major disaster or emergency.**

Introduced on September 22, 2005, by Tom Lantos (D-California) and signed by the President on October 6, 2006. Became Public Law No: 109-308. This act may be cited as the "Pets Evacuation and Transportation Standards Act of 2006." Related Bills: S.2548

Amends the Robert T. Stafford Disaster Relief and Emergency Assistance Act to require the Director of the Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) to ensure that state and local emergency preparedness operational plans address the needs of individuals with household pets and service animals prior to, during, and following a major disaster or emergency.

Authorizes the Director to: (1) study and develop plans that take into account the needs of individuals with pets and service animals prior to, during, and following a major disaster or emergency; and (2) make financial contributions, on the basis of programs or projects approved by the Director, to the states and local authorities for animal emergency preparedness purposes, including the procurement, construction, leasing, or renovating of emergency shelter facilities and materials that will accommodate people with pets and service animals.

Authorizes federal agencies to provide, as assistance essential to meeting threats to life and property resulting from a major disaster, rescue, care, shelter, and essential needs to individuals with household pets and service animals and to such pets and animals.

- **H.R.4075 To amend the Marine Mammal Protection Act of 1972 to provide for better understanding and protection of marine mammals, and for other purposes.**

Introduced on October 18, 2005, by Richard W. Pombo (R-California) and passed by the House on July 17, 2006. On August 4, it was referred to the Senate Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation. This act may be cited as

the "Marine Mammal Protection Act Amendments of 2006." Related Bills: H.R.2130, H.R.5946.

(Sec. 4) Amends the Marine Mammal Protection Act of 1972 (the Act) to grant limited authority for a marine mammal product to be exported from the United States for noncommercial and cultural purposes, including export by an Indian, Aleut, or Eskimo residing in Alaska as part of a cultural exchange.

(Sec. 5) Makes it unlawful for anyone under U.S. jurisdiction to release any captive marine mammal unless specifically authorized under the Act.

(Sec. 7) Revises requirements for the export of a marine mammal for purposes of public display, scientific research, or enhancing the survival or recovery of a species or stock. Prohibits the relevant Secretary (Secretary of the department in which the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration (NOAA) is operating, the Secretary of the Interior, or the Secretary of Commerce) from requiring or requesting, through comity or any other means, that a marine mammal or its progeny remain subject to U.S. jurisdiction when located in waters or on lands subject to the jurisdiction of another country.

Requires the relevant Secretary to establish and maintain, and update annually, an inventory of all marine mammals possessed pursuant to a permit that are held within U.S. lands and waters. Requires a review of the inventory and the relevant Secretary to report to Congress on the findings of such review.

Revises certain notification requirements to require that the relevant Secretary be notified only of the transport of a marine mammal for purposes of public display in cases where the transfer is between facilities where the ownership and care of the marine mammal will be under the same license or registration issued under the Animal Welfare Act. (Eliminates the requirement for the Secretary to receive notice in advance of the transport in such cases.)

(Sec. 8) Increases civil fines and criminal penalties, including vessel penalties for violations of the Act.

(Sec. 9) Requires: (1) the relevant Secretary to include the results of research under the marine mammal research grant program in a certain annual report; and (2) the head of each federal agency that conducts and provides funds for marine mammal research to report annually to Congress on such research.

(Sec. 10) Directs the Secretary of Commerce (currently, the Secretary of the department in which the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration is operating) to carry out a fishing gear development program to devise fishing gear and methods that reduce the incidental taking of marine mammals during fishing. Authorizes the Secretary to establish a gear improvement mini-grant program for the development of such fishing gear.

(Sec. 12) Applies provisions concerning the incidental taking of marine mammals to all fishing operations (currently, only commercial fishing). Requires take reduction plans to track the number of animals from strategic stocks being incidentally lethally taken or seriously injured each year through recreational fishing (in addition to commercial fishing), and to publish proposals for reducing such incidents within a strategic stock under certain conditions. Extends the deadline goal of a plan for the reduction of mortality or serious injury of marine mammals taken incidentally in the course of commercial or recreational fishing.

(Sec. 13) Requires the relevant Secretary to conduct a program on the nonlethal removal and control of nuisance pinnipeds, including the development of new technologies to deter nuisance pinnipeds. Requires an annual report from the relevant Secretary to Congress on marine mammal research re-

sults used in developing and conducting such program. Authorizes the Secretary to provide a grant to an eligible applicant to carry out a qualified nonlethal control project.

(Sec. 14) Repeals the requirement that the Marine Mammal Commission employ a minimum of 11 employees at any time.

(Sec. 15) Directs the relevant Secretary to collect and update existing practices and procedures for rescuing and rehabilitating entangled (currently, only stranded) marine mammals (having gear, rope, line, or net wrapped around it). Authorizes the relevant Secretary to enter into entanglement response agreements.

Extends through FY2010 the authorization of appropriations for the John H. Prescott Marine Mammal Rescue Assistance Grant Program and the Marine Mammal Unusual Mortality Event Fund for stranding or entanglement response. Authorizes the relevant Secretary to enter into cooperative agreements, contracts, or other agreements or arrangements to address stranding events requiring emergency assistance.

(Sec. 16) Renews the scrimshaw exemption (allowing the processing and sale of pre-Endangered Species Act ivory) for the 11-year period beginning October 31, 1999.

(Sec. 17) Makes it unlawful for a person subject to U.S. jurisdiction to take, import, export, possess, transport, or sell any polar bear or polar bear products in violation of the Agreement Between the Government of the United States of America and the Government of the Russian Federation on the Conservation and Management of the Alaska-Chukotka Polar Bear Population (Agreement) or any annual taking limit or other restriction adopted by the U.S.-Russia Polar Bear Commission. Authorizes a government official to import a polar bear or a polar bear product for purposes of forensic testing or any other law enforcement purpose.

Requires the Secretary of the Interior to administer and enforce the Agreement on behalf of the United States. Authorizes the Secretary of the Interior to share authority for the management of the taking of polar bears for subsistence purposes with the Alaska Nanuuq Commission.

Sets forth requirements for designation and appointment of U.S. members on the U.S.-Russia Polar Bear Commission.

Requires the Secretary of the Interior to take all appropriate actions to implement the decisions and determinations of the U.S.-Russia Polar Bear Commission.

Authorizes appropriations for FY2007-FY2010.

- **H.R.4764 To amend section 1368 of title 18, United States Code, to include rescue dogs in its protection.**

Introduced February 15, 2006, by Rob Simmons (R-Connecticut) and referred to the House Committee on the Judiciary and the Subcommittee on Crime, Terrorism, and Homeland Security. This act may be cited as the "Canine Volunteer Protection Act of 2006."

Amends the federal criminal code to modify the definition of "police animal" for purposes of the prohibition against harming certain animals (i.e., dogs and horses) used in law enforcement to include animals employed or commissioned for search and rescue missions.

- **H.R.5089 To enable the Great Lakes Fishery Commission to investigate effects of migratory birds on sustained productivity**

of stocks of fish of common concern in the Great Lakes.

Introduced on April 4, 2006, by Bart Stupak (D-Michigan) and referred to the House Committee on Resources' Subcommittee on Fisheries and Oceans. This act may be cited as the "Great Lakes Migratory Bird Research and Management Act." Related Bills: S.3605

Amends the Great Lakes Fishery Act of 1956 to authorize the Great Lakes Fishery Commission to carry out activities relating to the investigation of migratory bird depredation on commercial and sport fisheries in the Great Lakes.

Amends the Migratory Bird Treaty Act to require the Secretary of the Interior to issue permits to cooperating state, Provincial, Tribal, First Nation, and U.S. and Canadian federal agencies with migratory bird management authority, and signatory to a Memorandum of Understanding with the Great Lakes Fishery Commission, to manage and take migratory birds, for the purpose of control of depredation by such birds on commercial and sport fisheries in the Great Lakes.

- **H.R.5145 To authorize the National War Dogs Monument, Inc. to establish a national monument in honor of military working dog teams.**

Introduced on April 6, 2006, by Walter B. Jones, Jr. (R-North Carolina) and referred to the House Committee on Resources. On April 19, Executive Comment was requested from [the Secretary of the] Interior and the bill was referred to the Subcommittee on National Parks, Recreation and Public Lands. Subcommittee hearings were held on May 28.

Authorizes the National War Dogs Monument, Inc. to establish in the District of Columbia a monument to honor the sacrifice and service of United States Armed Forces working dog teams.

- **H.R.5229 To amend the Animal Welfare Act to ensure that all dogs and cats used by research facilities are obtained legally.**

Introduced on April 27, 2006, by Phil English (R-Pennsylvania) and referred to the House Committee on Agriculture. This act may be cited as the "Pet Safety and Protection Act of 2005."

Amends the Animal Welfare Act to list permissible sources of dogs and cats used by research facilities to include dogs and cats obtained: (1) from a licensed dealer; (2) from a publicly owned and operated pound or shelter that meets specified requirements; (3) by donation from a person who bred and raised the dog or cat and owned it for not less than one year; or (4) from a research facility licensed by the Secretary of Agriculture. Sets forth additional monetary penalties for related violations.

Revises provisions to prohibit federal facilities from purchasing or otherwise acquiring dogs or cats for exhibition purposes except from: (1) the operator of an auction that comports with legal requirements; or (2) a person holding a valid dealer or exhibitor license.

Revises provisions to prohibit dealers from selling or otherwise providing a research facility with random source dogs or cats unless specified certification requirements are met.

- **H.R.5351 To amend Homeland Security Act of 2002 to establish a Directorate of Emergency**

Management, to codify certain existing functions of the Department of Homeland Security, and for other purposes.

Introduced on May 11, 2006, by David G. Reichert (R-Washington) and referred to the House Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure and, in addition, to the Committees on Homeland Security, and Energy and Commerce. Reported out of Homeland Security with amendments on November 9. This act may be cited as the "National Emergency Management Reform and Enhancement Act of 2006."

SEC. 524. CATASTROPHIC PLANNING.

(a) Catastrophic Emergency Plans Required- The Secretary [of Homeland Security], acting through the Assistant Secretary for Grants and Planning and in consultation with the Assistant Secretary for Training and Exercises, shall require any State or urban area that submits an application to the Secretary for Federal homeland security financial assistance administered by the Department to maintain a catastrophic emergency plan to be implemented in the event of an act of terrorism, natural disaster, or other emergency. The Secretary shall require the State or urban area to update, implement, and exercise the catastrophic emergency plan as necessary.

(b) Requirements- Each catastrophic emergency plan required under this section, with respect to a State or urban area, shall include—(1) evacuation and sheltering in place procedures for the general population of the State or urban area; (2) the procedures in place to address the pre-positioning of food, medical and fuel supplies; (3) the evacuation and sheltering in place procedures for populations with special needs, including persons with disabilities, health problems, language barriers, and income barriers, the elderly, children, and individuals with pets, service animals, or farm animals;...(14) search and rescue procedures for populations with special needs, including persons with disabilities, health problems, language barriers, and income barriers, the elderly, children, and individuals with pets, service animals, or farm animals.

- **H.R.5557 To promote the humane treatment of farm animals.**

Introduced on June 8, 2006, by Christopher Shays (R-Connecticut) and referred to the House Committee on Agriculture's Subcommittee on Livestock and Horticulture and the House Committee on Government Reform. This act may be cited as the "Farm Animal Stewardship Purchasing Act."

Prohibits the federal government from purchasing any product derived from a covered animal used or intended for use as food or fiber or to produce food or fiber unless the animal is raised with: (1) adequate shelter which allows the animal to stand, lie down, walk, and turn around completely and fully extend all limbs or wings without touching any part of an enclosure; (2) daily access to adequate food and water; and (3) adequate veterinary care.

States that this Act shall apply to a covered animal: (1) during lawful transport; (2) in lawful rodeo exhibitions, state or county fair exhibitions, or other similar exhibitions; (3) in lawful scientific or agricultural research; or (4) undergoing veterinary care.

Defines "covered animal" as any non-aquatic farm animal, including a pig, head of cattle, chicken, turkey, duck,

goose, goat, horse, mule, sheep, rabbit, ostrich, emu, or rhea.

- **H.R.5798 To amend the Public Health Service Act to modify the program for the sanctuary system for surplus chimpanzees by terminating the authority for the removal of chimpanzees from the system for research purposes.**

Introduced on July 13, 2006, by Jim McCrery (R-Louisiana) and passed by the House on December 6.

Amends the Public Health Service Act to repeal provisions providing for the removal of surplus chimpanzees from a sanctuary facility. Prohibits use of such chimpanzees for research except for noninvasive behavioral studies.

- **H.R.5909 To promote public safety and improve the welfare of captive big cats, and for other purposes.**

Introduced on July 26, 2006, by Jim Ryun (R-Kansas) and referred to the House Committee on Agriculture's Subcommittee on Livestock and Horticulture. This act may be cited as "Haley's Act."

Amends the Animal Welfare Act to: (1) define the term "big cat" to mean any live species of lion, tiger, leopard, cheetah, jaguar, or cougar or any hybrid of such species; (2) allow the Secretary of Agriculture to deny or revoke licenses to animal dealers and exhibitors based on recommendations from state or local officials with jurisdiction over captive wildlife; (3) require the Secretary to include in standards that govern the humane handling, care, treatment, and transportation of animals by dealers, research facilities, and exhibitors a minimum requirement to provide for public safety; (4) increase civil and criminal penalties for violations of such Act; (5) prohibit a licensed exhibitor or dealer from allowing direct contact between a big cat and a member of the public, with an exception for zoos; and (6) prohibit the Secretary from granting a license to a dealer or exhibitor of a big cat until the Secretary has issued regulations to implement this Act.

- **H.R.5946 To amend the Magnuson-Stevens Fishery Conservation and Management Act to authorize activities to promote improved monitoring and compliance for high seas fisheries, or fisheries governed by international fishery management agreements, and for other purposes.**

Introduced on July 27, 2006, by Richard W. Pombo (R-California). On January 12, 2007, it became Public Law 109-479. This act may be cited as the "United States-Russia Polar Bear Conservation and Management Act of 2006."

Related Bills: H.R.1674, H.R.4075, H.R.6119, S.CON.RES.123, S.2012

Title IX: Polar Bears - United States-Russia Polar Bear Conservation and Management Act of 2006 - (Sec. 902)
Amends the Marine Mammal Protection Act of 1972 to make it unlawful for a person subject to, or in waters or on lands under, U.S. jurisdiction to take, import, export, possess, transport, or sell any polar bear or polar bear products in violation of the Agreement Between the Government of the United States of America and the Government of the Russian Federation on the

Conservation and Management of the Alaska-Chukotka Polar Bear Population (Agreement) or any annual taking limit or other restriction adopted by the U.S.-Russia Polar Bear Commission. Authorizes a government official to import a polar bear or a polar bear product for purposes of forensic testing or any other law enforcement purpose.

Requires the Secretary of the Interior to administer and enforce the Agreement on behalf of the United States. Authorizes the Secretary of the Interior to share authority for the management of the taking of polar bears for subsistence purposes with the Alaska Nanuuq Commission.

Subjects to seizure and forfeiture any polar bear or any part or product of a polar bear taken, imported, exported, possessed, transported, sold, received, acquired, purchased, exchanged, or bartered, or offered for sale or exchange in violation of this title without any showing that may be required for assessment of a civil penalty or for criminal prosecution.

Sets forth requirements for designation and appointment of U.S. members on the U.S.-Russia Polar Bear Commission.

Requires the Secretary of the Interior to take all necessary actions to implement the decisions and determinations of the U.S.-Russia Polar Bear Commission.

Authorizes appropriations for FY2006-FY2010.

- **H.R.6042 To amend the Animal Health Protection Act to prohibit the Secretary of Agriculture from implementing or carrying out a National Animal Identification System or similar requirement and to require the Secretary to protect information obtained as part of any voluntary animal identification system.**

Introduced on September 7, 2006, by JoAnn Emerson (R-Missouri) and referred to the House Committee on Agriculture's Subcommittee on Livestock and Horticulture. Related Bills: S.3862

Amends the Animal Health Protection Act to prohibit the Secretary of Agriculture from implementing or carrying out (and prohibits use of federal funds to implement or carry out) a National Animal Identification System or similar requirement that mandates the participation of livestock owners.

Sets forth requirements governing disclosure of information obtained through a voluntary animal identification system established by the Secretary to identify and trace animals.

- **H.R.6086 To amend the Homeland Security Act to provide for the health of Americans by implementing a system that detects and identifies in a timely manner diseases, conditions, and events that represent a threat to humans, animals, food production and the water supply.**

Introduced on September 14, 2006, by Lee Terry (R-Nebraska) and referred to the House Committee on Energy and Commerce's Subcommittee on Health. This act may be cited as the "National Reportable Conditions Act." Related Bills: S.3898

Amends the Homeland Security Act of 2002 to establish the Commission on National Reportable Conditions to review state and local regulations to determine the existence of conditions that represent a serious threat to the health of individuals in the United States, compile a list of national reportable conditions to be recommended for certifications, and advise the Secretary.

Directs the Secretary of Homeland Security, based upon the Commission's recommendations, to: (1) annually certify a list of national reportable conditions (i.e., diseases, conditions, and events that when identified by health practitioners, veterinarians, animal and food production specialists, state and local health professionals, environmental and public utility workers, and laboratory workers must be reported to the Department of Homeland Security (DHS)); (2) establish an electronic National Reportable Conditions System, a data repository of records processed by the System, a process to enable commercial entities to transmit reports to a single government entity, and a process for the identification of obstacles or challenges to the achievement of the purposes of this Act (including a research program to identify or create solutions); and (3) award grants to state and local entities to enable them to conduct surveillance and timely reporting activities regarding the submission of reports.

Requires the Secretary to establish a process that permits the simultaneous submission of reports to a state or local jurisdiction to achieve compliance with a state or local law.

- **H. RES. 1013 Encouraging municipalities to adopt and enforce effective protections against dog bites, and for other purposes.**

Introduced on September 16, 2006, by Thaddeus G. McCotter (R-Michigan) and referred to the House Committee on Agriculture and, on September 19 to the Subcommittee on Livestock and Horticulture.

RESOLUTION

Whereas the Congress has sought to protect the public from all safety hazards including dangerous dogs;

Whereas there are over 74,000,000 owned dogs in the United States;

Whereas the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention concluded dogs bite nearly 2 percent of the United States population (more than 4,700,000 people annually) and 800,000 bites per year are serious enough to require medical attention;

Whereas over 3,000 United States Postal Service mail carriers are bitten by dogs each year, along with an unknown number of meter readers, police officers, and other door-to-door professionals who have regular exposure to numerous dogs;

Whereas the average cost of a dog bite (or other attack) resulting in a claim for medical treatment equals \$336;

Whereas the Centers for Disease Control determined that over 70 percent of dogs involved in attacks are unneutered males;

Whereas the Centers for Disease Control, the United States Department of Agriculture, and the American Veterinary Medical Association have all determined the chaining or tethering of dogs continuously is an inhumane practice and creates dogs who are at significantly greater risk to bite;

Whereas communities across the country provide subsidized pet sterilization services; and

Whereas communities across the country have enacted legislation that bans or restricts the practice of chaining dogs for the purpose of addressing dog bites and dangerous dogs:

Now, therefore, be it Resolved, That it is the sense of the House of Representatives that—

(1) dog bites and dangerous dogs are issues which must be addressed by each community for the sake of community safety and, when addressing these issues, municipalities should consider the many factors contributing to a dog's temperament and enact model programs and legislation addressing these multiple factors; and (2) dogs who are continuously chained, and male dogs who have not been neutered, are more likely to pose a threat and, therefore, these factors should be a priority for communities addressing dog bite and dangerous dog issues.

- **S.3880 A bill to provide the Department of Justice the necessary authority to apprehend, prosecute, and convict individuals committing animal enterprise terror.**

Introduced on September 8, 2006, by James M. Inhofe (R-Oklahoma). Passed by both the House and Senate and signed into law by the President on November 27. Became Public Law No: 109-374. This act may be cited as the "Animal Enterprise Terrorism Act."

Amends the federal criminal code to revise criminal prohibitions against damaging or interfering with the operations of an animal enterprise to include intentional damage or loss to any real or personal property and intentional threats of death or serious bodily injury against individuals (or their family members, spouses, or intimate partners) who are involved with animal enterprises. Expands such crime to include conspiracies and attempts. Revises and increases monetary and criminal penalties for such crime.


Modifies the definition of "animal enterprise" to include: (1) an enterprise that uses or sells animals or animal products for profit for educational purposes; and (2) an animal shelter, pet store, breeder, or furrier.

Provides that expressive conduct (including picketing or other peaceful demonstration) protected by the First Amendment is not prohibited by this Act.

- **S.CON.RES.99 A concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the Congress regarding the policy of the United States at the 58th Annual Meeting of the International Whaling Commission.**

Introduced on June 12, 2006, by Olympia J. Snowe (R-Maine) and referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations. Related Bills: H.CON.RES.164, H.CON.RES.441, S.CON.RES.33

Expresses the sense of Congress that: (1) at the 58th Annual Meeting of the International Whaling Commission the United States should remain firmly opposed to commercial whaling (including any linking of a Revised Management Scheme (RMS) to the lifting of the commercial whaling moratorium), and take other specified related steps; and (2) the United States should make full use of all appropriate diplomatic mechanisms, federal law, relevant international laws and agreements, and other appropriate mechanisms to implement these goals.

For more information on bills, resolutions and other Congressional activity go to: <http://thomas.loc.gov/> 

Announcements...

Upcoming Meetings and Workshops

• Office of Laboratory Animal Welfare, National Institutes of Health Upcoming IACUC 101 Workshops for 2007

<http://grants.nih.gov/grants/olaw/olaw.htm>

The IACUC 101 series consist of didactic and interactive training programs designed to provide IACUC (Institutional Animal Care and Use Committee) members, administrators, veterinarians, animal care staff, researchers, regulatory personnel, and compliance officers with information on the role and responsibilities of IACUCs, including an understanding of Federal policies and regulations governing laboratory animal welfare.

- August 29-30, Spokane, Washington, University of Idaho IACUC 101 & 201
- September 27, Cincinnati, Ohio, University of Cincinnati IACUC 101 Workshop

For more information, contact Mary Lou James at phone: (314) 997-6896 or e-mail: mljames@mo.net

• Scientists Center for Animal Welfare Upcoming IACUC-Advanced Workshops

IACUC-Advanced was developed by the Scientists Center for Animal Welfare to train members of Institutional Animal Care and Use Committees (IACUCs). IACUC-Advanced workshops are for experienced IACUC members and others who work with laboratory animals. The focus will be on advanced protocol review and other issues, such as what to look for in a protocol that includes relieved and/or unrelieved pain and distress; how to recognize and evaluate the level of pain and distress; appropriate end points stated in the protocol; and special environmental conditions required because of potential pain and/or distress.

- September 5, Anchorage, Alaska

The SCAW Winter Conference will be held in San Antonio, Texas, on December 3-4, 2007.

For more information, contact SCAW at phone: (301) 345-3500, fax: (301) 345-3503, or e-mail: info@scaw.com, or web: <http://www.scaw.com>

• American Association for Laboratory Animal Science 2007 National Meeting

The 2007 annual conference will be held in Charlotte, North Carolina, October 14-18. Abstract submissions are now being accepted. For more information, go to <http://nationalmeeting.aalas.org/default.asp>

• Jackson Laboratory Workshop on Surgical Techniques in the Laboratory Mouse

For additional course offerings from Jackson Laboratory, visit them at <http://www.jax.org/courses/index.html>

This 5-day intensive hands-on workshop will be held from October 30 to November 3, 2007, at the Jackson Laboratory in Bar Harbor, Maine. It is for those wishing to obtain practical training in surgical techniques for the laboratory mouse. Topics to be covered include basic handling, anesthesia, routes of administration and procedures for the identification and tracking of individual mice. A wide range of standard and nonstandard surgical techniques are also taught and students are encouraged to submit requests for specific procedures. For more information, contact Toni Joerres, Jackson Laboratory, 600 Main Street, Bar Harbor, ME 04609, phone: (207) 288-6263; fax: (207) 288-6080; e-mail: toni.joerres@jax.org

Information Resources

• OLAW Offers New Guidance for Animal Care and Use Committees and Institutional Officials

A new FAQ (frequently asked questions) is now posted on the Office of Laboratory Animal Welfare (OLAW) website at: http://grants.nih.gov/grants/olaw/faqs.htm#instresp_8. This FAQ provides guidance on the roles of the Institutional Official and the IACUC in developing plans to diminish the likelihood that their institution or its employees will become targets of animal activists. Institutions are encouraged to review OLAW FAQs and make use of this resource. As necessary OLAW will update the site with new FAQs.

• NIH Announces Report on Responses to RFI Concerning Animal Care and Use Standards

The National Institutes of Health (NIH) has announced the Notice of a Report on the Review of Responses to the National Institutes of Health Request for Information (RFI): Standards for the Care and Use of Laboratory Animals. The Notice, NOT-OD-07-016, is to inform the research community of the NIH review of submissions to RFI NOT-OD-06-011 (Request for Information: Standards for the Care and Use of Laboratory Animals), which explored the need to update the laboratory animal welfare standards of the *Guide for the Care and Use of Laboratory Animals*. It is available at: <http://grants2.nih.gov/grants/guide/notice-files/NOT-OD-07-016.html>.

• Report of an IS RTP Workshop: Progress and Barriers to Incorporating Alternative Toxicological Methods in the United States

This report from the International Society of Regulatory Toxicology and Pharmacology is available at <http://www.isrtp.org>. According to the program, "...the objective of this workshop [was] to explore progress to date in implementing new, revised and alternative toxicological test methods across regulatory evaluation frameworks and decision-making programs in the U.S., identify barriers to progress and explore potential bridges to facilitate overcoming such barriers. These barriers may be technical, regulatory, economic or societal." Slides and speakers notes for all presentations are also available.

• Laboratory Mouse Handbook

This new publication from AALAS (American Association of Laboratory Animal Science) covers topics including mouse biology, housing, care and husbandry, identification, health and

Announcements Continued...

medicine, handling, and techniques used in research settings such as injections, blood collection, anesthesia and analgesia, and euthanasia. A new mouse anatomy poster is also available. Additional information and how to order the handbook are available on the AALAS website:
<http://www.aalas.org/bookstore/detail.aspx?ID=1378>.

- **Exotic Pet Behavior**

This 384-page paperback book contains information about normal behavior, medical implications of abnormal behavior, pain-related behavior, and behavioral modification techniques for species of exotic animals including rabbits, birds, reptiles, ferrets, guinea pigs, small rodents, and other small mammals commonly kept as pets. (Published in June 2006; ISBN: 1-4160-0009-7)

For ordering information, go to the Elsevier Publishing website: <http://www.elsevier.com/wps/find/bookdescription.librarians/708038/description>

- **The Mouse in Biomedical Research (American College of Laboratory Animal Medicine, Volumes 1-4)**

This 1,600-page, four-volume set is a source of reference information for students, specialists in laboratory animal science, animal care technicians, and the broader scientific community. The topics included in the set are: history, wild mice, and genetics; diseases; normative biology, husbandry, and models; and immunology. The volumes can be purchased together or individually. (Published in December 2006; ISBN: 0-12-369454-X)

For ordering information, go to the Elsevier Publishing website: <http://www.elsevier.com/wps/find/bookdescription.librarians/709401/description>

- **Clinical Laboratory Medicine With CD**

The third edition of this resource covers behavior, anatomy, physiology, breeding, husbandry, handling, blood and urine collection, drug administration, anesthesia, surgery, and diseases of most laboratory animals. There are also chapters on serologic testing and quality control, the research environment, and regulations and policies governing the care and use of laboratory animals. (Published in October 2006; ISBN: 0813829666)

Ordering information can be found on the Blackwell Publishing website:
<http://www.blackwellpublishing.com/book.asp?ref=9780813829661&site=1>

- **Primate Anatomy: An Introduction**

This 736-page book reviews the biology of all living primates, including humans. The third edition covers newly discovered species, including details about their anatomy, new research in molecular primatology, and basic biological taxonomy. New and controversial issues relating to primates, anatomy, and evolution are discussed. (Published in January 2007; ISBN: 0-12-372576-3)

For ordering information, go to the Elsevier Publishing website: <http://www.elsevier.com/wps/find/bookdescription.librarians/710335/description>

- **Insect Viruses**

This 552-page book takes a closer look at baculoviruses, insect-specific viruses that are used in insect pest management as well as research tools for the production of recombinant proteins, protein display, and potential vectors for human gene therapy. This resource contains sections titled Insect Viruses as

Laboratory Research Tools; Applications to Human and Animal Health; and Insect Pest Management. (Published September 2006; ISBN: 0-12-039868-0)

For ordering information, go to the Elsevier Publishing website: <http://www.elsevier.com/wps/find/bookdescription.librarians/708840/description>

- **On Farm Monitoring of Pig Welfare**

The objective of this 208-page book is to provide a scientifically based outline for how to evaluate the welfare of pigs at a farm level. Attention is focused on the assessment of the validation of the inferred indicators and parameters, and the validity, reliability and the feasibility of the measuring methods.

The book includes mainly animal-based parameters, although other environmentally based and management-based parameters are also described. These issues are elaborated by well-known experts in their field of work, i.e. fundamental and applied research on all aspects related to the production of pigs. This unique approach has added-value compared to other books because ideas developed in laboratory conditions are discussed here in relation to constraints experienced in field work.

Readers from various disciplines will find this critical analysis of the on-farm monitoring of pig welfare useful in relation to the development of certification procedures, the evaluation of production systems (farm, transport, slaughter), the analysis and solving of welfare-related problems and in the development of new research projects. (Published in 2007, ISBN-13: 978-90-8686-025-8)

For table of contents see:

Wageningen Academic Publishers, P.O. Box 220, 6700 AE Wageningen, The Netherlands, phone: +31 317 476516; fax: +31 317 453417 or <http://www.wageningenacademic.com>

On the Web

- **Assessing the Health and Welfare of Laboratory Animals**
<http://www.ahwla.org.uk/>

This free tutorial website provides practical guidance in recognizing signs of good health and welfare. The first is the basic assessment tutorial, which provides an introduction to assessing the health of laboratory animals and is designed for inexperienced research workers and animal care staff. A second tutorial provides an introduction to recognizing postoperative pain in animals.

- **ECOPA: European Consensus-platform for Alternatives**
<http://www.ecopa.eu/>

The concept of consensus between the parties concerned—that is, animal welfare, industry, academia and governmental institutions—has been accepted in various countries as an efficient way to stimulate research into alternatives to animal experiments and enforcing the acceptance of alternatives in experimental practice. The site provides access to a number of alternatives databases, course offerings, members' websites, workshops and conferences, and international regulations, directives, and other regulatory and guidance instruments. An excellent resource.

- **The Innovative Medicines Initiative: Implications for the 3Rs**

<http://www.nc3rs.org.uk/news.asp?id=246>

The author, Dr. Ian Ragan, Executive Consultant European Scientific Affairs, Eli Lilly, discusses this initiative put in place

Announcements Continued...

by the European Commission to fund research into new medicines.

From the abstract: The Innovative Medicines Initiative is a proposal for research funding under the European Commission's 7th Framework Programme. It aims to remove bottlenecks hampering the efficiency of the development of new medicines, thereby enabling the European pharmaceutical industry to maintain its position in the competitive environment and provide faster access to better medicines for European citizens. The Initiative has implications for the 3Rs, not least because reduction of drug attrition prior to, and during, clinical trials should lead to reduction of the overall number of animals used in drug discovery and development. This article describes the current drug development process, the ways in which the Innovative Medicines Initiative will redesign this process, and the consequences this will have for laboratory animals.

- **LifeLine Grants**

<http://www.uan.org/index.cfm?navid=28>

Through LifeLine, United Animal Nations provides grants for companion animals during life-threatening emergencies when caregivers cannot afford the entire cost of treatment or care.

Grants are available to individuals, Good Samaritans, animal rescuers and organizations assisting with an animal emergency involving a group of animals. Grants range from 100 to 2,500 dollars.

- **Manual for Community Representatives on Animal Care and Use Committees**

http://www.ccac.ca/en/CCAC_Programs/Assessment/CCAC-CFHS_Manual_e.pdf

An update to the excellent resource manual written by the Canadian Council on Animal Care, this manual provides a good overview of the responsibilities of the community representative on IACUCs and gives an overview of the role of the IACUC in its oversight function of animal research. While it is written with Canadian guidelines in mind, the ideas apply to US IACUCs.

- **NIH Anesthesia/Analgesia Formulary**

<http://oacu.od.nih.gov/ARAC/tablesbyspecies.pdf>

Provides tables of drugs commonly used at the National Institutes of Health (NIH) for pre-anesthesia, anesthesia, analgesia, sedation, tranquilization, and restraint of laboratory animal species. The dosage recommendations and other data presented are based upon current data in the literature and the professional judgement of veterinarians on the NIH Animal Care and Use Committee Subcommittee on Training.

- **NIH Checklist for ACUC Incident Investigation**

<http://oacu.od.nih.gov/UsefulResources/ACUCChecklist2.pdf>

The procedures used by NIH to investigate complaints in its intramural animal care program.

- **Nordic Information Centre for Alternative Method**

<http://www.cctoxconsulting.a.se/nica.htm>

The Nordic Information Centre for Alternative Method (NICA) provides information about alternatives to animal experiments. The center is organized by the Scandinavian Society for Cell Toxicology and the documentation and information activities are managed by Cecilia Clemedson. NICA was founded in January 1998. Access is provided to the MEIC (Multicentre

Evaluation of In Vitro Cytotoxicity) study, which is an international program to evaluate the relevance and reliability of in vitro tests for predicting acute systemic toxicity. You can also access the MEMO (the MEIC monographs on time-related human lethal blood concentrations) project [which contains] published and unpublished (from poison information centers and medico-legal institutes) case reports from human poisonings of the 50 MEIC reference chemicals. Other toxicology databases and information are available.

- **Postoperative Pain Recognition in Animals: Training Module**

http://3r-training.tierversuch.ch/en/module_3r/pain/assessment_of_pain

A new module on recognizing pain has been added to the 3Rs online training course provided by the 3R Research Foundation Switzerland. The module, devised by Prof. P. Flecknell of the University of Newcastle examines pain assessment and recognition, behavioral measures of pain, pain scoring, analgesia, and anesthesia. Other recently added modules available online include the Draize test and its replacement and validation, allergic contact dermatitis (ACD) – sensitization in vitro, and 3-D Tox receptor database on the Internet. To access the full list of training modules, go to: <http://3r-training.tierversuch.ch/>.

- **Proceedings of the 2006 CCAC National Workshop**

http://www.ccac.ca/en/CCAC_Programs/ETCC/presentations.htm

Available is a presentation on Post-Approval Monitoring: The Importance and Application, given by Dr. John Norton, Director, Duke University, University Veterinarian and Director, Division of Laboratory Animal Resources.

- **SEFREC: Serum Free Cell Lines Database**

<http://www.sefrec.com/>

This new interactive database, financed by the 3R Research Foundation in Switzerland (<http://www.forschung3r.ch/>), will simplify the search for current serum free cells and serum free medias. Searching the database is a free service; however, users must first obtain a login and agree to usage terms.

- **Searching for 3Rs Information—Published Literature Sources**

http://www.impi.org.uk/i3r_v2_jul2002.pdf

Developed by the UK group Information Managers in the Pharmaceutical Industry to assist scientists and information specialists in retrieving information on alternatives in animal research from the published literature.

- **Traveler's Pet Corner - shipping your dog or cat**

http://www.iata.org/whatwedo/cargo/live_animals/pets.htm

Provides information from the International Air Transport Association on air shipment of dogs and cats. Also includes: Recommendations for shipping a dog or a cat, Container information applicable to cats and dogs, and Pet Passport FAQ - European Union Regulations. A link is also provided to the *IATA Travel Centre- Online Travel Visa and Health Requirement Source* which provides entry requirements for both people, items, pets, and wildlife into the world's various countries. An excellent resource.





News...

- **How to Obtain Information About Investigations or Enforcement Documents from APHIS' Investigative and Enforcement Services (IES) or USDA's Office of the General Counsel (OGC)**

Requests for information about Animal Welfare Act (AWA) and Horse Protection Act (HPA) cases and investigations as well as related IES and OGC enforcement documents are increasing. APHIS' Animal Care program is committed to providing a timelier means for the public and media to access AWA and HPA enforcement information and actions.

To be more consistent, APHIS' Legislative and Public Affairs (LPA) Office will respond to media or public inquiries about open investigations with the same information. It is our policy not to comment on open investigations, or to confirm or deny that we have an open investigation pertaining to a particular person or entity. Disclosure of information concerning open investigations could interfere with the conduct of those investigations. For more information, you can contact LPA's Public Affairs Office at (301) 734-7799.

IES and OGC enforcement documents on AWA and HPA cases and investigations, once processed, are available through a variety of means. A brief description of each enforcement action is below, as well as information about how to obtain the documents described. The enforcement actions listed below, in ascending order of severity, are: the Official Warning Letter (7060); the Stipulation; the OGC Complaint; the Consent Decision; and the Decision and Order.

The Official Warning Letter (7060) is a notification to an individual or company regarding an alleged AWA violation. The letter warns that any further infractions may result in more serious consequences such as a civil penalty or criminal prosecution. A copy of an Official Warning Letter can only be obtained through a Freedom of Information Act (FOIA) request. To make a FOIA request for such documents, please phone (301) 734-8296, or go to: <http://www.aphis.usda.gov/ac/efoia.html> and provide your contact information and the item(s) requested.

A Stipulation is an agreement in which the Agency gives notice of an apparent violation and agrees to accept a specified penalty to settle the matter. The penalty must be paid within a designated time frame and the violator waives their right to a hearing. A copy of a Stipulation is available only through a FOIA request. To make a FOIA request for such documents, please phone (301) 734-8296, or go to: <http://www.aphis.usda.gov/ac/efoia.html> and provide your contact information and the item(s) requested.

An OGC Complaint gives notice to an Animal Care licensee or registrant of formal allegations regarding possible violations of the AWA or the HPA. The Complaint does not mean the respondent is guilty of these violations, but serves as a notice that they must respond and either agree to the allegations in the Complaint, or seek a hearing date before a USDA Administrative Law Judge (ALJ). A copy of a Complaint is available on the USDA ALJ Web site. For OGC or USDA ALJ documents, go to: <http://www.usda.gov/da/oaljdecisions/#> and select the Current ALJ Decisions pull down menu, and then select the ap-

propriate enforcement action. The USDA ALJ Web site also includes an Agriculture Decisions Search Engine to assist search requests when the type of enforcement action sought is unknown.

A Consent Decision is an agreement reached between OGC and the respondent before a USDA Administrative Law Judge (ALJ) enters a decision regarding the case. A copy of a Consent Decision is available on the USDA ALJ Web site. For OGC or USDA ALJ documents, go to: <http://www.usda.gov/da/oaljdecisions/#> and select the Current ALJ Decisions pull down menu, and then select the appropriate enforcement action. The USDA ALJ Web site also includes an Agriculture Decisions Search Engine to assist search requests when the type of enforcement action sought is unknown.

A Decision and Order is issued by the ALJ based on the evidence presented by APHIS and the respondent. The respondent has the right to appeal this decision. A copy of a Decision and Order is available on the USDA ALJ web site. For OGC or USDA ALJ documents, go to:

<http://www.usda.gov/da/oaljdecisions/#> and select the Current ALJ Decisions pull down menu, and then select the appropriate enforcement action. The USDA ALJ Web site also includes an Agriculture Decisions Search Engine to assist search requests when the type of enforcement action sought is unknown.

- **APHIS Animal Care Stakeholder Update: Inspection Guides Now Available**

March 23, 2007

The Animal Care (AC) program within the U.S. Department of Agriculture's (USDA) Animal and Plant Health Inspection Services (APHIS) continuously evaluates its programs and policies in an effort to improve all facets of its operations. As part of this overall effort, AC has developed a Resource Guide for Exhibitor Inspections and has revised the Research Facility Inspection Guide. These are both now available online on our website.

The Exhibitor Inspection Guide is written specifically for our AC personnel. An exhibitor refers to a person who maintains certain warmblooded animals for display or public performance. Exhibitors include, among others: circuses, zoos, animal acts, drive-through wildlife parks, photo shoots and marine mammal displays.

Similarly, the Research Facility Inspection Guide is provided for our AC personnel. Some items of note in the updated version of this Guide:

- Protocol Review, Inspection Procedures (pg. 6.3.12) includes additional guidance for inspectors to ensure APHIS-approved "multiple major survival surgery" stipulations are being met.
- Annual Report, Content (pg. 14.1.3) includes examples for inspectors on facility reporting of unusual circumstances, including unexpected pain/distress or animal incidents.

USDA News cont'd on p.30

USDA News cont'd from 29

- Personnel Qualifications (pg. 16.2.2) includes inspection aids for assessing training programs.
- Electronic Communications (pg. 18.8.1) includes the criteria that must be met in order for the Institutional Animal Care and Use Committee (IACUC) to conduct its activities via electronic communication systems. These criteria have been developed in conjunction with National Institutes of Health (NIH) Office of Laboratory Animal Welfare (OLAW). (See <http://grants.nih.gov/grants/guide/notice-files/NOT-OD-06-052.html>)

Please feel free to review the Exhibitor Inspection Guide provided online at http://www.aphis.usda.gov/animal_welfare/eig.shtml and the Research Facility Inspection Guide online at http://www.aphis.usda.gov/animal_welfare/rig.shtml.


Also note that AC has recently updated its stakeholders list to include organizations we believe would be interested in receiving information from our program. If you have received

this e-mail and do not wish to receive future notices, or if there is a more appropriate address you would like these updates to be sent to, please e-mail us at: ac_stakeholders_update@aphis.usda.gov.

• **Horse Protection Act Information**

APHIS has finalized the Horse Protection Operating Plan for the 2007-2009 show seasons.

This plan is for horses regulated under the Horse Protection Act only. The plan can be viewed at http://www.aphis.usda.gov/animal_welfare/hp/downloads/hp_2007-09_op.pdf


Questions about the Operating Plan should be directed to Dr. Chester A. Gipson. Dr. Gipson can be reached via e-mail at Chester.A.Gipson@aphis.usda.gov or by phone at 301-734-4980. 

Comparison cont'd from p2

practical problems. Another point which has met with criticism is the nonexistence of a superior organization to inspect that the regulations are met equally in every research facility and in every federal state ["Bundesland"].

The American Welfare Act is more practically orientated and focuses on the current state of science and the acceptance of animal welfare. The act states that "measures which help meet the public concern for laboratory animal care and treatment are important in assuring that research will continue to progress" [Section 1, (4)]. The Animal Welfare Act therefore does not just focus on the reduction of pain in animals, but also on the economical interconnections of animals and people. The laws provided in the Animal Welfare Act are more user-oriented and therefore easier to fulfill.

The introduction of a superior organization, the "information service at the National Agricultural Library" [Section 13 (e)] along with Federal inspectors from the USDA, Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service, Animal Care unit assures that the regulations are met throughout the country. The Animal Welfare Information Center provides many information resources on animal welfare and animal treatment as well as training for inspectors and research associates.

The establishment of a similar information service would be a desirable aim for Germany, because this could ensure more uniformity in animal care and experimentation. 

Rep. Gallegly Introduces Animal Fighting Bill

WASHINGTON, DC—Congressman Elton Gallegly (R-Ventura and Santa Barbara Counties) [introduced] on [January 4, 2007], the first day of the 110th Congress, a bill making violations of federal animal fighting law a felony punishable by up to three years in prison, make it a felony to transport an animal across state or international borders for the purpose of animal fighting, and prohibit the interstate and foreign commerce in knives and gaffs designed for use in cockfighting.

[Editor's note: This act became Public Law 110-022 on May 3, 2007.]


"Animal fighting is a brutal, inhumane practice," Gallegly said. "Criminals engage in the activity to launder money. It is closely tied to the drug trade. Children are endangered from dogs trained to fight in their homes. And cockfighting has been tied to the spread of bird flu."

The bill is similar to one introduced by Congressman Mark Green of Wisconsin in 2005. Gallegly was an original cosponsor of Green's bill and was responsible for gathering about 200 of the 324 cosponsors on the bill.

Cockfighting has been identified as the major contributor of the spread of avian flu throughout Thailand and other parts of Asia, where the strain originated. Many of the humans who contracted avian flu and died from it contracted it from fighting birds. Experts say it's just a matter of time before it reaches our shores.

Roosters smuggled into the United States for the express purpose of cockfighting could likely carry the disease.

It wouldn't be the first time disease entered the U.S. with contraband roosters. Fighting roosters smuggled into California from Mexico caused the 2002-2003 outbreak of exotic Newcastle disease. Newcastle cost U.S. taxpayers \$200 million to eradicate. It cost the poultry industry millions more in lost overseas exports as it spread across the southwestern United States.

Avian flu could be much worse. The world is expecting a pandemic among the human race from the predicted mutation of one particular strain, dubbed H5N1, with deaths in the United States estimated as high as 1.9 million. For more information, contact Tom Pfeifer at phone: (202) 225-5811. 

ARS Animal Welfare News...



Relaxed Management Improves Cattle Disposition

From Healthy Animals, July 2006:
<http://www.ars.usda.gov/is/np/ha/han26.htm>

When research is conducted, most of the time results aren't predictable. That's the foundation for good scientific method. But sometimes, indirect results can be the real surprise. So say scientists at the J. Phil Campbell Sr., Natural Resource Conservation Center in Watkinsville, Georgia. While conducting primary research on forage, they found that their style of handling the cattle contributed to development of a calm herd.

Animal scientist John Stuedemann and other researchers before him have conducted forage research with their resident herd of Angus cat-

tle, which was established in the 1950s. The 250-cow herd has been receiving disposition scores for the past 5 years from the finisher outfit, Tri-County Steer Carcass Futurity, in Iowa.

"We like to handle our herd in a slow and calm manner, which may account for their good disposition scores," says Stuedemann.

Calves are given the scores during each trip through the cattle chute. A score of 1 means the calf is so calm it may just settle in for a nap; a 5 means the calf is ferociously uninhibited. Disposition scores of the Watkinsville steers and heifers ranged from 1.0 to 1.9, and most were below 1.5.

Stuedemann's philosophy is that because the researchers handle the animals so much, they want them to be as calm as possible. Any excitable or unstable cattle are removed to lessen the risk of injury to staffers, especially student workers. "The last thing we want is anyone injured by ornery cattle," says Stuedemann.

Management methods have also been modified to keep the herd relaxed. "Working the cattle can be rough or calm, and we feel the fastest way to work cattle is to do it slowly," asserts Stuedemann. "Aids sometimes used to restrain or hurry cattle along were thrown away at Watkinsville a long time ago. Cattle are more likely to go through the chutes calmly when pain is removed from the experience." This conditioning allows researchers to move the animals through the chutes for monthly weigh-ins without incident.

While calm cattle make life easier for those handling them, Tri-County also finds the health and average daily weight gain of the cattle to be excellent. In the 5 years of custom feeding with Tri-County, 816 head of steers and heifers posted average daily weight gains ranging from 3.1 to 4.6 pounds. Only 30 of those animals graded "Select," while the other 774 graded "Choice" or better. A total of 381 head earned the "Certified Angus Beef" label.

"The Watkinsville staff has done a fantastic job with their cattle in handling and selection," says Tri-County's Darrell Busby. "There are very few health problems, they gain weight well, and their quality grades are exceptional. Compared to other cattle we handle, we feel fortunate when Watkinsville cattle come in."—By Sharon Durham, Agricultural Research Service Information Staff.

This research is part of Rangeland, Pasture, and Forages, an ARS National Program (#205) described on the World Wide Web at www.nps.ars.usda.gov.

John Stuedemann is retired from the J. Phil Campbell Sr., Natural Resource Conservation Center, 1420 Experiment Station Rd., Watkinsville, GA 30677; phone: (706) 769-5631, fax: (706) 769-8962.

Chill Out!

From Healthy Animals, November 2006: <http://www.ars.usda.gov/is/np/ha/han27.htm>

Stress in animals can foster poor health, reduced weight and, in the worst cases, death. Helping animals "keep their cool" can promote productive efficiency.

Three factors influence an animal's stress level: the environment, management practices and individual susceptibility. At the Roman L. Hruska U.S. Meat Animal Research Center (USMARC) in Clay Center, Neb., agricultural engineer Tami Brown-Brandl and her colleagues are developing a model for analyzing these influences and predicting an individual's stress level. The model also indicates a degree of certainty for each prediction, allowing producers to modify their responses accordingly.

Having the ability to identify animals with greater susceptibility to heat stress would allow producers to separate them and give them special care. The model could also monitor weather, helping them respond to environmental extremes. And producers could compare how different management strategies impact stress, enabling them to make the best decisions for the well-being of their herds.

In a separate study, Ted Elsasser, with the Beltsville Agricultural Research Center Growth Biology Laboratory, is investigating whether vitamin E could be used to treat stress. Early studies suggest that preventative doses of vitamin E—which might be administered in anticipation of birth or weaning stress—may forestall the complications of oxidative stress, decrease susceptibility to infection and maintain growth rates in young cattle. If vitamin E proves to be an effective intervention treatment, this could translate into lower treatment costs, decreased antibiotic use and, ultimately, a healthier product for consumers

ARS News cont'd on p.32

Food, Glorious Food

From Healthy Animals, November 2006: <http://www.ars.usda.gov/is/np/ha/han27.htm>

Nutrition is another essential element of animal well-being. One way to ensure that animals eat a healthy diet is to have the highest quality forage available to them. Holstein dairy cows enjoy a meal. Dozens of research projects within the ARS Rangeland, Pasture and Forages National Program are designed to improve our Nation's forage supply and teach producers how to use it most effectively. (See HA issue 26.)

In the ARS Livestock Issues Research Unit at Lubbock, Texas, research leader Jeff Carroll and his colleagues are testing nutritional supplements as alternatives to antibiotics for enhancing immune systems in swine and cattle. According to Carroll, some nutritional supplements, such as spray-dried plasma, could increase immunity in piglets by preventing pathogens from binding to their intestines. And fish oils help build immunity at a cellular level. This research has been expanded to include other nutritional supplements obtained from various yeast and plant sources.

A new program at USMARC and the Fort Keogh Livestock and Range Research Laboratory at Miles City, Mont., will aim at reducing cattle production costs by increasing feed efficiency. Currently, feed makes up 65-75 percent of beef production costs. The research will attempt to identify genes and other factors that influence efficient use of nutrients. Increasing efficiency will reduce costs and minimize the industry's environmental impact.

These are only a few of the current ARS research programs designed to promote animal welfare and improve production. Together, they help ensure that the United States maintains one of the strongest animal production industries in the world.

For more information about ARS's Food Animal Production National Program, go to: http://www.ars.usda.gov/research/programs/programs.htm?NP_CODE=101

To subscribe to Healthy Animals, go to: <http://www.ars.usda.gov/is/np/ha/subscribe.htm>

Idaho Research Station Helps Beleaguered Bird

From Healthy Animals, January 2007: <http://www.ars.usda.gov/is/np/ha/han28.htm>

By Erin Peabody

They whistle, puff their chests and strut like peacocks. But for all their attention-getting efforts, greater sage grouse are slowly disappearing from the American West. Once estimated to be in the millions, the birds may now number only about 150,000. There's one group of researchers, though, that hasn't forgotten about the grouse: Agricultural Research Service (ARS) scientists in Dubois, Idaho.

There, at the agency's U.S. Sheep Experiment Station, researchers have been tracking the bird for more than 40 years. While their focus is sheep production, scientists at the sprawling 50,000-acre station make certain to include the needs of wildlife in their management plans.

The sage grouse, a favorite of bird enthusiasts and wildlife photographers, is probably best known for its elaborate mating ritual. Every spring, the birds engage in a lot of wing-swishing, chest-puffing and whistling to attract potential mates. To carry out this colorful ritual, grouse need sagebrush and a variety of other high-altitude, mountain-loving plants for food and protection. Situated in southeastern



A male sage grouse flaunts his feathers and puffs his chest, trying to capture the attention of nearby females.

Idaho, in the shadow of the

Centennial Mountains, the ARS research station is home to lots of sagebrush—of the right kinds and ages.

According to Dubois research leader Gregory Lewis, a monoculture of thick, burly sage isn't inviting to birds. Instead, what draws the grouse—as well as deer, elk, pronghorn antelope and moose—is rich, layered vegetation. Lewis drafts some unlikely assistants to help create this favorable habitat: the station's 3,000 sheep. The animals' hooves and jaws open up thick, unruly sage brush stands so that more diminutive plants can take root. Lewis and his team also prescribe regular burns to further rejuvenate the soil and encourage tender, green plant growth. According to Lewis, these primary tools—sheep and fire—have helped boost the station's greater sage grouse population.

Read more about this and other ARS wildlife conservation efforts in the November/December 2006 issue of Agricultural Research magazine at <http://www.ars.usda.gov/is/AR/archive/nov06/range1106.htm>.

To reach scientists mentioned in this story, contact Erin Peabody, USDA-ARS Information Staff, 5601 Sunnyside Ave., Beltsville, MD 20705-5129; e-mail: erin.peabody@ars.usda.gov, phone (301) 504-1624, fax (301) 504-1486. 🌱



New life is breathed into the ecosystem following prescribed burns. After vegetation is burned away, low-lying plants can establish and better access soil nutrients and moisture.

International News...

United Kingdom

Crown copyright material reproduced with the permission of the Controller of Her Majesty's Stationary Office and the Queen's Printer for Scotland. Reproduced under the terms of the PSI Licence.

• Animal Welfare Act 2006

<http://www.defra.gov.uk/animalh/welfare/act/index.htm>

When does the new law come into effect?

From 6 April 2007 in England, and in Wales from 27 March, animal welfare law is being improved. It is still against the law to be cruel to an animal. But now you must also ensure that all the welfare needs of your animals are met.

What does the new law do?

It makes owners and keepers responsible for ensuring that the welfare needs of their animals are met. These include the need:

- For a suitable environment (place to live)
- For a suitable diet
- To exhibit normal behaviour patterns
- To be housed with, or apart from, other animals (if applicable)
- To be protected from pain, injury, suffering and disease

The new law also increases to 16 the minimum age at which a person can buy an animal and prohibits giving animals as prizes to unaccompanied children under this age.

Anyone who is cruel to an animal, or does not provide for its welfare needs, may be banned from owning animals, fined up to £20,000 (\$40,000), and/or sent to prison.

• Mutilations and Tail Docking of Dogs

Mutilations

From 6 April 2007 in England, and 28 March in Wales, the mutilation of animals is banned under the Animal Welfare Act 2006, with certain exemptions set out in Regulations. "Mutilation" covers any procedure that involves interference with the sensitive tissues or bone structure of an animal other than for therapeutic purposes (medical treatment).

Certain procedures are exempt from the ban because of long-term welfare or management benefits. There are some specific requirements on how many of the procedures are performed, and all must be carried out in a way that keeps pain to a minimum, under hygienic conditions, and in accordance with good practice.

These exemptions largely consolidate and replicate existing legislation. There have been no very significant changes to the status quo.

A full version of the Regulations, including an Explanatory Memorandum, can be obtained from the Office of Public Sector Information at <http://www.opsi.gov.uk>.

Tail Docking

The docking of dogs' tails is banned in England from 6 April 2007, and in Wales from 28 March 2007; but with exemptions from the ban for certain working dogs, and for medical treatment.

There is also a ban on the showing of docked dogs (all dogs docked after the commencement date of 6 April/28 March) at

events to which members of the public are admitted on payment of a fee. However, this ban does not apply to dogs shown for the purpose of demonstrating their working ability.

Tail docking was one of the more contentious topics debated by the House of Commons during the Animal Welfare Act's passage through Parliament. The Government's view was that it was right for Parliament to decide on this issue. MPs had a free vote after a debate in the House of Commons and voted for a ban on tail docking with an exemption for working dogs.

The exemption for working dogs allows a dog that is likely to perform certain specified types of work to have its tail docked by a veterinary surgeon. The dog will have to be less than 5 days old or less, and the veterinary surgeon will have to certify that he or she has seen specified evidence that the dog is likely to work in specified areas. The dog will also need to be micro-chipped to identify it. The types of dog that will be allowed to be docked, and the types of evidence needed, is detailed in further regulations. These are available on the Office of Public Sector Information website at <http://www.opsi.gov.uk>

• Department for Environment, Food and Rural Affairs (Defra) Publishes its Vision for the Future of Animal Welfare

28 November 2006

A strategy for improving animal welfare in England by building new relationships between Government and its key partners, is published for consultation today.

The Animal Welfare Delivery Strategy aims to increase society's understanding and expertise in caring for animals, and to improve welfare above and beyond the baseline standards set by law.

[While this strategy covers England only, the Government will work closely with agencies in Scotland and Wales to share best practices.]

It suggests innovative ways of doing this, such as improving the labeling of food with information about the welfare conditions of the animals from which it was produced, allowing consumers to make informed choices about what they buy.

Other proposals include building agreement on global animal welfare standards, which can be embedded in future international laws and treaties.

Ben Bradshaw, Minister for Animal Health and Welfare, said: "Everyone who keeps or works with animals can help improve their care. While it's our job in Government to set minimum standards by law, the public and our key partners also have a vital role to play. This strategy suggests ways we can take responsibility for different aspects of this issue and work together to achieve good animal welfare – it's a subject that affects us all and we want to hear what others think of our vision."

In all, the strategy proposes five key goals:

- Improving the quality and range of training and education for animal keepers
- Enforcing welfare rules efficiently to protect animals while putting as little burden as possible on their keepers
- Providing more comprehensive and standardized information to consumers on the welfare history of animal products
- Working towards internationally-agreed standards for animal welfare

International News...

- Developing a robust and thorough system for measuring welfare standards

Today's publication will be followed by a 12-week consultation period. The full strategy is available at www.defra.gov.uk/corporate/consult/awelfare-strategy/index.htm

• **Animal Welfare Act Receives Royal Assent**

8 November 2006

The most important piece of animal welfare legislation for nearly a century received Royal Assent today. The Act will come into effect on 6 April 2007.

By updating and bringing together more than 20 pieces of animal welfare legislation relating to farmed and non-farmed animals, the Animal Welfare Act 2006 will:

- introduce a "duty of care" on people to ensure the needs of any animal for which they are responsible;
- create a new offence of failing to provide for the needs of an animal in your care;
- allow action to protect animals to be taken much earlier - rather than have to wait for an animal to show the signs of suffering, enforcers will be able to intervene before suffering begins;
- place more emphasis on owners and keepers who will need to understand their responsibilities and take all reasonable steps to provide for the needs of their animals.

Animal Health Minister Ben Bradshaw said: "The most fundamental piece of animal welfare legislation for nearly a century has now passed into law. The Government believes that by extending the duty of care to non-farmed animals, it will reduce animal suffering in this country. This is the culmination of several years work during which the government has worked closely with stakeholders. The result is legislation of which we can all be rightly proud."

Debby Reynolds, Chief Veterinary Officer, said: "I am delighted that the Animal Welfare Bill has now received Royal Assent. The bringing up to date of animal welfare legislation will help to improve the way people look after their animals. The extra powers will mean that action can now be taken before an animal starts to suffer, and will put companion animals on the same legislative footing as farmed animals. The new Act forms an important part of our overall strategy on animal health and welfare."

For more information on the UK Animal Welfare Act go to www.defra.gov.uk/animalh/welfare/bill

• **Statistics of Scientific Procedures on Living Animals in Great Britain During 2005**

<http://www.homeoffice.gov.uk/rds/pdfs06/spanimals05.pdf>

The statistics in this publication relate to experiments or other scientific procedures performed on living animals that were subject to the provisions of the Animals (Scientific Procedures) Act 1986 during the year from 1 January 2005 in accordance with section 21(7) of the Act. The system of control under the 1986 Act is explained in detail in Appendix A. Under this Act any scientific procedure carried out on any living vertebrate animal, or

one species of octopus (*Octopus vulgaris*), which is likely to cause that animal pain, suffering, distress or lasting harm is a regulated procedure requiring licence authority. Recognized veterinary, agricultural or animal husbandry practice and the administration of medicines under an Animal Test Exemption granted under the Medicines Act 1968 are excluded from the controls of the 1986 Act. Statistics of scientific procedures on living animals are collected and published annually by the Home Office. The system of control under the Act is explained in Appendix A. The statistics exceed European Union requirements. Since 2005, the Home Office has published abstracts of animal research project licences to better inform understanding of this issue. They are available online at:

<http://www.scienceandresearch.homeoffice.gov.uk/animal-research/publications/abstracts/>

• **European Guidelines on Animal Research a Step Forward for Animal Welfare**

Home Office Minister Joan Ryan has welcomed new guidance on European standards of welfare for animals in research. The revised standards, set by international organization the Council of Europe, are the first major overhaul of European standards of accommodation and care in 20 years and will lead to improvements in welfare for animals in research across Europe. The revised appendix A to Convention ETS 123 is available online at <http://www.coe.int/>

UK's controls on the use of animals in research are among the tightest in the world, and UK technical experts played a large part in outlining and drafting the revised provisions. They reflect current UK best practice and are widely supported by both the UK's scientific community and animal welfare groups. Home Office Minister Joan Ryan said: "I am delighted that the UK has been able to contribute significantly to these guidelines through its Recognized authority and expertise on this important issue. The improved accommodation and care practices we have been able to negotiate will help ensure that across Europe, vital life-saving research takes place with animal welfare concerns at the forefront."

"Animal research and testing has played a part in almost every medical breakthrough of the last century. It has saved hundreds of millions of lives worldwide, and is vital to our National Health Service."

"We will continue to work with our partners in the Council of Europe to ensure that the balance between animal welfare and scientific advancement is maintained."

The Government is firmly committed to the 3Rs—reducing the numbers of animals used, replacing animals wherever possible, and refining scientific procedures involving animals—and improving animal welfare. To this end, the Government and its agencies spend upwards of £10 million (\$20 million) annually on this research, and the industry itself spends significantly more.

The Home Office works to ensure that the highest possible standards of animal welfare are applied to animals used in scientific procedures and that they are used only where it is fully justified. There are considerable safeguards in place to ensure strict regulation and monitoring, and will take any breaches of the regulations very seriously.

The Council of Europe Convention governing animal research (ETS 123) was first adopted in 1986. The new guidelines - set out in the form of an appendix to ETS 123 - include considerable increases in the minimum provisions recommended for

International News...

accommodating laboratory animals. These will serve to promote more group accommodation and a more stimulating and interesting environment for animals as already exists under codes of practice in the UK.

While not legally binding on Council of Europe member states, the new guidelines will be reflected in a revised EU directive governing animal research, due to be discussed over the coming months. Where necessary, UK codes of practice will be updated to reflect these improved practices.

The Council of Europe is the continent's oldest political organization, founded in 1949. The council was set up to:

- defend human rights, parliamentary democracy and the rule of law;
- develop continent-wide agreements to standardize member countries' social and legal practices; and
- promote awareness of a European identity based on shared values and cutting across different cultures.

European Union

• Prospects for an EU Animal Welfare Labelling Scheme

Markos Kyrianiou, European Commissioner for Health, Concluding Speech at the Conference "Animal Welfare: improving by labelling?" co-hosted by the German Presidency of the Council, the European Council, and the European Economic and Social Committee
Brussels, 28 March 2007
Reference: SPEECH/07/201



I am very pleased to be here today to discuss an extremely interesting and current topic. I would like to thank the German Presidency and the European Economic and Social Committee for their part in organising the conference.

In particular, thanks must go to the European Economic and Social Committee for the work it put into adopting an opinion specifically on the Animal Welfare Labelling. The opinion puts forward some very interesting options for all of us to consider.

Animal welfare ranks high on the Commission's agenda. We have been developing legislation in this area for over 30 years and we are continuously reviewing and improving our measures in line with the latest scientific opinions and technological trends.

We also give particular attention to the views of the European consumers, which have certainly evolved over the decades, and their demands in terms of animal welfare are growing continuously.

Why is animal welfare such a priority? Ethical considerations are, of course, an important factor. Feedback we have received from EU citizens reveals a general sense of moral obligation to ensure the wellbeing of animals under human care, including those that enter the food chain.

I receive hundreds, and for some specific issues thousands, of letters every year confirming a growing and persistent public interest, and we have received strong support for any EU measures which improve the conditions under which animals are kept.

EU consumers are now showing a preference for food produced in line with good animal welfare standards, as they associate it with better quality and food safety.

From the last Eurobarometer results, it is evident that the majority of Europeans are willing to make a concerted effort to buy animal welfare-friendly products. [In fact, 62% of Europeans would be willing to change the place where they usually shop in order to buy goods produced in line with higher animal welfare standards.]

[In addition, over half of the citizens surveyed perceived food produced in line with high animal welfare standards to be healthier than other products, while 48% think it would be of better quality.]

This trend is not limited to Europe. In countries such as the USA and Australia, there is also an increasing demand for products produced in a sustainable manner.

This is evidence of the competitive edge that animal-welfare friendly products can have for the food sector. And this is an opportunity that the EU food producers (from farm to retail) must seize.

The enthusiasm for welfare-friendly products is not just evident in surveys. We only have to look at the growing market share of food produced under quality schemes focusing on animal welfare, to see that consumers are willing to support animal welfare through more than just words.

Successful examples of marketing schemes like "Label Rouge" in France, "Freedom Food" in the UK and "Neuland" in Germany show that good animal welfare offers a competitive advantage to European farmers and industry.

So, we can see that there is a potential for a win-win situation for producers who commit to the EU's higher welfare standards and for consumers who wish to be able to choose these products.

And this is where labelling becomes an important instrument. It is in fact our tool for ensuring proper implementation of animal welfare rules, proper return for those who apply them and an informed choice for the citizen.

Moreover, in addition to supporting animal-welfare friendly products, EU citizens are now calling for better identification of these products. The last Eurobarometer, interestingly showed that over 54% of EU citizens find it hard to identify information on the animal welfare standards applied on food products.

This makes the importance of labelling all the more evident. The Commission is therefore ready to take initiatives to offer and promote more information, and to encourage any private initiatives on labelling and certification in Europe (as suggested by the Opinion).

The EU is one of the global leaders when it comes to animal welfare. This is a reflection of the higher quality standards we apply in the EU across the food chain.

European producers should therefore be able to capitalise on the higher standards demanded of them under EU legislation.

As discussed today, this is one of the main reasons why the possibility of a label to indicate conformity with EU standards should be seriously considered. And I am glad that the Opinion of the Economic and Social Committee endorses this consideration.

Such a label would reflect animal welfare production as part of the more sustainable approach in EU food production also indicating high standards of animal health and food quality. Many

International News...

of the food safety scares over the past decade or so are linked in the citizen's mind to the way in which animals are farmed, fed and killed.

This is why producers who are ready to commit to the EU's high standards of animal welfare have much to gain from the marketing opportunities that this offers and in effect from relevant labelling.

At the same time, and also for the sake of competition for our producers, it is important to continue to promote animal welfare standards in international fora. The Commission is already making successfully efforts before the OIE, the WTO and importantly, in bilateral agreements with third countries.

In this context, and against the background of increasing international competition in the food sector, I was also very interested by the Opinion's suggestion that EU agricultural products which comply with our mandatory animal welfare standards must be identified by a label indicating the EU designation of raw material making up the product.

This goes to the direction of an eventual EU-logo label which will assure the citizen that food is produced based on the very high quality standards provided by EU legislation. And I am sure you will agree that today, exactly because of the high demand for food safety, competition is driven by quality and not price.

Even when animal welfare standards lead to an increase of cost for producers, this can easily be mitigated by a return from the higher price that EU consumers are obviously willing to pay (as shown by the Eurobarometer and market trends). Moreover, all evidence shows that price increase for better animal welfare is minimal.

Therefore, a label indicating better animal welfare is bound to be perceived as a "quality" label and has for this reason benefits for the consumer.

However, in this respect a certain degree of caution is needed.

We must ensure that any new labelling scheme developed at European level is applied in a clear and authentic way.

Finally, in implementing any new animal welfare labelling measure, particular attention must be given to avoiding any unnecessary administrative burden; the Commission is particularly observant of this principle. In this context, the involvement of private certification is certainly an option to be considered.

I am sure that today's conference has provided a very useful insight for the Commission's future work on animal welfare labelling. I am personally committed to the promotion of this policy as part of our global strategy for better quality in food production to the benefit of the EU's industry and citizens alike.

I would therefore like to close by taking today's opportunity of addressing such a wide range of stakeholders to invite you all to continue working with the Commission constructively to help us build on this policy which is obviously in everyone's interest.

• EU Consumers Willing to Pay for Better Animal Welfare

IP/07/398, Brussels, 22 March 2007

EU consumers are willing to make an extra effort to buy animal welfare friendly products, even if this means changing where they shop or paying more for goods, according to a Eurobarometer survey on attitudes to animal welfare, published today. The report shows, however, that citizens feel they lack the necessary information to distinguish between products on animal welfare grounds. In the first EU survey on animal welfare to cover all 27 Member States, as well as Turkey and Croatia, 62%

of respondents said that they would change their shopping habits in order to access more animal welfare friendly goods. The survey also revealed that citizens do not feel that they are provided with this option at the moment, due to insufficient information on animal welfare in food production. A large majority of respondents backed the idea of labelling or logos to indicate the animal welfare standards met in producing the foods they buy. The survey demonstrates general support for financially rewarding EU farmers who use better animal welfare practices.

Markos Kyprianou, Commissioner for Health, said, "The message from EU citizens is clear – they view animal welfare as a priority and are willing to contribute to its promotion. The results of this survey are an affirmation of what the Commission is trying to achieve in the field of animal welfare and confirm that our efforts are a response to public demand for action in this area. The Commission attaches great importance to improving animal welfare both in the EU and internationally, and it is good to see that citizens support our efforts."

A priority for citizens

The Eurobarometer shows that animal welfare is an issue which EU citizens rank highly, giving it an 8 out of 10 on average in terms of importance. Most perceive that animal welfare has improved in their country over the last decade, although 77% still believe there is more to be done. Greeks (96%) Cypriots (91%) and Portuguese (90%) in particular would like more attention to be given to the wellbeing of animals in their country. The Eurobarometer also shows that citizens are in favour of further incentives to promote animal welfare in the EU. Over 70% of respondents supported the idea of financial rewards for producers who apply high animal welfare standards. There was also strong consensus (89%) that imports should have to be produced under the same animal welfare conditions as those originating in the EU.

Perceived benefits of animal welfare

In addition to the traditional ethical concerns that generate support for animal welfare, the well-being of animals during the production of food now appears to be strongly associated with the healthiness and quality of products. Over half of those surveyed perceived food produced in keeping with high animal welfare standards to be healthier than other food, while 48% said they thought it to be better quality.

More information needed

This link in people's minds between animal welfare and the quality and safety of food means that consumers are more inclined towards animal welfare friendly products. In last year's Eurobarometer[1], consumers said that they would be willing to pay more for food produced based on animal welfare practices, while the Eurobarometer published today indicates that they would even go so far as to change their shopping patterns. Nevertheless, over half of those surveyed felt that they had neither enough knowledge about the farming conditions in their country nor the information to differentiate good animal welfare products from others. When asked how animal welfare products should be distinguished in retail outlets, 39% were in favour of written information on the labels, 35% supported the idea of logos and 26% backed the use of a grading/star system on packaging. The Community Action Plan on the Protection and Welfare of Animals 2006-2010 (see MEMO/06/21) foresees the establishment of standardised indicators for animal welfare and possibly an EU animal welfare label, while the German Presidency is

International News...

host[ed] a conference on animal welfare labelling options on 28 March 2007.

For the Eurobarometer survey, see:

http://ec.europa.eu/food/animal/welfare/survey/index_en.htm

For information on Animal Welfare, see:

http://ec.europa.eu/food/animal/welfare/index_en.htm

For the labelling conference, see:

http://www.bmelv.de/cIn_045/nn_757140/EN/08-AnimalWelfare/AnimalLabelling/___AnimalLabelling__node.html

- **Animal Welfare in Transport: New EU Rules Enter Into Force**

IP/07/2, Brussels, 4 January 2007

The new regulation on animal welfare in transport enter[ed] into force [on January 5], 2007. European Health Commissioner Markos Kyprianou said, "This important animal welfare legislation aims to reduce the stress and harm that animals can experience during land and sea journeys. Among the new safeguards for animals being introduced are higher standards for vehicles and equipment, and stricter requirements for those dealing with animals in transport. The Regulation also provides for measures to ensure the better enforcement of EU rules in this area, such as the use of satellite navigation systems."

Better conditions

Under the new rules, vehicles used to transport animals for 8 hours or more will have to be upgraded and officially approved. New equipment in the vehicles will ensure that the microclimate in the vehicle is more adapted for the animals and stricter watering requirements are set out. Special attention is paid to young animals and new born animals and females within 1 week of giving birth may not be transported at all.

Better handling

Drivers and attendants of animals in transit will be subject to compulsory training, and from 2008 certified to care for the animals. The new legislation extends and clarifies the chain of responsibility for the animals, to include not only transport operators but also traders, drivers, and staff at each point of the journey. Given that animals tend to experience more stress when being loaded and unloaded from vehicles, better rules for the handling of animals at these times are set out, as are new requirements for loading/unloading facilities.

Better enforcement

From now on, any new vehicles to be used for the long distance transport of animals (over 8 hours) must be equipped with a satellite navigation system. This will allow better controls on the enforcement of EU rules on travel and rest times. Older trucks which are already in use have until 2009 to install this equipment.

Time and space

Regulation 1/2005/EC does not include new measures on traveling times or stocking densities, as the Commission's original proposal had envisaged, due to Council's failure to reach a compromise on this issue at the time (see IP/04/1391). However, Commissioner Kyprianou has committed to bringing forward proposals on these 2 important aspects of animal transport before the end of 2009.

The European Food Safety Authority (EFSA) has already issued opinions on stocking densities for animals in transport, and

the Commission will closely consult Member States and stakeholders on this issue.

For more information, see: http://ec.europa.eu/food/animal/welfare/index_en.htm

- **Cat and Dog Fur: Commission Proposes Total EU Ban**

IP/06/1586, Brussels, 20 November 2006

The European Commission has today adopted a proposal to ban the import, export and sale of cat and dog fur in the EU. There is evidence that cat and dog fur is being placed on the European market, usually undeclared as such or disguised as synthetic and other types of fur. The vast majority of the cat and dog fur is believed to be imported from third countries, notably China where the rearing of these animals for this purpose is practiced. Many Member States have introduced their own specific legislation against cat and dog fur in response to the strong opposition of EU consumers to the trade of fur from these animals. However, as these national bans are divergent, they may cause disruption to the internal market. The proposed Regulation adopted today addresses EU citizens concerns and creates a harmonized approach, prohibiting all production, marketing and imports and exports of cat and dog fur in the EU. It also establishes a system of information exchange on the detection of cat and dog fur.

Markos Kyprianou, Commissioner for Health and Consumer Protection, said, "The message that we have received from EU consumers has been loud and clear. They do not find it acceptable to farm cats and dogs for their fur, nor do they want products containing such fur sold on the European market. The EU ban we are proposing today will mean that consumers can rest assured that they are not inadvertently buying products containing cat or dog fur. In view of the broad political support for this measure I am confident that the European Parliament and the Council will ensure its adoption at the earliest opportunity."

Public and political concerns

Findings of cat and dog fur on the EU market have provoked a strong response from EU consumers, who have asked for measures to be taken to prevent such fur and fur products from being sold in the EU (through letters to the Commission and MEPs as well as through petitions). The Commission has been informed that such fur has been found not just on clothing but also on a number of personal accessories as well as children's soft-toys. There has also been great political demand to introduce an EU ban in this area. Both the European Parliament and the Council of Ministers have officially asked the Commission to draft proposals on an EU ban on cat and dog fur, which would be more effective than national bans and help to restore consumer and retailer confidence. As there is no practice of cat and dog fur production in the EU, third country (especially Asian) imports are considered to be the origin of such fur. Therefore, a complete ban on the imports of cat and dog fur accompanied by a ban on intra-Community trade in such fur will assure consumers that it will no longer be sold in anywhere in the EU.

Harmonized approach

A number of Member States have responded to public concerns by introducing national legislation on cat and dog fur, and legislative initiatives are underway in response to public campaigns against companion pets being used for fur production. However, there are differences in the Member States' ap-

International News...

proaches, ranging from bans on the rearing and slaughter of cats and dogs to labeling requirements to restrictions on production and/or imports. These divergences may pose difficulties for consumers, retailers and traders who wish to carry out cross-border transactions in other types of fur. A uniform EU ban on marketing and trading in cat and dog fur will set out a clear-cut legal situation and a level playing field throughout the Community and remove unnecessary barriers within the internal market.

Tests and controls

Enforcing this ban on cat and dog fur will require good detection methods that can differentiate between cat and dog fur and other fur, even when the cat and dog fur is treated or dyed. Several Member States are already employing effective detection methods to check for cat and dog fur on their markets (e.g. Mass Spectrometry, DNA testing etc). The proposed Regulation states that Member States should regularly exchange information on detection methods for cat and dog fur, and share details of tests which are most efficient, so that fur imports and products on the market can be checked.

Next steps

The draft regulation will now be considered by the European Parliament and the Council of Ministers for adoption by the co-decision procedure.

For more information, see: http://ec.europa.eu/food/animal/index_en.htm

• CoE, EU and OIE Agree on a Joint Declaration on Animal Welfare in Europe

Press release – 724(2006), Strasbourg, France, 24 November 2006

The Council of Europe (CoE), the European Union (EU) and the World Organization for Animal Health (OIE) today adopted a joint declaration entitled “Animal Welfare in Europe: achievements and future prospects.” The Declaration, which commits to greater cooperation on all aspects of animal welfare, was adopted at the close of a one-and-a-half-day international workshop aimed at bridging the gap between animal welfare legislation and its practical application.

Senior government and veterinary representatives from 50 countries in the European region took part in the workshop, which was hosted by the Council of Europe in Strasbourg, in cooperation with the European Union and the OIE. They had the opportunity to exchange best practice solutions and discuss ways to overcome social, legal, and economic obstacles that hinder the effective implementation of animal welfare guidelines throughout Europe. The workshop also allowed the CoE, EU and OIE to consider how their existing activities could complement each other, with a view to maximizing the efforts being made to improve animal welfare in Europe.

In the Declaration adopted today, the Council of Europe, the OIE and the European Union commit to providing mutual support and cooperating on all aspects of animal welfare, from the elaboration of legislation, to the training of veterinary professionals and para-professionals, to raising public awareness of the societal value of animal welfare. The important link between animal welfare and the need for adequate scientific and veterinary expertise is stressed in the document.

Furthermore, the Declaration commits to efficiently assisting countries to comply with, develop or enforce animal welfare laws, standards and guidelines at a national level.

Andrea Gavinelli, Deputy Head of Unit for Animal Welfare in the European Commission, said, “The European Commission

is constantly working to ensure the highest possible level of animal welfare in the EU. A strong body of EU legislation is in place in this respect, which we review and update as necessary, in line with latest developments and scientific advice. We are also committed to promoting animal welfare standards internationally, as is reinforced in our Action Plan on Animal Welfare. This workshop has been an excellent opportunity for countries from the entire European region to come together to look for solutions to current obstacles and to share best practice experiences. We must continue to work towards the common goal of improving animal welfare, both domestically and at international level.”

“Proper animal welfare can be determined scientifically and this workshop was a great opportunity to stress its direct link with animal health and demonstrate it is a genuine domain of expertise that needs our full attention,” Dr Sarah Kahn, head of the OIE International Trade Department said.

For more information, Council of Europe legal affairs http://www.coe.int/T/E/Legal_Affairs/Legal_co-operation/Biological_safety_use_of_animals/

China

• Emergency Measures Adopted by the Chinese Government Following the Pet Food Contamination Incident (05/04/07)

<http://www.china-embassy.org/eng/xw/t316294.htm>

The Chinese Government attaches great importance to the pet food contamination incident in the United States. Investigations were immediately carried out in March 2007 and a host of emergency measures have been taken to ensure the hygiene and safety of export plant-origin protein products. The measures include the following:

- Increase supervision on all export plant-origin protein products listed under mandatory inspection with focus on melamine. Products found to contain melamine shall be banned from export or domestic sale.
- Exercise stricter export inspection and require relevant export companies to increase screening and prevent evasion of inspection. Require companies to honestly and earnestly fulfill foreign trade contract and declare the use of the products to the inspection and quarantine authorities at various levels. Carry out inspection and examination on those used as animal feed or human food processing material strictly according to the requirements of the importing countries or regions. Violations of the rules on the use and addition of chemicals or other banned substances will be dealt with severely.
- Introduce a registration system for companies exporting plant-origin protein products and strengthen supervision and management on additions and manufacturing process so as to ensure the safety of plant-origin protein products.
- To prevent mal-declaration of plant-origin protein products destined for use in human food or animal feed as non-mandatory products, the General Administration of Quality Supervision, Inspection and Quarantine (AQSIQ) will work with the General Administration of Customs to list plant-origin protein products under the category of mandatory inspection. 🍌




Recent Products from AWIC and USDA

NEW! - Resource Guides and Proceedings

- **Bioethics Symposium: Proactive Approaches to Controversial Welfare and Ethical Concerns in Poultry Science, January 2007**
http://www.nal.usda.gov/awic/pubs/FTAAProceedings/BioethicsSymposium2007_2.pdf
- **Information Resources on the Care and Welfare of Ferrets**
AWIC Resource Series No. 38, December 2006
<http://www.nal.usda.gov/awic/pubs/Ferrets06/ferrets.htm>
- **Information Resources on the Care and Welfare of Rodents**
AWIC Resource Series No. 37, December 2006
<http://www.nal.usda.gov/awic/pubs/Rodents/rodents.htm>
- **Information Resources on the Care and Welfare of Horses**
AWIC Resource Series No. 36, December 2006
<http://www.nal.usda.gov/awic/pubs/Horses/horses.htm>
- **Disposal of Dead Production Animals**
Revised November 2006
<http://www.nal.usda.gov/awic/pubs/carcass.htm>
- **Johne's Disease—*Mycobacterium avium* subsp. *paratuberculosis*: A Debilitating Enteric Disease of Ruminants**
Revised October 2006
<http://www.nal.usda.gov/awic/pubs/johnes/johnes.htm>
- **Information Resources on Marine Mammals**
AWIC Resource Series No. 35, August 2006
<http://www.nal.usda.gov/awic/pubs/MarineMammals/MarineMammals.htm>
- **Environmental Enrichment for Nonhuman Primates Resource Guide**
AWIC Resource Series No. 32, July 2006
<http://www.nal.usda.gov/awic/pubs/Primates2006/Primates.htm>
- **Information Resources on Elephants**
AWIC Resource Series No. 18, Updated June 2006
<http://www.nal.usda.gov/awic/pubs/elephants/elephants2006.htm>

NEW! - AWIC Information Resources Available on CD-Rom

- **Animals in Research:**
Amphibians, Fish and Reptiles; Bats; Birds; Ferrets; Fish; Insects; Invertebrates; Molluscs; Opossums; Rabbits; Swine
- **AWIC Resources on Literature Searching for Alternatives:**
Articles; Slides from the AWIC Workshop; AWIC Searching Brochure; Searching Tutorial; Alternatives Search Worksheet
- **Diseases:**
Avian Influenza; Bovine Spongiform Encephalopathy (BSE); Johne's; Newcastle; Tuberculosis; West Nile Virus; Zoonotic
- **Farm Animals:**
Beef Cattle; Disposal of Dead Animals; Emus and Ostriches; Induced Molting in Chickens; Livestock and Poultry Handling and Transport; Dairy Cattle; Swine; Proceedings: Swine Well-being; South American Camelids; Horses
- **Information Resources for IACUCs, 1985-2000**
- **Techniques, Methods and Procedures:**
Pain and Distress; Analgesia and Anesthesia; Cage Wash and Sanitation; Environmental Enrichment; Spaying and Neutering
- **Zoo and Wildlife:**
Amphibians, Fish and Reptiles; Bats; Birds; Elephants; Emus and Ostriches; Ferrets; Old World Camels; Opossums; Pandas; South American Camelids; Tigers; Zoo Library Directory
- **Environmental Enrichment:**
Nonhuman Primates and Other Laboratory Animals
- **Marine Mammals and Other Aquatic Species:**
Molluscs; Fish Welfare; Invertebrates; Amphibians, Fish and Reptiles; Marine Mammals; Handling Fish Fed to Fish-eating Animals; Sterilization of Marine Mammal Pool Waters; Marine Mammal Water Quality 

“Meeting the Information Requirements of the Animal Welfare Act”

The Animal Welfare Information Center (AWIC) of the U.S. Department of Agriculture, National Agricultural Library (NAL) has developed a 1- ½ day workshop for individuals who are responsible for providing information to meet the requirements of the Animal Welfare Act.

The regulations of the act require that investigators provide Institutional Animal Care and Use Committees (IACUC) with documentation demonstrating that alternatives to procedures that may cause more than momentary pain or distress to the animals have been considered and that activities do not unnecessarily duplicate previous experiments. A thorough literature search regarding alternatives meets this Federal mandate. An alternative is any procedure which results in the reduction in the numbers of animals used, refinement of techniques, or replacement of animals.

The objectives of the workshop are to provide:

- an overview of the Animal Welfare Act and the information requirements of the act.
- a review of the alternatives concept.
- a comprehensive introduction to NAL, AWIC, and other organizations.
- instruction on the use of existing information databases/networks.
- online database searching experience.

This workshop is targeted for principal investigators, members of IACUC's, information providers, administrators of animal use programs, and veterinarians. All participants will receive a resource manual.

The final workshop of the year will be held at the National Agricultural Library on October 24-25, 2007. The workshop is limited to 22 persons.

Please note: You must receive confirmation of your registration request. If you do not receive a confirmation notice within one week, please contact the Center. In the event a workshop session is cancelled by AWIC, registrants will be notified as soon as possible.

To register, use the registration form found at <http://awic.nal.usda.gov/workshops> or contact AWIC at phone: (301) 504-6212, fax: (301) 504-7125, e-mail: awic@nal.usda.gov or write to: AWA Workshops, Animal Welfare Information Center, U.S. Department of Agriculture, National Agricultural Library, 10301 Baltimore Avenue, Room 410, Beltsville, MD 20705--2351

The U.S. Department of Agriculture (USDA) prohibits discrimination in all its programs and activities on the basis of race, color, national origin, age, disability, and where applicable, sex, marital status, familial status, parental status, religion, sexual orientation, genetic information, political beliefs, reprisal, or because all or a part of an individual's income is derived from any public assistance program. (Not all prohibited bases apply to all programs.) Persons with disabilities who require alternative means for communication of program information (Braille, large print, audiotape, etc.) should contact USDA's TARGET Center at (202) 720-2600 (voice and TDD). To file a complaint of discrimination write to USDA, Director, Office of Civil Rights, 1400 Independence Avenue, S.W., Washington, D.C. 20250-9410 or call (800) 795-3272 (voice) or (202) 720-6382 (TDD). USDA is an equal opportunity provider and employer.

United States Department of Agriculture
Agricultural Research Service
National Agricultural Library
AWIC Newsletter Staff
10301 Baltimore Ave. Room 410
Beltsville, MD 20705-2351

OFFICIAL BUSINESS

Penalty for Private Use, \$300

ANIMAL WELFARE INFORMATION CENTER BULLETIN
ISSN 1050-561X

If changes are required to your mailing address, enter them on the label and return it or a copy of it to the above address. If you wish to be removed from the mailing list for this publication check here and return this page or a copy of it to the above address.

ANIMAL WELFARE INFORMATION CENTER Bulletin

(ISSN 1050-561X) is published quarterly and distributed free of charge by the National Agricultural Library. The Animal Welfare Information Center Newsletter provides current information on animal welfare to investigators, technicians, administrators, exhibitors, and the public. Mention of commercial enterprises or brand names does not constitute endorsement or imply preference by the U.S. Department of Agriculture. Articles appearing in this newsletter do not necessarily represent positions or policies of the U.S. Department of Agriculture or any agency thereof.

Tim Allen, Editor
Kristina Adams, Assistant Editor
D'Anna Jensen, Production and Layout

Website <http://awic.nal.usda.gov>

**PRESORTED STANDARD
POSTAGE AND FEES PAID**

USDA

PERMIT NO. G95