

THE UFAW HANDBOOK ON THE CARE AND MANAGEMENT OF LABORATORY ANIMALS

With an Appendix on Statistical Analysis

EDITED BY

ALASTAIR N. WORDEN, M.A. (Cantab.), B.Sc. (Lond.), M.R.C.V.S., A.R.I.C.

MILFORD PROFESSOR AND DIRECTOR OF RESEARCH IN ANIMAL HEALTH, UNIVERSITY
COLLEGE OF WALES, ABERYSTWYTH; FORMERLY OF THE INSTITUTE
OF ANIMAL PATHOLOGY, UNIVERSITY OF CAMBRIDGE

WITH A FOREWORD BY

PROFESSOR T. DALLING, M.A., M.R.C.V.S., F.R.S.E.

DIRECTOR, VETERINARY LABORATORY, MINISTRY OF AGRICULTURE AND FISHERIES, WEYBRIDGE, SURREY



LONDON

BAILLIÈRE, TINDALL AND COX 7 & 8, HENRIETTA STREET, COVENT GARDEN, W.C.2

(Reprinted) 1949

First Edition 1947 Reprinted, 1949

PRINTED IN GREAT BRITAIN

This book is protected under the Berne Convention. It may not be reproduced by any means, in whole or in part, without permission. Application with regard to reproduction should be addressed to the Publishers.

FOREWORD

EVERY scientist who correctly appreciates the part played by laboratory animals in research work recognizes the importance of using the right technique in their maintenance and handling. Not only is the accuracy of our results at stake, but we are under an obligation to show the utmost consideration for the animals themselves. It behoves us, therefore, to see that they are produced and maintained under conditions that will conform to a high standard of humaneness and will at the same time ensure that our conclusions shall be thoroughly reliable.

Many of us have attempted to improve on the older methods of rearing and keeping laboratory animals and doubtless in some cases our efforts have been successful. The information has, however, been largely confined to the place in which the knowledge was gained, and only exceptionally has it been available

to other laboratories.

In this handbook there is brought together a mass of information which will satisfy a long-felt want. It provides a collection of knowledge gained by first-hand experience, and even the most knowledgeable among us will find in it something which will be of value to him. At any time we may have to make use of species with which we have hitherto been but poorly acquainted, and we now have a reference book which will guide us in this important subject.

The Universities Federation for Animal Welfare is to be congratulated on its choice of writers, and the collaborators on the able manner in which they

have presented their subjects.

T. DALLING.

WEYBRIDGE.

PREFACE

This handbook, which has been produced by the Universities Federation for Animal Welfare (U F A W, 284 Regent's Park Road, London, N.3), is intended as a practical introduction to the husbandry of laboratory animals, for use both by research workers and by technicians. It is not to be regarded as a manual of

experimental technique.

The method adopted in its compilation has been to secure, wherever possible, an expert worker to draft the chapter on each subject, species or group of species, and to obtain supplementary information by means of a questionnaire. This questionnaire was sent to all holders of a British licence for animal experimentation and to a number of persons and bodies in the United States of America, the Soviet Union, Canada, India, South Africa, Palestine, Sweden, Algeria and elsewhere. UFAW is indebted to various scientific journals (including Science, Lancet, British Medical Journal, Veterinary Record, Journal of the American Medical Association, Canadian Medical Association Journal and Canadian Journal of Comparative Medicine), to the British Council (through Mrs. E. M. Malley, of the Science Department), to its late President, Sir Peter Chalmers Mitchell, F.R.S., and to Dr. Leptesa (of the Soviet Red Cross and Red Crescent) for their kind assistance in the search for information.

The war interfered, in some cases perhaps rather seriously, with the carrying out of this plan. Many experts were unable to undertake the drafting of chapters or even the provision of information, while a few potential contributors, including Lieut. N. A. W. Hayward, R.M., of Exeter, were killed in action. Death has ended also the participation of contributors in civilian life. The late Mr. R. M. Ranson, of the Bureau of Animal Population, Oxford, had undertaken to draft three chapters and to assist in many other ways, while Miss Phyllis Kelway, of Huddersfield, completed the preliminary draft, upon which Chapter 7 was to have been based, only two days before she died. The late Mr. D. L. Robarts, of Weybridge, had fortunately submitted his contribu-

tion to Chapter 4 before his untimely death.

Certain species have been omitted deliberately, except for the brief notes and references in Chapter 23. It was felt that little useful purpose would be served by attempting to deal in the limited space available with the monkey, dog, cat, horse and other ungulates as laboratory animals, and invertebrates also have been but scantily noticed. In a later publication it might be possible to extend the list of species, but for present purposes information of the type given in Chapter 23 is regarded as more helpful in connection with them.

An index has been provided, although for all practical purposes the contents of the book are clearly listed on pp. xi to xiv. It must be stressed here that references to many further sources of general information are to be

found in Section 8 of Chapter 2, pp. 42-45.

Several members of the staff of the National Institute for Medical Research (and in particular Dr. C. H. Andrewes, M.D., F.R.S., and Mr. R. E. Glover, M.A., F.R.C.V.S.) were kind enough to read the first drafts of the various chapters and to make valuable suggestions; in many instances it has been possible to make alterations or additions accordingly. Mr. Charles Elton and

PREFACE viii

his colleagues at the Bureau of Animal Population, Oxford University, have also afforded considerable assistance in the revision of certain chapters and in tracing Mr. Ranson's notes. Dr. G. Lapage, of the Institute of Animal Pathology, Cambridge University, has helped to handle the Russian contributions. Mr. E. W. Shingfield, of the drawing-office staff, Army Operational Research Group, has re-drawn figs. 15, 17, 22, 24, 38, 45-47 and 64-70. My personal thanks are due also to Dr. F. Jean Vinter and Major C. W. Hume, of UFAW, who have rendered invaluable assistance in editing, and to my father, Dr. C. N. Worden, for preparing most of the manuscript for the press.

ALASTAIR N. WORDEN.

EAST BARNET. May 1945.

in the book:

Note added in proof, August, 1946.

RENEWED thanks are due to many of those mentioned above, in particular to members of the staff of the National Institute for Medical Research and of the Bureau of Animal Population, Oxford. It has not been possible to take advantage of many kind offers to read the proofs but I am most grateful to Mr. S. J. Edwards (Agricultural Research Council Field Station, Compton), Dr. C. Horton Smith (Ministry of Agriculture, Veterinary Laboratory, Weybridge) and Dr. J. R. M. Innes (Imperial Chemical Pharmaceuticals), for their assistance in this respect and to my secretary, Miss M. Joan D. Addyman, who has shared in all the tasks at this stage. The following include those who have helped in many ways but to whom adequate acknowledgement or reference is not made elsewhere

Prof. E. D. Adrian (Physiological Laboratory, Cambridge), Dr. G. Alexander (Department of Surgical Neurology, Edinburgh), Mr. F. D. Asplin (Ministry of Agriculture, Veterinary Laboratory, Weybridge), Prof. F. G. Bartlett (Psychological Laboratory, Cambridge), Dr. A. Beck (Public Health Laboratory, Burnley), Dr. S. Beck (Glasgow Royal Cancer Hospital), Dr. D. B. Blacklock (Liverpool School of Tropical Medicine), Major J. A. Boycott (R.A.M.C.), Mr. A. Brownlee (Agricultural Research Council Field Station, Compton), Messrs. Warren E. Buck and E. S. Ward (Meems Bros, and Ward, New York), Prof. J. H. Burn (Department of Pharmacology, Oxford), Dr. H. Burrows (Chester Beatty Research Institute, London), Prof. E. P. Cathcart (Physiological Department, Glasgow), Prof. G. A. Clark (Faculty of Medicine, Sheffield), Miss A. S. Cloe (King's College, London), Dr. T. V. Cooper (County Pathologist, Dorchester), Prof. D. P. Cuthbertson (now at the Rowett Research Institute, Aberdeenshire), Sir Henry H. Dale, P.R.S. (Royal Institution, London), Sir Jack C. Drummond (now Scientific Director, Boot's, Nottingham), Prof. A. N. Drury (Lister Institute of Preventive Medicine, London), Dr. F. J. Dyer (College of the Pharmaceutical Society, London), Dr. I. S. Farrel, Dr. J. S. Faulds (Cumberland Pathological Laboratory, Carlisle), Mr. D. A. Finlayson (Ogilvie Flour Mills Co., Winnipeg), Mr. J. R. Finlayson, Dr. Myron Gordon (New York Zoological Society), Mr. R. F. Gordon (Ministry of Agriculture, Veterinary Laboratory, Weybridge), Dr. W. S. Gordon (Agricultural Research Council Field Station, Compton), Prof. James Gray (Zoological Laboratory, Cambridge), Dr. A. Haddow (Chester Beatty Research Institute, London), Prof. J. B. S. Haldane (University College, London), Dr. John Hammond (School of Agriculture, Cambridge), Dr. M. F. Harbord (Howmill, Carlisle), Dr. Evelyn Hewer (London School of Medicine for Women), Prof. F. G. Hitch (Royal Naval Medical School, Greenwich), Dr. F. D. M. Hocking (Royal Cornwall Infirmary, Truro), Prof. A. StG. Prof. E. D. Adrian (Physiological Laboratory, Cambridge), Dr. G. Alexander (DepartPREFACE

(then at R.A.F. General Hospital, St. Athan), Dr. Catharine Lucas (London School of Medicine for Women), Dr. R. A. McKail (Ballochmyle Hospital, Aryshire), Dr. Douglas McClean (Lister Institute of Preventive Medicine, Elstree), Prof. Wm. C. Miller (then at the Royal Veterinary College, London), Dr. E. M. Morland (then Editor of the Lancet), Dr. S. B. Morgan (Antigen Laboratories, London), Major J. O. Oliver (then at the Command Laboratory, Campbell College, Belfast), Dr. H. J. Parish (Wellcome Physiological Research Laboratories, Beckenham), Dr. P. R. Peacock (Glasgow Royal Cancer Hospital), Dr. N. W. Pirie (Rothamsted Experimental Station, Harpenden), Dr. G. Pontecorve (Department of Genetics, Glasgow), Mr. W. A. Pool (Imperial Bureau of Animal Health, Weybridge), Dr. L. I. Pugsley (Department of Pensions and National Health, Ottawa), Miss M. M. Rayner (Royal College of Veterinary Surgeons, London), Dr. E. G. Rawlinson (Royal Institute of Public Health and Hygiene, London), Mr. F. Ridley (95, Harley Street, London, W.I.), Mr. R. W. Roach (now c/o New Zealand Government), Dr. W. F. Robertson (West of Scotland Neuro-Psychiatric Research Institute, Glasgow), Dr. Sherman Ross (Columbia University, New York), Mr. W. I. Rowlands (Veterinary Investigation Officer, Bangor), Dr. F. F. Rundle (68, Thames Street, Twickenham), Dr. H. Russell (Christie Hospital and Holt Radium Institute, Manchester), Dr. Norah H. Schuster (formerly at the Royal Chest Hospital, London), Mr. H. A. Scott (Purina Mills, St. Louis), Surgeon Lieut-Commander D. Shute (then at the Royal Naval Auxiliary Hospital Liverpool), Dr. M. J. Stewart (School of Medicine, Leeds), Prof. W. J. Tulloch (Medical School, St. Andrews), Dr. C. C. Twort (Portslade, Dr. F. W. Twort (Brown Institute, London), Dr. Janet Vaughan (then at London Blood Supply Depot), Sir Cecil Wakeley (then at Royal Naval Hospital, Gosport), Dr. Walther (Whipps Cross Hospital), Dr. M. A. Watson (Rothamsted Experimental Station, Harpenden), Dr. R. Wien (May & Baker, Dagenham), Prof. G. S.

Sincere apologies are offered for any omissions in this list and for failure to take advantage of all the kind offers to assist in the preparation of the handbook.

ALASTAIR N. WORDEN

University College of Wales, Aberystwyth,

CONTENTS

CHAP		PAGE
	FOREWORD. Prof. T. Dalling, M.A., M.R.C.V.S., F.R.S.E. (Director, Veterinary Laboratory, Ministry of Agriculture and Fisheries, New Haw, Weybridge, Surrey	v
	PREFACE	vii
	CONTENTS	xi
	LIST OF ILLUSTRATIONS	xv
I.	LAW AND PRACTICE: THE RIGHTS OF LABORATORY ANIMALS. Major C. W. Hume, M.C., B.Sc	I
2.	THE ANIMAL LABORATORY. Compiled from various sources 1. Introduction. 2. The construction of an animal laboratory. 3. Food preparation; washing-up and sterilizing equipment. 4. Cages; cage-equipment; watering; bedding. 5. The supply and identification of laboratory animals. 6. Assistants. 7. The infected-animal room. 8. Some notes on technique and on further sources of information (experimental technique; anæsthesia; the sharpening of hypodermic needles). 9. Units of length, weight, volume and temperature.	21
3.	PESTS OF THE ANIMAL HOUSE AND THEIR CONTROL. Prof. P. A. BUXTON, Sc.D., F.R.S. (London School of Hygiene and Tropical Medicine), and J. R. BUSVINE, Ph.D. (London School of Hygiene and Tropical Medicine) 1. General considerations. 2. The bedbug. 3. Fleas. 4. Lice. 5. Mites and ticks. 6. Flies and mosquitoes. 7. Cockroaches. 8. Insect pests of stored foodstuffs. 8. Rats and mice.	49
4.	THE RABBIT. W. KING WILSON (Harper Adams Agricultural College, Newport, Shropshire); with a section on Diseases by R. O. Muir, B.Sc., M.R.C.V.S. (Veterinary Laboratory, Ministry of Agriculture and Fisheries, New Haw, Weybridge, Surrey). 1. Introduction. 2. Accommodation. 3. Nutrition. 4. Breeding. 5. Handling and general management. 6. Anæsthesia and euthanasia. 7. Diseases.	65
5.	THE GUINEA-PIG. DAVID L. HUGHES, M.R.C.V.S., Dip. Bact.(Lond.) (Agricultural Research Council Field Station, Compton, Berkshire)	96

снаг 6.		PAGE
7.	of the Laboratory Rat. Appendix: Wild brown rats. THE BLACK RAT (Rattus rattus). The late PHYLLIS KELWAY (Arkholme, Almondbury, Huddersfield)	19 00
8.	THE MOUSE. The Maintenance and Handling of Mice. P. A. Gorer, D.Sc., M.R.C.S., L.R.C.P., D.A. (Department of Pathology, Guy's Hospital) and P. J. Ewers (Technical Assistant, Chester Beatty Research Institute, Royal Cancer Hospital) 1. Accommodation: the mousery. 2. Nutrition. 3. Breeding, 4. Handling. 5. Anæsthesia and euthanasia. 6. Some observations on the diseases of mice (by P. A. Gorer). 7. A note on the training of assistants.	150
9.	THE WILD HOUSE-MOUSE (Mus musculus). URSULA PHILIP, Ph.D. (Department of Biometry, University College, London)	168
10.	THE WOOD MOUSE. Notes on Breeding Apodemus sylvaticus. The late R.M. RANSON (Bureau of Animal Population, University Museum, Oxford)	170
II.	DEER MICE. Methods for the Rearing of Peromyscus. Prof. Lee R. Dice, A.B., M.S., Ph.D. (Laboratory of Vertebrate Biology, University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, Michigan, U.S.A.) 1. Introduction. 2. Accommodation. 3. Nutrition. 4. Bedding. 5. Cleaning. 6. Handling. 7. Breeding. 8. Parasites and diseases.	171
12.	THE COTTON RAT (Sigmodon). Production of Cotton Rats in Captivity. D. B. MEYER, D.V.M., and MARTHA MARSH, M.S. (Bureau of Laboratories, Michigan Department of Health, Lansing, Michigan, U.S.A.) 1. Introduction. 2. Accommodation. 3. Nutrition. 4. Breeding. 5. Losses. Appendix: Experience in breeding cotton rats at the National Institute for Medical Research.	178

CHAP		PAGE
13.	THE COMMON OR FIELD VOLE (Microtus agrestis). Based on a publication and notes of the late R. M. RANSON (Bureau of Animal Population, University Museum, Oxford)	0 .
	5. Handling and transport. 6. Diseases.	
14.	THE ORKNEY VOLE (Microtus orcadensis). Compiled Introduction. 2. Accommodation. 3. Nutrition. 4. Breeding. 5. Handling.	192
15.	THE GOLDEN HAMSTER (Mesocricetus auratus). E. Hindle, Sc.D., F.R.S. (Scientific Director Zoological Society of London 1. Introduction. 2. Characteristics of the species. 3. Accommodation. 4. Nutrition. 5. Breeding. 6. Anæsthesia and euthanasia. 7. Diseases.	196
16.	THE FERRET. DAVID L. HUGHES, M.R.C.V.S., Dip. Bact.(Lond.). (Agricultural Research Council Field Station, Compton, Berkshire)	203
17.	THE HEDGEHOG. J. T. EDWARDS, D.Sc., M.R.C.V.S. (Research Station, Foot-and-Mouth Disease Research Station, Pirbright, Surrey)	208
18.	THE PIGEON. DAVID L. HUGHES, M.R.C.V.S., Dip. Bact.(Lond.), KATHLEEN J. SPARROW, N.D.P., and DIANA P. EELES, N.D.P. (Field Station of the Agricultural Research Council, Compton, Newbury, Berkshire)	219
19.	THE CANARY. J. W. CORRAN, Ph.D., F.R.I.C., and S. H. EDGAR, Ph.D., F.R.I.C. (Research Department, Reckitt & Colman, Ltd., Carrow Works, Norwich), with a Section on Diseases by C. A. McGaughey, M.A., M.Sc., M.R.C.V.S., D.V.S.M. (Institute of Animal Pathology, University of Cambridge)	231

CHAP.	PAGI
20. THE KEEPING OF AMPHIBIA FOR LABORATORY PUR-POSES. E. M. Stephenson, M.Sc. (lately Lecturer in Biology, University College of the South West, Exeter)	244
21. XENOPUS LÆVIS DAUDIN. R. E. ELKAN, M.D. [Frbg.), L.R.C.P. & S. (E.M.S. Hospital, Bishop Auckland, County Durham)	251
22. FRESHWATER FISH. F. T. K. PENTELOW, M.A. (Naturalist, Ministry of Agriculture and Fisheries)	263
23. NOTES ON SOME SPECIES NOT DEALT WITH IN DETAIL IN THE HANDBOOK	277
Appendix. A CONSPECTUS OF THE ELEMENTS OF STATISTICAL ANALYSIS. Major C. W. Hume, M.C., B.Sc., Chairman of U F A W	283
CUBIECT INDEX	
SUBJECT INDEX	353
AUTHOR INDEX	362

LIST OF ILLUSTRATIONS

Fig.]	PAGE
I	Section of the Animal Laboratory of Virol, Ltd				24
2			• •		24
3					26
4	Automatic balance presented by UFAW to the Institute of An		atholog		07
					27
5					29
6	Plan of the ferret stock cage illustrated in Fig. 5				30
7	Ferret breeding cage designed by McIntosh	•			31
8	Guinea-pig stock cage designed by McIntosh	•			31
9	Guinea-pig breeding-cage designed by McIntosh			• •	31
10	L 0				32
II			1		33
12				* *	34
13	Wheels and discs for exercise				36
14	(a) Rabbit drinking from water-bulb (Chester Beatty Research			• •	37
	(b) Apparatus designed by Wood for filling water-bulbs				37
15	Water-bulb suitable for use with laboratory rodents				38
16	Ear-punch designed by E. C. Wood				40
17	Method of sharpening hypodermic needles		**		45
18	(a) Ctenocephalides canis; (b) Head of Ctenocephalides felis	; (c)	Head	of	
	Leptosylla segnis; (d) Head of Nosopsyllus fasciatus; (e) I sylla cheopis	neau (or Aemo	P-	53
19	(a) Cnemidocoptes mutans; (b) Notoedres cati; (c) Demodex of	anis.	(d) P.	50-	33
19	robtes communis				56
20	roptes communis	acanth	us stra	m-	
	ineus; (d) Polyplax spinulosa	. 5			59
21	General-purpose hutch designed by King Wilson				67
22	Copenhagen type cage for rabbits or guinea-pigs, as used by D	ewar			68
23	Use of illuminated bull's-eye lens in anæsthetizing a rabbit	by int	traveno	us	
	injection				76
24	Pens for guinea-pig breeding stocks at Compton				98
25	Lister design of large cage for groups of rats				II2
26	Breeding-cage, with detachable wire floor and door. (An Laboratory, Lever Bros. & Unilever, Ltd.)	imal .	Resear	ch	113
27	Battery to house twelve large cages. (Animal Research Lat	orato	ry, Lev	rer	
	Bros. & Unilever, Ltd.)				114
28	Lister cage used for vitamin B experiments				115
29	Hut used by Dewar to provide shelter for rats				116
30					117
31	Method of taking vaginal smear adopted at the Dunn Nutrition	nal La	borator	y,	
	University of Cambridge, and the Medical Research Council				127
32	Black rat eating	1			141
33	Young black rats eating				142
34	A corner of the mouse-breeding room at the Chester Be				
	Institute	2	STATE OF THE STATE OF		ISI

vi	ILLUSTRATIONS			
IG.	me and the state of the state o	the m		PAGE
35	The mouse-breeding room illustrated in Fig. 34, showing in detail framework for holding the mouse cages			152
36	Framework and large cages used for the stock mice. (Chester Beatty Institute)	Resea	rch	154
37	Cage designed by Brownlee for experiments involving controlled fo	od inta	ake	
38	by mice. (Wellcome Physiological Research Laboratories) Method of holding mouse recommended by Berenblum. (Sir Willi	am Du	inn	156
5	School of Pathology, University of Oxford)			159
39	Details of cage used for <i>Peromyscus</i>			172
40	Female cotton rat, one year old			178
41	Cotton rat breeding-cage			179
42	Cage used for weaned cotton rats and for those ready for test			179
43	Male cotton rat, six months old, affected with alopecia			182
44	All-metal cage designed by Young for use with Orkney voles			193
45	Box for normal stock hedgehogs. (Foot-and-mouth Disease	Resear	rch	
	Station)			209
46	Structural details of hedgehog box, illustrated in Fig. 45			210
47	Galvanized-iron bin used for individual experimental hedgehogs, mouth Disease Research Station	Foot-a	nd-	211
48	Partridge-breeding pens used for hedgehog-breeding at Oxford	-01/219		211
49	Pigeon lofts at Compton	envete		220
50	Plan of pigeon lofts at Compton	10.40		220
51	Diagrammatic side view of flight and pen			221
52	Perspective drawing of nesting-shelves			222
53	Feeding-table with straw racks			223
54	Canary breeding-cage			233
55	Details of canary breeding-cage illustrated in Fig. 54. (a) section	throi	10h	-33
33	cage: (b) perch: (c) seed trough: (d) nesting-box with pla	ain wo	bood	
	bottom; (e) bird bath			235
56	bottom; (e) bird bath			251
57		b) from	ntal	251
58	(a) Xenopus tadpoles, one day old, attached to water weeds by an	(invisil	ole)	254
30	thread emerging from the cement gland; (b) Xenopus tadpole	s, 6 to	0 8	
	weeks old			256
59	Xenopus lævis Daudin. Development and metamorphosis			257
60	Xenopus test jar with perforated lid, metal clamp and platform	(1)		258
61	Posterior view of: (a) female Xenopus, showing Cloacal Valves; Xenopus, showing absence of valves	(b) m	ale	260
62	Plant for the dechlorination of water			266
63	Cross-section of aquarium			268
64	The standard normal frequency function U			291
65	The standard normal test of significance; probits			346
66	Testing for significance with Student's t			347
67	Testing for significance with the square contingency χ^2			348
68	Nomogram for computing Fisher's z			349
69	(a) Testing for significance with Fisher's z : $\alpha = 0.05$: (b) testing	for sig	ni-	
				50-I
70	ficance with Fisher's z ; $\alpha = 0.01$			352

CHAPTER 1

LAW AND PRACTICE: THE RIGHTS OF LABORATORY ANIMALS

By Major C. W. HUME, M.C., B.Sc.

1. HISTORICAL NOTE. 2. THE LAW AND ITS APPLICATION. 3. BASIC PRINCIPLES. 4. SOME DESIDERATA.

1. Historical Note

The British Association and British Medical Association. At its Liverpool meeting, 1870, the British Association for the Advancement of Science requested the Committee of Section D:

to consider from time to time whether any steps can be taken by them, or by the Association, which will tend to reduce to its minimum the suffering entailed by legitimate physiological enquiries; or any which will have the effect of employing the influence of this Association in the discouragement of experiments which are not clearly legitimate on live animals.

At the Edinburgh meeting in the following year a committee appointed by Section D presented the following report, which was adopted by the General Committee:

(i) No experiment which can be performed under the influence of an anæsthetic ought to be done without it.

(ii) No painful experiment is justifiable for the mere purpose of illustrating a law or fact already demonstrated; in other words, experimentation without the employment of anæsthetics is not a fitting exhibition for teaching purposes.

(iii) Whenever, for the investigation of new truth, it is necessary to make a painful experiment, every effort should be made to ensure success, in order that the suffering inflicted may not be wasted. For this reason, no painful experiment ought to be performed by an unskilled person with insufficient instruments and assistance, or in places not suitable to the purpose, that is to say, anywhere except in physiological and pathological laboratories, under proper regulations.

(iv) In the scientific preparation for veterinary practice, operations ought not to be performed upon living animals for the mere purpose of obtaining greater operative dexterity.

Signed: M. A. Lawson, Oxford. G. M. Humphry, Cambridge.
John H. Balfour, Arthur Gamgee, Edinburgh.
William Flower, Royal College of Surgeons, London.
J. Burdon Sanderson, London.
George Rolleston, Secretary, Oxford.

In 1871 a Committee of the British Medical Association reported in the same sense. Although it is now agreed that these recommendations did not go far

I

enough, nevertheless when we remember that they represent the first informed attempt to arbitrate between the claims of science on one hand and the rights of animals on the other, that the signatories were parties to the suit, and that Britain had only recently discarded such things as colonial slavery and the sweating of children, we must pay homage to the breadth of mind and humanity of the men of science who laid such a foundation for the subsequent developments which will now be described.

A petition calling for legislation was signed by Darwin, Huxley, Jenner, Owen, the Presidents of the Royal Colleges of Physicians and Surgeons, and other leaders of scientific thought, but on 14 April, 1875, Darwin wrote to Hooker: "We now think it advisable to go further than a mere petition." A Bill was accordingly drafted by his son-in-law, R. B. Litchfield, and entrusted to Lyon Playfair, F.R.S., afterwards Lord Playfair. The possessor of this apt patronymic was M.P. for the Universities of Edinburgh and St. Andrews, had held a Chair of Chemistry in Edinburgh, as Gladstone's Postmaster-General had introduced halfpenny postcards, had invented the incendiary shell and the gas shell, and as a Commissioner of the Great Exhibition had helped to found the

Royal College of Science.

It would be unfair not to mention that attention had first been called to the subject by a lay movement organized by Miss Frances Power Cobbe, with encouragement from Queen Victoria, F.R.S., Froude, Tennyson, Carlyle, Lecky, Martineau, Lord Shaftesbury, Cardinal Manning, the Lord Chief Justice, the Lord Chief Baron, and others. The anti-vivisectionists were inspired by humane feelings that deserved respect, but the methodology of scientific research lay beyond their comprehension and they rested their case on an extraordinary claim to the effect that animal experimentation must be useless, though Miss Cobbe herself wisely protested against their doing so (Life, vol. 2, p. 292). Moreover they refused to discriminate between callous and humane research workers, and held all alike up to execration as monsters of cruelty. In this way they alienated sympathizers, and even Darwin, who was too humane to fish with live worms and had written to Ray Lankester (22 May, 1871) that vivisection was a subject that "made him sick with horror" and kept him awake at night, felt compelled to publish a rebuttal of the antivivisectionists' sweeping allegations. He wrote to Romanes (22 April, 1881): "I thought it fair to bear my share of the abuse poured in so atrocious a manner on all physiologists." Tempers were lost on both sides, and the discussion degenerated into a dogfight. In fact, the dogs have gone on barking and scuffling for three-quarters of a century with all the zest and gusto that those engaging animals do bring to that sort of employment. One result is that animal protectionists as such have no voice in implementing the legal rights that have been accorded to laboratory animals. Another is that the constructive discussion of Home Office practice, sine ira ac studio, cannot be carried on in public. Another is that public opinion in scientific circles, which in the eighteen-seventies befriended animals as a matter of course, has until recently been rendered allergic to any reference to the prevention of cruelty. Then animals enjoyed the open patronage of scientists as such, but subsequently they were largely deprived of it by the polemical intemperance of those who intended to act as their champions.

The Cardwell Commission. In May 1875 Lyon Playfair introduced his Bill in the Commons, but a week earlier a Bill promoted by anti-vivisectionists had

been introduced in the Lords. On the advice of Disraeli's government both Bills were therefore withdrawn, and a Royal Commission was appointed. The Chairman was that Viscount Cardwell who as Secretary for War had founded the Army Reserve. The other members were T. H. Huxley, P.R.S., some time Hunterian Professor at the Royal College of Surgeons, and Fullerian Professor of Physiology at the Royal Institution; Sir Eric Erichsen, F.R.S., some time Professor of Surgery at University College, London; W. E. Forster, who had been the minister responsible for the Elementary Education Act of 1870; Lord Winmarleigh, formerly Chief Secretary for Ireland; Sir J. B. Karslake, who had held office as Solicitor-General and Attorney-General; and R. H. Hutton, who had been Professor of Mathematics at Bedford College, London, and joint editor of the National Review, the Economist and the Spectator.

The main report of this weighty Commission was unanimous, but Mr. Hutton added a minority report to the effect that certain species which are popular in this country should be exempted from experiment. The main

report stated, inter alia:

that the infliction of severe and protracted agony is in any case to be avoided; that the abuse of the practice (of vivisection) by inhuman or unskilful persons . . . is justly abhorrent to the moral sense of Your Majesty's subjects generally, not least so of the most distinguished physiologists and most eminent physicians and surgeons.

With reference to the infliction of any pain that was not absolutely necessary they referred to Charles Darwin's dictum that "it deserves detestation and abhorrence" and added:

This principle is accepted generally by the very highly educated men whose lives are devoted to scientific investigation and education. . . .

On the other hand, Huxley, Erichsen and their five colleagues unanimously recorded the following opinion:

Besides the cases in which inhumanity exists, we are satisfied that there are others in which carelessness and indifference prevail to an extent sufficient to form a ground for legislative interference. . . . Cases may not improbably arise in future in which the physiologist may be disposed to underrate the pain inflicted. . . .

The Commission's proposals for legislation were consistent with the British Association's report, and are embodied in the present statute with minor changes and provision for administrative machinery. The concluding paragraph of the unanimous report of the Cardwell Commission was as follows:

We believe that by such a measure as we have now proposed the progress of medical knowledge may be made compatible with the just requirements of humanity. In zeal for physiology the country of Harvey, Hunter, Bell and Darwin may well endure the test of comparison. We trust that Your Majesty's Government and the Parliament of this Kingdom will recognize the claim of the lower animals to be treated with humane consideration, and will establish the right of the community to be assured that this claim shall not be forgotten amid the triumphs of advancing science.

The Act of 1876. The ensuing Government Bill, which became the statute that is in force to-day, was introduced in the Lords by the Earl of Caernarvon on 15 May, 1876. In its original form it appears to have been drafted without sufficient knowledge of the way in which research is done, but it was amended in Committee of the Lords to meet the objections raised on behalf of science. In moving the second reading in the Commons on 9 August (Hansard, vol. 231):

Mr. Assheton Cross (Home Secretary) said [col. 890] that they were endeavouring to put in practice and carry out simply the resolutions of the British Association; and [col. 894] that the Bill, if passed, would set an example to the world that the medical and scientific men of this country had put down the infliction of unnecessary cruelty and pain under the guise of scientific enquiry.

The Bill was attacked on behalf of the anti-vivisectionists by Mr. Holt, and in defence of the reputation of the medical profession by Dr. Ward and by Robert Lowe, F.R.S. The latter, afterwards Lord Sherbrooke, was one of Bright's Adullamites, the first M.P. for the University of London, and an ardent advocate of bicycling.

Mr. Lowe (University of London) said the language of the Bill "was such as to lead to the supposition that the persons against whom it was directed were unworthy of trust and had wicked propensities." He then turned to the general law against cruelty to animals and pointed out that "the law did not say a word in favour of non-domestic animals; so far as they were concerned, their charter of freedom and mercy had not yet begun to be written in the legislation of this country." (Later, in the Committee stage of the Bill, he was to move, without success, the addition of a clause dealing comprehensively with all forms of cruelty and imposing severe penalties on anybody who should "cruelly abuse or torture any animal.")

Sir John Lubbock also condemned, by contrast with "the general sentiments of English men of science, the dreadful sufferings of animals which are caught in traps, and which have so often been known in their torment to gnaw off the limb by which they were held fast." Honour having been satisfied, all parties agreed to the second reading, which took place without a division after a significant intervention by Lyon Playfair.

Mr. Lyon Playfair (Universities of Edinburgh and St. Andrews) said [col. 921]: "We propose to regulate one minute corner of the vast field of the cruelty of the world. When we do so we are bound to survey the whole field for legislation on a future occasion. . . . I know of nothing more cruel than the mode of supplying rabbits to the Billingsgate market. They are caught in traps, and struggle through the whole of the night in cruel anguish, often with broken legs. . . . Now if one of our dozen physiologists was to describe a single experiment made with such reckless disregard of animal suffering he would be scouted by his brother physiologists and driven out of the Kingdom.

"There are, however, well-grounded reasons for legislation, and these operated upon me last year when I introduced a Bill on the same subject... It was in reality prepared by very eminent physiologists, among whom I may mention Mr. Darwin, Mr. Huxley, and Dr. Burdon Sanderson,