

PUBLIC HEALTH—GENERAL SCIENCE

# Dogs or Babies?

## California Voters Being Asked To Choose Between Medical Progress and Antivivisection Legislation

By WATSON DAVIS

**T**HE LIVES of millions of men, women and children now and in the years to come? Or the lives of a few dogs and other animals? Which will you save?

This question, along with the "funny money" \$30 every Thursday plan and over a score of other referendum propositions, will come before California voters on Nov. 8.

The proposed antivivisection legislation, masquerading as a "humane pound law," would plunge a knife into scientific research in California universities, laboratories and other institutions. It would throttle medical inquiries into the causes and cures of disease.

It is quite possible that those who vote for this restrictive legislation will be signing their own death warrants. For in California as in other parts of the world, bands of scientists are working valiantly to conquer diseases not yet controllable or fully understood. They must have animals upon which to experiment, just as others before them have with the help of animals discovered the way to cure, control and prevent so many ills of mankind.

Loving his "man's most faithful companion," the misled or misinformed California voter for the proposed "regulation of pounds" act may very well be endangering the health of his dog. For veterinarians use scientific medicine in keeping well or curing pets and other animals.

### Forced to Fight

Repeatedly in recent years the scientists, who have little enough time as it is for their investigations, have been forced to come out of their laboratories to fight for the right to continue the sort of animal experimentation that made possible modern surgery and the control of such diseases as diphtheria, smallpox, syphilis, diabetes, and other ills that once raged unchecked.

Emotional ladies, with the help of well-paid publicity experts, insistently plague legislative bodies with demands for what they call "antivivisection" legislation. Despite long campaigns they have been generally unsuccessful.

The California "humane pound" act represents a change of tactics. An attempt to mislead the public into approving antivivisection referendum legislation through an indirect attack is being made. The proposed act upon casual reading may appear to be innocuous, but lawyers find jokers in it. Anyone collecting animals for any purpose except for sale as pets becomes a "poundmaster" and any such person would be prevented from allowing any domestic animal to be used for experimental purposes. Animals for experimental or demonstration purposes would have to be bred en masse on the very premises of medical institutions. As this is quite impracticable, the effect would be to pre-

vent animal experimentation on any useful scale. Moreover, such a law would open the way for persecution of medical institutions and scientists through a constant inquisition by the antivivisectionists.

Nationwide opposition to the proposed California legislation has developed in lay, scientific and medical circles. Leading churchmen, scientists, and others are advising the California electorate to defeat this referendum proposal as they did a similar attempt in 1922. In California the California Society for the Promotion of Medical Research in opposing the measure has the backing of foremost educators, professional and lay men and women, as well as scores of scientific societies.

The mis-named "humane pound" act is called by its opponents "an intelligence test for the people of California."

## • Advice From Scientific Experts

I am convinced that it would be detrimental to medical progress, both human and veterinary, to prohibit the use of animals in legitimate experiments. On the contrary, laws should be passed which will authorize definitely the use of animals for scientific experiments by any approved research institution. — *Surgeon General Thomas Parran, U. S. Public Health Service.*

With the aid of animal experimentation modern medicine has freed man from the constant fear of pain, suffering, disease and death. Animals have benefited from such investigations as much as man himself — *Dr. Morris Fishbein, Editor, Journal of the American Medical Association.*

Further progress in the development of new methods of diagnosis and the perfection of proved methods now in use will undoubtedly be seriously impeded if research investigators are to be denied the use of animal experimentation humanely conducted. — *Dr. Olin West, Secretary, American Medical Association.*

The number of animals sacrificed for medical purposes is small in comparison with the hecatombs that are killed for food or sport or merely because they interfere with our material welfare or comfort. All legislation that is designed to obstruct the work of these serious trained scientific investigators must be counted as a disservice to the best interests of mankind. — *Dr. W. H. Howell, formerly professor of physiology, Johns Hopkins University, Vice-President and Chairman Executive Committee, Science Service.*

One single game season inflicts more suffering on our animal friends than all the experimentation that has been done upon them through all the centuries for medical purposes. — *Dr. R. A. Millikan, Nobelist in Physics; Chairman, Executive Council, California Institute of Technology.*

It would be a terrible catastrophe for the people of California should they be deceived by propaganda and vote in favor of a bill which would put an end to the valuable studies which are being pursued in the laboratories of their state for the good of both man and animal. Investigation of animals has led to saving humanity much suffering and with the defeat of the proposed law it may be expected to continue to bring increasing health and happiness to Californians and all mankind. — *Dr. George R. Minot, Nobelist in Physiology and Medicine; director, Thorndike Memorial Laboratory, Boston City Hospital.*

It would be a very evil thing to restrict the beneficent use of the lower animals for the study of diseases that affect them and mankind in the same way. I know from experience that no cruelty is inflicted on animals used in the laboratory for experiments; in fact, it would defeat the very purpose of the work to do so. I sincerely trust that no restrictive law will be passed that might interfere with further progress that means so much for the welfare of mankind. — *Dr. Thomas Hunt Morgan, Nobelist in Physiology and Medicine; Director, Kerckhoff Laboratories, California Institute of Technology.*

The antivivisectionists weigh stray dogs against babies, it is charged, and if the measure becomes law, the babies will lose. One slogan of the scientists is: "If you do not kill this measure, it may kill you!"

## Hopes For Cancer Cure Depend on Use of Animals

By JANE STAFFORD

ALL over the country people are beseeching scientists to find a cure for cancer. Every parent in the land is hoping that next summer doctors can give his child something to protect him from infantile paralysis. And who that dreads the dentist's drill does not long for scientists to discover the way to cure or prevent tooth decay?

But if the people of California vote on Nov. 8 to make the proposed "regulation of pounds" proposal a law, they may be sounding the death knell for these hopes.

A telegraphic survey by Science Service

shows that scientists in California are now working on the vitally important problems of cancer, leukemia, infantile paralysis, high blood pressure, heart disease, pneumonia and other lung diseases, sterility and fertility, human nutrition with all its angles and glandular disorders.

They are trying to find a non-inflammatory, safe inhalation anesthetic; a non-addiction substitute for morphine; and a way to prevent and control brain convulsions, arthritis, liver disorders, amebic dysentery, leprosy, trichinosis, plague, horse "sleeping sickness," disorders of the menopause, anemia and the common cold.

All of these would be interrupted by the passage of the so-called humane pound bill.

One of California's research laboratories has come very near to giving the world a preventive of infantile paralysis. Another has found a fertility factor in food with practical applications that are being investigated in laboratories all over the country. Neither of these discoveries—protective nasal sprays for infantile

paralysis and the fertility vitamin E—could have been made without the use of animals for experimental study.

### Improved Insulin

A new and improved insulin to make life easier for diabetes sufferers was developed at another California research laboratory—with the aid of animals. At this same laboratory scientists found a practical way of using a gland product of the body to check growth of cancer in rats. This research is being pushed right now in the hope of extending its usefulness. The gland substance is not a cure for cancer, but the scientists are trying to find what there is about it that can affect cancer. Following this lead, they may arrive at a cancer cure or, at least, at discovery of the mechanism in the body which, when it goes wrong, paves the way for cancer to develop. But the studies cannot be made without the use of animals.

It is such studies, however, that the so-called humane pound law would seriously hamper if not stop altogether. The proposed law does not specifically prevent research, but as Dr. Loren R. Chandler, dean of Stanford University's Medical School, stated in a wire to Science Service, it "would seriously interfere with all medical research and prevent much."

Research is not the only life-saving, health-preserving activity that will be hampered by passage of this proposed law. Animals are used routinely in laboratories that make tests to diagnose certain diseases.

### Needed For Tests

Syphilis cannot be eradicated, as everyone now hopes it will be, without tests to diagnose early, infectious cases. And the Wassermann test for syphilis cannot be made without animals. In medico-legal cases animals are often needed to settle questions of poisoning. They are needed for tuberculosis tests and for tests to determine pregnancy early.

The proposed law might also hamper the activities of laboratories that make vaccines and serum to protect against disease. California has several such laboratories, and they all need animals to use in testing their products before they are known to be safe for use on humans.

Demands for medical care regardless of ability to pay are now widespread and vociferous. But a demand for a measure to limit use of animals for medical research is a demand to choke medical care at its roots in the research and medical school laboratories.

## On Proposed California Law

No intelligent thoughtful person can even by the greatest stretch of imagination believe that this law has been drafted by humane, sane thinking persons in the interest of humanity to man's best friend, the dog. Obviously the brain child of propagandists or of persons unfamiliar with the great discoveries in medicine which have been possible only through the use of, but not abuse of, animals in the laboratory, it offers no rational or actual protection for the dog but presents a most effective hindrance to further protection from disease of every helpless child as well as his mother and father in the State and perhaps every State in the union.—*Dr. William P. Murphy, Nobelist in Physiology and Medicine; Harvard Medical School.*

The anemia work to learn how the body can build new blood hemoglobin was begun in San Francisco at the University of California in 1914. In all this work during the next ten years and subsequently dogs have proven to be the most useful and reliable experimental animal. The work could not have been done on other animals.—*Dr. George H. Whipple, Nobelist in Physiology and Medicine; Dean, School of Medicine and Dentistry, Rochester University.*

It would be most unfortunate if California should pass the humane pound law limiting useful animal experimentation which has been so effective in advancing our ability to combat disease not only in humans but also in the animals which this law aims to protect. Sentimentality should not be allowed to defeat

the true humanitarian aims of science.—*Dr. John P. Peters, Yale University School of Medicine, secretary of the Committee of Physicians for the Improvement of Medical Care.*

The basis of advance in medicine and surgery is animal experimentation. The routine control of many diseases likewise requires the use of animals as test objects. Legislative actions that tend to restrict such experimentation under properly controlled auspices are against sound public policy and tend to increase of human suffering and of the death rate itself.—*Dr. Frank R. Lillie, President, National Academy of Sciences; Emeritus Professor of Embryology, University of Chicago.*

This measure says in effect the leaders in medical education and medical research in the State of California can not be trusted to treat unclaimed stray dogs and cats humanely.—*Dr. A. J. Carlson, Professor of Physiology, University of Chicago.*

Scientific gains made possible through laboratory use of animals result in the saving of hundreds of thousands of lives annually in the United States, have made possible such medical advances as the "iron lung," insulin, present-day anti-toxins and vaccines, have led to the control of cholera, yellow fever, typhoid fever, and are today opening the way to national control of syphilis.—*Dr. Elliott C. Cutler, Chairman of the American Medical Association's Committee for the Protection of Medical Research.*

Science News Letter, November 5, 1938

Science News Letter, November 5, 1938