

AMERICAN ASSOCIATION FOR THE ADVANCEMENT OF SCIENCE

Science serves its readers as a forum for the presentation and discussion of important issues related to the advancement of science, including the presentation of minority or conflicting points of view, rather than by publishing only material on which a consensus has been reached. Accordingly, all articles published in *Science*—including editorials, news and comment, and book reviews—are signed and reflect the individual views of the authors and not official points of view adopted by the AAAS or the institutions with which the authors are affiliated.

Editorial Board

ROBERT L. BOWMAN	EVERETT I. MENDELSON
JOSEPH W. CHAMBERLAIN	NEAL E. MILLER
JOHN T. EDSALL	JOHN R. PIERCE
EMIL HAURY	KENNETH S. PITZER
ALEXANDER HOLLAENDER	ALEXANDER RICH
WILLARD F. LIBBY	DEWITT STETTIN, JR.
GORDON J. F. MACDONALD	CLARENCE M. ZENER

Editorial Staff

Editor

PHILIP H. ABELSON

<i>Publisher</i>	<i>Business Manager</i>
DAEL WOLFLE	HANS NUSSBAUM

Managing Editor: ROBERT V. ORMES

Assistant Editors: ELLEN E. MURPHY, JOHN E. RINGLE

Assistant to the Editor: NANCY TEIMOURIAN

News and Comment: DANIEL S. GREENBERG, JOHN WALSH, ELINOR LANGER, LUTHER J. CARTER, MARION ZEIGER, JANE AYRES

Europe: VICTOR K. MCELHENY, Flat 3, 18 Kensington Court Place, London, W.8, England (Western 5360)

Book Reviews: SYLVIA EBERHART

Editorial Assistants: ISABELLA BOULDIN, ELEANORE BUTZ, BEN CARLIN, GRAYCE FINGER, NANCY HAMILTON, OLIVER HEATWOLE, ANNE HOLDSWORTH, KONSLYNNIETTA HUTCHINSON, KATHERINE LIVINGSTON, DIRGHAM SALAH, BARBARA SHEFFER

Advertising Staff

<i>Director</i>	<i>Production Manager</i>
EARL J. SCHERAGO	ROSE MARIE ROMAGNOL

Sales: New York, N.Y., 11 W. 42 St. (212-PE-6-1858): RICHARD L. CHARLES, ROBERT S. BUGBEE
Scotch Plains, N.J., 12 Unami Lane (201-889-4873): C. RICHARD CALLIS

Chicago, Ill. 60611, 919 N. Michigan Ave., Room 426 (312-DE-7-4973): HERBERT L. BURKLUND

Los Angeles 45, Calif., 8255 Beverly Blvd. (213-653-9817): WINN NANCE

EDITORIAL CORRESPONDENCE: 1515 Massachusetts Ave., NW, Washington, D.C. 20005. Phone: 202-387-7171. Cable: Advancesci, Washington. Copies of "Instructions for Contributors" can be obtained from the editorial office. ADVERTISING CORRESPONDENCE: Rm. 1740, 11 W. 42 St., New York, N.Y. 10036. Phone: 212-PE 6-1858.

Animal Care Legislation

Congress has passed, and the President has signed, a bill that establishes federal controls over the transportation, sale, and handling of animals intended for research use (*Science*, 19 August). The bill is a compromise in which neither advocates nor opponents of federal control got what they wanted.

The position of scientists on this matter has long been clear. As far back as 1881 the Medical Congress meeting in London unanimously resolved: "That this Congress records its conviction that experiments on living animals have proved of the utmost service to medicine in the past, and are indispensable for its future progress; that, accordingly, while strongly deprecating the infliction of unnecessary pain, it is of opinion that, in the interest of men and animals, it is not desirable to restrict competent persons in the performance of such experiments."

Advocates of federal control—the antivivisectionists of the past who now prefer the more positive sounding label *animal welfare*—contend that substantial unnecessary pain is inflicted; that animals are often ill fed, ill housed, and ill cared for in research laboratories and on the premises of animal dealers; that state laws do not prevent these abuses; and that federal controls are therefore necessary.

In the past, many legislative proposals have been introduced, but not brought to vote. Recently, however, the advocates of legislation have worked with unremitting vigor, and some time ago it became clear that some form of legislation was likely to be adopted. Congress still, however, had a number of choices. Should federal controls apply only to animal dealers, or also to research laboratories, and perhaps to research procedures? Should the legislation apply only to cats and dogs, or also to other animals? (Logically and ethically there would seem to be no reason to distinguish between a dog and a pig, but the emotional arguments center on cats and dogs, not on pigs or *Drosophila*.) Should the legislation concern itself only with safeguards and restrictions, or should it also offer positive aid to the improvement of animal-care facilities and procedures? The advice Congress received on these issues pointed in all directions. Congress did what the whole legislative process is designed to do: effect a compromise between conflicting points of view. The advocates of legislation have gotten part of what they asked for. But Congress acted with restraint; research will not be seriously handicapped. Additional government regulations have been established; regulatory machinery will be developed; and the taxpayer will have an additional bill to pay.

The long history of the controversy and the fact that no one got all he wanted make it seem unlikely that the argument will now end. Those who want stronger controls will continue to press. The new legislation is a compromise between what they wanted and the complete absence of federal controls. Another compromise in a few years is possible, and if that one comes, it will be between the present provisions and the stronger controls then being asked for. More stringent legislation need not be enacted, however, if biologists can persuade Congress that self-regulation through the American Association for the Accreditation of Laboratory Animal Care and other professional organizations is adequate to safeguard the welfare of the animals that are essential for biological and medical research and education.—DAEL WOLFLE