

would wager that a very small percentage of them have read it through. Therefore, I am going to summarize some of the points contained in it. In part, it reads:

It is now seven years since the Council for Laboratory Animals first drew the federal government's attention to the unsatisfactory treatment of research animals in Canada.

During the last three years considerable progress has been made in improving the housing and husbandry of laboratory animals in Canadian universities. The Canadian Council on Animal Care, set up by the Association of Universities and Colleges of Canada in 1966 with National Research Council financing, has been active in encouraging the universities to upgrade the 70 per cent of animal facilities which were rated as inadequate at the time of the original survey. Animal care committees have been established at most universities, and steps taken to raise the standards of training of laboratory technicians responsible for the animals.

The Canadian Council on Animal Care has not, however, been given the responsibility of reviewing experimental procedures and this represents a major gap in the protection afforded to laboratory animals. The medical journals report considerable numbers of Canadian experiments involving pain or stress to animals each year, some of which appear, on the face of it, to be of doubtful value in relation to the suffering involved.

I have a dozen documented examples of this. Here is one titled, "Conflict and Conditioned Aversive Stimuli in the Developments of Experimental Neuroses," and I read:

Method: 30 cats used. Cats placed in metal box with floor bars (electrified) $\frac{3}{4}$ inch apart. A squeeze partition employed to note cat's response to constriction. Cats trained to open food container and eat (after 24 hours starving). Then two cats placed together to test "dominance in feeding." After training, shocks given on removing food cover or when food entered mouth.

Some of the "neurotic behavior" noted:

Violently resists entry to cage, agitated pacing and tremors, seeks escape, crouching in corner, violently resists approach to food, hissing, clawing, arching back, persistent violent combat with partner cat, rejects all food, panic, maximum fear of signal, panic reaction to constriction etc.

This is one of the lesser forms of torture recorded in various medical journals. I maintain that the Council for Laboratory Animals is perfectly justified in saying:

We believe that, just as the private individual is required under the Criminal Code to justify the infliction of suffering on an animal, so the scientist should be ready to justify painful experiments before a competent body. We suggest, therefore, that the staff of the Canadian Council on Animal Care be expanded to include a small, but highly qualified, inspectorate of medical and veterinary scientists who would review proposals for experiments approved by University Animal Care Committees and the subsequent reports of these experiments.

The Council goes on to outline the degree of such inspection, and suggest exactly the sort of thing that is proposed in my bill:

• (5:10 p.m.)

We suggest that the federal government take steps:

(1) to provide permanent funding for the inspectorate of the Canadian Council on Animal Care in order to ensure its continuity and

(2) to make the inspectorate responsible to the Minister of Agriculture rather than to the institutions whose facilities it is required to supervise.

It would be impossible to over-emphasize the importance of this second point. It is not a good idea, as I have

Scientific Research Animals Protection Act

suggested, for a conflict of interest to obtain wherein the inspectorate is responsible, as is the case now, to the very colleges and universities that it seeks to supervise. It is far better that the council on animal care should be made, as proposed in this bill and in that of the hon. member for Victoria the responsibility of the Minister of Agriculture, who is in no way responsible to the universities and colleges of Canada. That, I submit, is a good principle to adopt in legislation.

I realize that in the recent press communiqué of the association of universities and colleges of Canada it is claimed that a great deal has already been done in the matter of voluntary controls. Undoubtedly, this is true. Nevertheless, I submit that voluntary controls are not enough, partly because of the conflict of interest I have mentioned and partly because legislation is the only way of making sure that animals in the hands of sadistic, thoughtless or careless people shall not be subject to unnecessary cruelty. Therefore, our reliance on the effectiveness of voluntary controls in this matter is quite insufficient. The council for laboratory animals emphasized this point in a pamphlet that it submitted to the prime minister some years ago. It said that education and persuasion do not go far enough; that what we need and must have, in addition, is an outside policing of those institutions using animals for experimental purposes. We must have legislation. We must have the framework to protect, so far as possible, helpless creatures from unnecessary cruelty at the hands of anyone using them.

May I point out that across Canada there are about half a million helpless animals used every year for experimental purposes. The amount of cruelty perpetrated on those animals is beyond belief and quite beyond the imagination. May I also say to those people who think that the present system is not good enough, that increasing attention is being given in other countries to the substitution of nonsentient materials, or of other methods, in place of animals in testing and experimentation, and to a reduction in the number of animals used through better methodology. A number of practical alternatives to the use of animals have been developed in recent years. These include the use of tissue and organ cultures, chick embryos, chemicals, chromatography, radio-immuno assays, mathematical models and the computer, etc. In medical education, sophisticated audio-visual aids can largely replace the living animal.

But since I was taught in my childhood that often the best is the enemy of the good, so I believe that to make a plea right now for anti-vivisection would be to take away emphasis from that which I believe we most need, legislative controls, legislative standards and legislative prohibitions against the unnecessary cruelty that goes on behind the scenes in our scientific laboratories from coast to coast. I welcome the work which has been done voluntarily and which has improved the situation to a certain extent. Yet I emphasize again, Mr. Speaker, that the only way we can control this experimentation and be sure that these voiceless and helpless creatures are receiving proper attention in our medical laboratories and in university laboratories, is to bring forward effective legislation. It must be legislation which will make these colleges