

Society for Veterinary Medical Ethics

Newsletter

VVF

Volume 3 Number 2
June 1997

President's Message

As I prepare to pass the mantle of the Presidency to **John Boyce**, I am pleased to report that this has been a good year for our Society. My major aims for the year have been to solidify and extend our membership and to develop our Newsletter into a useful and stimulating tool for discussion. Thanks to the tireless efforts of **Bob Speth**, the latter goal has been accomplished. I regularly receive comments from practitioners, academics, and veterinary students about how interesting they find the Newsletter.

Our membership has grown slowly but steadily -- not a simple feat at a time when we are all accustomed to endless requests for subscription fees and dues. We have also been qualified by the Internal Revenue Service as a 501(c)(3) charitable organization.

Finally, at last year's annual meeting I proposed creating an e-mail list open only to our members and devoted to the discussion of ethical issues relating to veterinary medicine and animals. I am pleased to report that this project is well underway. A list, created and maintained by **Ione Smith**, is already in the testing phase, and we hope to have it up and running by the end of the summer. Our list will help immeasurably in the serious discussion of issues, and will make membership in the Society a matter of frequent stimulation and satisfaction for list aficionados.

I would like to share with you some ideas about possible future developments.

1) We now include many laboratory animal practitioners and members of veterinary school and

Jerrold Tannenbaum, MA, JD, President

Albert S. Dorn, DVM, Past-President

John Boyce, DVM, PhD, President-Elect

Kathy Potter, DVM, Secretary

Robert C. Speth, PhD, Treasurer

Richard Fink, DVM, Parliamentarian

Larry Carbone, DVM, Historian

JUN 18 1997

WASHINGTON STATE UNIVERSITY

university facilities. As a reflection of the interest of much of our membership in ethical issues relating to animal science and animal research, I have organized our plenary session in Reno (**the full description of the Annual Meeting is on page 3 of this Newsletter**) this summer around these issues. However, we need to attract and involve in our activities more private clinical practitioners. **Al Dorn**, whom I soon join in the ranks of Past-Presidents, has been especially interested in this goal. I believe that **John Boyce**, from his past work with the AVMA and present activities with the state licensing boards, is uniquely qualified to bring private practitioners into our ranks.

2) Our list of student members, though growing, is still too small. In the next year I hope to contact members at the veterinary schools to see how we can attract more students to join and participate in our discussions.

3) We can still take greater advantage of cyberspace. **Ione Smith** has developed a very nice Web page for the Society, which can be used for all sorts of announcements and exchanges of ideas. We also might use the list and web page to distribute our Newsletter, updated membership lists, or important announcements.

If you are in Reno for the AVMA meeting in July, please join us at our plenary session on Monday the 21st. It promises to be informative and exciting. Thank you for allowing me to be your third President. I wish you all a healthy, happy, and productive year.

Jerrold Tannenbaum, MA, JD

© Copyright 1997 Society for Veterinary
Medical Ethics

President Elect's Message

When I agreed to accept the nomination as President-Elect of the Society for Veterinary Medical Ethics last year, I was in the process of completing a significant career change. As many of you know, I served on the staff of the AVMA for nine years. During that period, I spent a lot of time dealing with animal welfare issues, as staff assistant to the AVMA Animal Welfare Committee and as a member of the 1993 AVMA Panel on Euthanasia. In 1995, one of the groups I worked with as an AVMA staff member, the National Board Examination Committee (NBEC), became an independent organization and it separated completely from the AVMA last year. When it did, I chose to leave the security of the AVMA office for the flexibility of working out of my home as the NBEC's Executive Director. Earlier this year, we moved our home and the NBEC office from suburban Chicago to Bismarck, North Dakota. Bismarck is a much less expensive area to live, and we are finding it to be a much better place to live, too.

The career change has resulted in a new focus with regard to ethical issues in veterinary medicine. While I am still interested in animal welfare and euthanasia, my attention these days is directed more at ethical issues faced by licensing boards. The main job of the SVME's President is to plan the Society's annual meeting for the coming year. I am thinking about putting together a session for the 1998 SVME meeting in Baltimore that will take a look at some of the ethical challenges facing practicing veterinarians and the licensing boards charged with regulating them in the public interest. Any suggestions you may have for topics and speakers would be appreciated.

As the current President, **Jerry Tannenbaum**, mentioned in this newsletter last year, membership is a key area of responsibility for each SVME member. We need to continue to attract new members in order to expand the Society's influence in the profession, through our annual meetings and this newsletter. The other day, I put together a list of about 20 colleagues who were not members of the

Society, and I plan to send them each a personal letter of invitation and a membership application. I hope that each Society member will share with interested colleagues the membership application at the end of this newsletter, and encourage them to join.

Special thanks must be given to two members. **Ione Smith** has put together a great Web site for the Society. If you haven't yet been there, the URL at which you can reach it is: <http://funnelweb.utcc.utk.edu/~ilsmith/SVME.html>. The other person deserving of continuing recognition is our Secretary, **Bob Speth**. This newsletter continues to impress me with its quality and timeliness. Thanks, Ione and Bob, for helping the Society through your outstanding volunteer efforts.

John R. Boyce, DVM, PhD.

Treasurer's Message

It's time to get your checkbooks out again! Included with this issue of the Newsletter is the Dues Renewal Notice. The dues will again be 'only \$20.00'. Make check payable to SVME. Please return the bottom half of the dues notice with your check to: SVME, c/o Bob Speth, VCAPP, Washington State Univ., Pullman, WA 99164-6520.

At the present time, the Society has 140 members: 133 are Regular Members and 7 are Student Members. As of May 31, 1997 the Society's assets are \$2846.56. Aside from interest on the Society's bank account (\$25.25 so far this year) our income arises entirely from dues payments. Expenditures so far this year (January 1 to May 31) have been \$226.05 for postage for the Newsletter and Constitution vote, office supplies and photocopying of the Newsletter.

Thanks again to all of you for your support for the Society and your work towards its growth and development.

Bob Speth, Ph.D.,

Exciting Plenary Session Set for Reno

The annual SVME plenary session for 1997 will be held in conjunction with the AVMA meeting in Reno. Our session will be held on **Monday, July 21 in the Peppermill Hotel**. The convention manager of the Peppermill has indicated that actual rooms will be assigned to AVMA affiliated groups on the day of their meetings. Room assignments will be posted at the entrance to the convention area at the Peppermill.

Our discussion meeting will begin at 9 am and run, with a lunch break, until 4:30 pm. At 4:30 pm we will have our annual business meeting, during which next year's officers will be elected and miscellaneous business will be discussed.

At the time this issue of the Newsletter went to press, some of our speakers had not yet settled on a title for their talk. The general topic of their discussion is indicated below.

This will be an interesting and stimulating meeting. If you will be in Reno on the 21st, please attend. And if you are still making plans, please consider spending the day with us.

EDUCATING STUDENTS AND THE PUBLIC ABOUT ETHICAL ISSUES IN ANIMAL RESEARCH AND ANIMAL WELFARE.

- 8:30 - 9:00 Gather in the meeting room.
- 9:00 - 9:15 **Jerrold Tannenbaum**, Introductory remarks about the day's topic
- 9:15 - 10:00 **Jerald Silverman**, "Opening Minds to Different Views About Animal Use in Research and Teaching"
- 10:00 - 10:45 **Ione Smith**, "Dialogue or Diatribe? Reason vs. Rhetoric"
- 10:45 - 11:00 Break
- 11:00 - 12:00 **Susan Paris**, "Animal Rights Impact on the Public's Perception of Animal Research"
- 12:00 - 1:00 Lunch break
- 1:00 - 1:45 **Richard Simmonds**, "Benefits of Animal Research for Animals"
- 1:45 - 2:30 **Lawrence Carbone**, "The public life of dogs: The special role of dogs in the Animal Welfare Act"
- 2:30 - 2:45 Break
- 2:45 - 3:30 **Robert Speth**, "Educating students and the public about 'Animal Rights'."
- 3:30 - 4:15 **General Discussion**. Questions to be presented to the group will include:
1) Do we have an obligation to present to students and the public a "balance" of pro- and anti-research positions? 2) What is the difference between education and indoctrination? 3) What should be the role of the AVMA and other professional groups in educating veterinary students about ethical issues in animal research? 4) What should be the role of our Society for Veterinary Medical Ethics?
- 4:30 - 5:30 **Annual business meeting**

Slate of Officers Proposed

At each year's business meeting, the Society elects officers for the following year. Our Constitution requires that nominations of officers be presented to the members at least 30 days before the meeting. As President, I am pleased to nominate the following members of the Society for offices. The terms of office of Parliamentarian, and Historian run for 2 years. **Dick Fink**, our Parliamentarian, and **Larry Carbone**, our Historian, have 1 year remaining in their terms. Under our Constitution and By-Laws, the sitting President-Elect, who is presently **John Boyce**, becomes President at the conclusion of the year's business meeting. (The President and President-Elect serve for 1 year.) Only the offices of **President-Elect**, **Treasurer** and **Secretary** are to be filled at our meeting in Reno.

It gives me great pleasure, on behalf of the present officers of the Society, to nominate **Bob Speth** for the office of President-Elect. For the past three years, Bob has been the most visible member of the Society to all our members, and he has certainly been the hardest working. He has turned the Newsletter into a first-rate publication, has collected dues and maintained our membership lists, and worked tirelessly and patiently on our application to the IRS for 501(c)(3) status. Bob is Associate Professor in the Department of Veterinary and Comparative Anatomy, Pharmacology, and Physiology at Washington State University. He is a first rate researcher and scientist. He has been an active and well-known contributor to debates on the use of animals in research. Bob will lead our Society with the energy and intelligence that have marked his invaluable contributions to the Society's formative years. I also nominate **Bob Speth** for re-election as Treasurer this next year. By the time he is President, we shall find another member to assume these duties and will appoint a new Newsletter editor.

I am also pleased to nominate **Ione Smith** for the office of Secretary. Ione has her DVM degree from the University of Tennessee, where she is now a Ph.D. candidate. Her major area of scientific

interest concerns stereotypical behavior in animals. Ione created and maintains our Society's Web page and has been working on our long-awaited e-mail list. As Secretary, Ione will bring us into the age of cyberspace.

Jerrold Tannenbaum, MA, JD.

New Member Profiles

Gary Block, DVM works part-time at the Animal Emergency Center in W. Bridgewater, MA. while pursuing a Masters degree in the Animals and Public Policy program at Tufts University. He is interested in moral theory and its relationship to animal use in our society, the use of animals in Veterinary education and xenotransplantation. He is the National Director of the Student Chapters of the Association of Veterinarians for Animal Rights (AVAR), but confesses he is grappling with the philosophical concept of "rights."

Dennis J. Chmiel Jr. is a Veterinary student at Tufts University. He notes "Veterinary Medicine and ethics are like two sides of the same coin, while you can direct your focus to one side of the coin, the other side will always remain an inseparable part of it. This analogy became apparent to me during a recent course in Veterinary Ethics and Jurisprudence here at Tufts and previous work at Tufts Center for Animals & Public Policy. The exposure I gained has helped me modify certain personal values and question my opinions in numerous areas in which I was otherwise ignorant and lacked perspective. I suspect that other Veterinary students/Veterinarians throughout the country would also benefit from similar insights and the SVME would seem an excellent forum for such a task. By encouraging awareness of the ethical and legislative issues and by promoting discussion to define the factors which act upon these issues, we can make possible the development of educated and meaningful opinions which will in turn positively influence the ethical and legislative policies which govern our profession."

New Member Profile (continued)

Helen Chuang is a Veterinary Student at the University of California, Davis. Her interest focuses on the issue of how to decide on the quality of life and euthanasia in a small animal private practice.

Mary (Libby) Coleman is a Veterinary Student at Mississippi State University. She is interested in all aspects of Veterinary Ethics.

Linda M. Contos, DVM is the Main Campus Veterinarian at the University of New Mexico in Albuquerque. She is interested in the use of animals in research and in Public Health matters.

Deni Elliot, Ed.D. is the Director of the Practical Ethics Center at The University of Montana and hold the titles University Professor of Ethics and Professor, Department of Philosophy. Her work involves faculty development to improve research and pedagogy in applied and professional ethics for the teaching of required ethics courses, of which there are 42 to choose from at the University. Her 'animal' interest is primarily through IACUC participation as 'the non-scientist' at Dartmouth when she directed the Ethics Institute there and continued membership on the IACUC at UM. She has done some writing on ethics and animal research as part of her work on the larger questions of ethics in scientific research. Her work in applied and professional ethics

includes production of documentaries and writing about journalism ethics, but also includes a documentary and some writing on genetic testing.

Duane Flemming, DVM, J.D., FAVO is a Veterinary Ophthalmologist and practicing lawyer, specializing in Animal & Veterinary Law. He is a Regional Director of the American Veterinary Medical Law Association and a member of the California Veterinary Medical Association (CVMA) Legislative Committee and the CVMA Ad Hoc Committees for Continuing Education and Feline Post-Vaccinal Sarcoma. He is also the column editor of the California Veterinarian Journal column on Veterinary Law & Ethics. His ethical interests

center around those issues involved in the actual practice of Veterinary Medicine, particularly those affecting the Vet-Vet and Vet-client relationships.

James G. Fox, DVM, is Professor and Director of Comparative Medicine at the Massachusetts Institute of Technology (MIT).

Linda Fulton, DVM, MS, is Clinical Veterinarian and Lecturer in the Department of Research Services and Animal, Dairy, and Veterinary Science, at Clemson University in South Carolina. Her interests focus on veterinary ethics and agricultural practices, research animals and analgesic use.

Susan Fussell, DVM is Clinical Veterinarian in the Department of Animal Care and Veterinary Services at the University of Western Ontario. She has been in Laboratory Animal Medicine for 11 years while also working with both small and food animals and teaching (veterinary technicians). Her principal interest in ethics relates to issues surrounding the use of animals in research. On the personal side she is also very interested in the ethics of human interactions with their environment. Of note, her email signature file contains the quote by Piet Hein: "Problems worthy of attack prove their worth by hitting back."

Torgny Jeneskog, VMD, PhD is the Laboratory Animal Veterinarian (University Veterinarian) and Associate Professor at Umeå University, since 1983. His interest in the Society is related to "veterinary anesthesiology", and specially related to animals in research etc. He has been chairman of the Umeå Local Ethical Committee on Animal Experiments 1980-1988, and is since 1992 chairman of the Ethical Committee and member of the National Board for Laboratory Animals (CFN) in Sweden.

Steven L. Leary, DVM is the Assistant Vice-Chancellor for Veterinary Affairs and Director, Division of Comparative Medicine at Washington University School of Medicine in St. Louis, Missouri. He is a member of the AVMA's Animal Welfare Committee. His interest in veterinary ethics focuses on the use of animals in biomedical research.

New Member Profile (continued)

Brent Martin, DVM is the Director of the Vivarium at the University of California at Santa Barbara. His interests focus on the use of animals in research. He is a frequent and valuable contributor to the COMPAMED bulletin board (editor's note).

Tim Montgomery, DVM is the owner of the Dacula Animal Clinic in Dacula Georgia. He is a long-time member of the Ethics Committee of the AVMA.

Jose Peralta, DVM, MS is presently a Ph.D. student in animal science at Cornell University in Ithaca NY. In his participation in Cornell's Institutional Animal Care and Use Committee (IACUC) for the last couple of years, he has become more interested in animal welfare issues and the ethical use of animals, especially for research, and would like to be more involved in such issues in the future.

Gayle Roberts, DVM is a private practitioner in Irvine California and the Chair of the California Veterinary Medical Association Ethics and Professional Conduct Committee.

Rachel Rothschild, J.D., is the Assistant Dean of the School of Veterinary Medicine at the University of Wisconsin. Her interest in Veterinary Medical Ethics arises from 15 years of association with the profession through her activities at the School of Veterinary Medicine. Those activities include, serving as the risk manager at the Veterinary Medical Teaching Hospital, speaking to students on a variety of topics, and serving as the liaison between the school and the Wisconsin Veterinary Examining Board.

Mary Schmidt, DVM, MS is from Pendleton, Indiana. She works as a research consultant to animal research facilities helping them develop compliance programs addressing requirements of USDA, PHS, FDA/GLP and AAALAC. She is also active in the IVMA Animal Welfare Committee. Her interest in SVME is to join in a forum that discusses the many ethical issues our profession is facing.

Anthony (Tony) Schwartz, D.V.M., Ph.D is the Associate Dean for Academic Affairs at Tufts University School of Veterinary Medicine in Boston, Massachusetts.

Doug Stark, DVM is a private practitioner in Grand Junction Colorado. He feels strongly that the Veterinary Medical profession has an obligation to the public in the area of internal self-regulation and quality assurance. He feels that the peer review process offers an excellent means of accomplishing this goal.

Karen Timm, DVM, PhD is Associate Professor at the College of Veterinary Medicine at Oregon State University. She teaches first year veterinary microanatomy and third year special animal medicine. Her interest in the Society relates to the ethical use of animals, a general interest in ethics, and the teaching of veterinary students.

Paul Townsend, B. Vet. Med., DLAS, MRCVS is the Head of the Animal Services Unit at the Central Veterinary Laboratory in New Haw, Addlestone Surrey, United Kingdom. He is a member of the Council of Management of the British Laboratory Animal Veterinary Association. His main interest is in the use of animals in biomedical research and ethical models for making decisions about such use.

Julia Wang-Lewis, DVM is a resident in Laboratory Animal Medicine at the University of California at Davis. Her interest in the Society stems from recognition of the need to communicate with others facing the dilemma of how to deal with personal and professional conflicts that arise from being in the field of Laboratory Animal Medicine.

Craig L. Wardrip, DVM is clinical veterinarian, and Instructor in the Dept. of Surgery at the University of Chicago, in Chicago, Illinois. He is interested in the ethics of animal use in research and the ethics of veterinary private practice.

Bruce T. Williams, DVM is a private practitioner at the Renton Veterinary Hospital in Renton, Washington. Rumor has it that he and our immediate Past-President Al Dorn were in 4-H together in Illinois a few years ago. Bruce currently serves on the ethics committee of a regional medical center. His interests in the Society relate to the issues of scarce resource allocation, informed consent, and futile medical treatment. He hopes to be able to translate ethical issues in human medicine

New Member Profile (continued)

Bruce T. Williams, DVM (continued)

into a form practicing veterinarians can use in their daily practice. His view is that ethical behavior can be taught best by example and discussion. "As general practioners, we may be somewhat isolated from the best kinds of contact with our peers. We must take responsibility for our own ethical growth." He also has an interesting email signature file quotation: "If you pick up a starving dog and make him prosperous, he will not bite you. This is the principle difference between a dog and a man." ---- Mark Twain

Editor's Note: If I have left any new members off this list please accept my apologies and let me know so I can include your mini-biosketches in the next issue of the Newsletter. Members who joined since May 31st will be profiled in the next issue.

Bob Speth

THE QUESTION:

In the last issue of the Newsletter our President **Jerrold Tannenbaum** posed the question:

In March of this year, Dr. Ian Wilmut announced that he and his colleagues in Scotland had succeeded in cloning a sheep, one "Dolly," from an adult sheep. This event has sparked a flurry of comments and commentaries in the public media regarding ethical issues raised by cloning. However, virtually all of the published comments have dealt with the issue of whether it is, or could ever be, ethically appropriate to clone human beings. The comments appear to assume that no ethical issues are raised by the cloning of animals. Are there in your view distinctive and important ethical issues raised by the cloning of animals? If so, what are they and what would you say about them?

The following are the responses received from our members:

John Boyce

With regard to ethical concerns about cloning animals, I really don't see much of an ethical issue here, as long as the cloned animals do not intentionally suffer from painful conditions. It doesn't seem much different to me than intensive selective breeding using artificial insemination and embryo transfer, or producing inbred strains of mice and other animals. Cloning certainly does not present for me the same ethical concern as do transgenic animals, many of which do suffer from painful conditions, some intentionally (when they are designed as models of animal or human diseases) and others unintentionally (such as the somatotropin transgenic animals of a few years ago). As to why cloning of animals isn't much of an issue to me, while cloning of human beings is, that's the subject of another discussion.

Gary Block

Cloning continues to move rapidly ahead despite serious medical, ethical, and public policy concerns. Biomedical researchers have plunged into the question of whether they could successfully clone without adequate regard for whether they should be pursuing this areas of research. Veterinarians and the veterinary profession have been surprisingly silent on this issue, as well as on the societal debate surrounding cloning, despite the fact that both have major ramifications for our profession, as well as animal and human health and welfare.

Veterinarians have been entrusted with a responsibility to protect animal health and relieve animal suffering, yet cloning technology will undoubtedly inflict considerable pain and suffering on animals. Animals will be bred, raised, confined, and in many instances killed for these purposes. Although research involving animals is often justified on the grounds that it will ultimately benefit other animals, one would be hard pressed to make a

THE QUESTION: (continued)

utilitarian argument regarding cloning which did not leave animals deep on the debit side of the equation; to say nothing of the interests of individual animals.

The widely reported "success story" of the recently cloned sheep often left out the fact that of 277 fused pairs of cells (adult donor cell plus recipient egg) only one - "Dolly" - survived. As with many developing medical techniques (involving animals), a large number of failures will translate into a large loss of animal life. In other cases, animals have and will continue to be born with, serious and sometimes fatal genetic defects. Even with refinement of these techniques, our society, and in particular veterinarians, must seriously consider utilizing animals that will be bred, raised, and in many cases killed, solely as means to human ends.

This is not simply an issue of ethics and animal welfare. There are serious human health and welfare issues which appear to have taken a back seat to the hype and excitement surrounding cloning. Rather than looking to animals, human health might be better served by devoting time and money to cloning or creating human tissue and organs. Although this may seem farfetched to some, human "skin" and even a primitive liver have been grown in vitro using human cells. Despite major media coverage of the possible future for biomedical research technologies such as cloning, certain historical facts and technical questions are being ignored. Whether cloning research involving animals will ultimately become clinical realities remains to be seen. With so many people in this country lacking access to basic health care, would our scarce medical resources be better utilized toward proven medical techniques rather than toward technologies which may never come to fruition?

Indicative of the ambivalence our society has to these animal research techniques, a survey cited in *The Economist*, noted that 53% of people opposed cloning animals for research. In another example of our inconsistency between attitudes and treatment of animals, 71% of those surveyed were prepared to

"abandon their principles" if it was for life-saving purposes. This degree of confusion cries out for a rational and ethically sensitive voice. Who better than veterinarians to lead the discussion and debate on this issue. As professionals with unique training in science, ethics and animal health, veterinarians would best serve the public by acting as moderators in the debate over cloning animals, xenotransplantation and other forms of animal-based genetic engineering.

James Harris

I think that cloning when used properly has a place. If it is used for example to increase and improve the world's food supply it is an appropriate use. Currently all the bananas grown commercially are clones I consider cloning as I do gun powder. Its not the discovery that is the problem, it is the use or more properly the misuse.

Edward Leonard

Pirating is already a sizable and profitable business in some nations. This particular technological advance may make genetic piracy relatively easy. Imagine businesses cloning animals for profit, without permission of the legal owners. It seems mass production of pirated animal genetic material would only take the necessary equipment and a profit opportunity. The potential role of veterinarians in these matters seems obvious.

As always, the veterinary profession should encourage the selection of animals that have suitable traits and temperament. Physically and behaviorally unsuited breeds, types, or crosses should not have their cloning promoted, regardless of the potential for profit.

Susan Paris

While the news that a scientist in Scotland has successfully cloned a sheep will engender an important and necessary debate on the ethics of cloning humans, we mustn't lose sight of the nearer-

THE QUESTION: (continued)

term beneficial impact of this discovery on human health.

With cloned animals modeling human diseases, scientists will be able to study more efficiently and effectively genetic diseases such as cystic fibrosis for which there is currently no cure. Cloned animals will be able to produce pharmacologically useful proteins, such as the clotting factor used by hemophiliacs. The chronic shortage of organs for transplantation could be ended by cloned animals created with hearts, kidneys and livers that are suitable for transplant into humans.

No doubt, in the coming days animal rights groups will use scare scenarios to try turn public opinion away from animal cloning. Those of us who are facing illnesses ourselves or who have seriously ill loved ones say it is time to get beyond tabloid headlines and bad science fiction. Let's make our judgment on animal cloning based on its ability to improve the health of us all.

Editor's Note: This response was published in The Washington Times, Boston Globe, Chicago Tribune, Detroit News, Wall Street Journal and other newspapers throughout the country shortly after the announcement that a sheep had been cloned in Scotland.

Karen Purcell

In my mind there are very distinctive ethical issues raised in the concept of cloning. These are actually many of the same issues raised in the cloning of plants, long established in the scientific world.

Of course, there is the first issue of "Who are we to play favorite deity here?" Do we have the 'right' to change the genetics of any species just because we can, or we, as the scientists, feel an improvement can be introduced? Plants and animals have developed for millions of years under the influence of many factors, but man has increased his influence first by breeding for specific traits, and now

the ability to reproduce specific animals in quantity that have proved desirable. As veterinarians, our oaths stand to protect the animal species that cannot speak for themselves. Do we have a sufficient understanding of genetics and immunology to know that the individuals chosen for cloning are indeed an improvement on that animal, for survival in the face of environmental change? Are we setting these breeds up for mass die-outs from newly evolved viruses? Also, as veterinarians, we need to study the scientific methods used for the cloning process. Is the resultant offspring truly identical? Could any part of the process introduce harmful mutations due to the manipulation the DNA? What is the health status of the clone? Is it as healthy as it's previous genetic counterpart? Is it fertile? Are its mental processes equivalent? (Though in a sheep, that may be difficult to determine!)

I think that we as human beings have distinctive contributions to make regarding the issue of human cloning, with our veterinary training providing the necessary scientific knowledge to understand the methods used.

Andrew Rowan

There are certainly some interesting issues raised by the cloning of animals and by Wilmut's feat. However, perhaps the most interesting aspect of the media fallout to Dolly was why it occurred. Cloning is not that new. John Gurdon succeeded in cloning frogs back in the early 1970s at Oxford (I was there at the time and I remember it causing a mild flurry of interest in the media but mostly in the scientific press) and we have been cloning cattle (in the sense of splitting eight cell embryos into individual cells which then develop normally into embryos) for ten years or more. Most of the recent public excitement seems to have been focused on the idea that one might take an adult (or pre-adult) human and create a genetic clone. This has been variously criticized because it undermines God's creation and/or the integrity and uniqueness of the individual. There appears to be (much) less public (and bioethicist)

THE QUESTION: (continued)

concern about the undermining of God's creation when the cloned adult is a non-human animal. Nevertheless, the submission of yet another element of "natural" procreation to the biotechnologist does further erode the "mystery" of life and of God's exclusive domain and renders animals a smidgen more like the biological machines of Cartesian thought. In that sense, the advance of biotechnology into procreation and "creation" has an impact on our values and our ethical thinking.

The other criticism regarding the uniqueness of the individual raises interesting questions about animal personality and cognition. In fact, there is a paradox in the human equation too. If we are simply the predetermined product of our genes such that the cloning of one of our cells will create an identical individual, then how much free-will and individual integrity can we humans lay claim to? If, on the other hand, each individual is much more than the outcome of his or her gene products then why should we be that concerned about cloning a human adult. In the animal realm, the more the animal is simply viewed as a product of its genes and the less it is perceived to have "free will", personality and individuality, then the less the public is likely to be concerned about its cloning. Hence, the cloning of frogs arouses little public concern but an adult ape would be a very different matter, I wager.

There are also some interesting welfare aspects (i.e., pain and distress) to animal cloning. First, the harvesting of ova for fertilization is not a completely benign procedure. Second, cloning appears to produce oversized or giant neonates at a high rate which causes all kinds of problems at parturition. It is not entirely clear why this might be so although a colleague says that one of the thoughts is that the fetus develops normally but that the signal for parturition is either delayed or defective. Third, of the five fertilized eggs (out of 277) that developed into live births, three had severe organic defects that led to their dying shortly after birth.

Bob Speth

Just as Pasteur's work on vaccines, Banting and Best's identification and characterization of insulin, and countless other biomedical advances have improved human and animal health, animal cloning offers similar, if not even greater potential benefits. While we must always be vigilant to the risks and ethical concerns posed by this and any other new technology, to reject this and other new technologies would be analogous to the proverbial Ostrich putting its head in the sand to avoid danger. Thus from a Veterinary Ethical perspective, it would be wrong to eschew this technology due to exaggerated worries of fearmongers who paint frightful pictures of Frankensteinian farm animals to make an emotional appeal against cloning technology. To put this advance into perspective, USDA Leaflet 177, issued in 1939 was issued to allay fears that Pasteurization of milk was a health hazard! More recently milk was attacked by those who insisted that the use of bovine somatotrophin (growth hormone) would contaminate the milk supply.

Already the hysteria generated by the cloning of Dolly is dying down and is being replaced by objective scientific and rational ethical appraisals of the benefits of this advance. I, for one, am optimistic that this discovery will provide great benefits to animal health and well-being.

V.E. Valli

[Regarding the issue of numbers of animals used in research, cloning] is a double edged sword. e.g., many experiments are of the type designed to detect treatment related or dose related effects. A clone of animals would assist to determine if there was ANY effect and require less animals to do so but may be less useful than outbred animals which would detect the idiosyncrasy that occurs in the occasional animal and needs to be found.

THE QUESTION: (continued)

Christine S. F. Williams

First, let me declare myself as a long term sheep raiser, with an affinity for Finn-Dorsets, and a realization that all of my sheep could be better than they are! I am delighted that Wilmut cloned a Finn-Dorset. Now the breed has received more than its 15 minutes of fame! My problem would be the decision as to which one of my 175 breeding ewes I would choose. None of them are perfect. When you breed livestock, there is always the expectation that some of them will be better. It would actually be quite depressing if all the clones performed exactly the same, especially if one of their attributes was undesirable. If you are bio-pharming, what you want is a transgenic product. If you are real-farming, you want a sheep that has wonderful maternal behavior, easy-lambing, loads of high-antibody colostrum, good udder and body conformation, longevity, disease resistance, doesn't jump into feeders, doesn't crawl under fences, doesn't run down the chute at 50 miles an hour, and generally doesn't annoy me.

Overall, I haven't seen much discussion on the ethical issues of livestock artificial insemination (AI), embryo transfer and embryo splitting, nor has there been much on the ethics of creating all kinds of dog breeds with genetic and conformation "defects", so it's understandable that there has been little discussion of cloning animals.

Announcements

Charter member of SVME, **William Waddell**, VMD, has written a new book entitled: "A Challenge to Christianity." This book describes Dr. Waddell's experience securing housing in Fargo, ND in the 1960's. This book encourages readers, regardless of race, religion, color, creed, age, gender, or social preference, to seek and find the good within.

Those wishing to purchase a copy of this book can order it from Dr. Waddell at P.O. Box 678, Kaaawa, HI 96730, or by calling 808-237-8209 which will enable you to charge the cost of the book, \$17.50 plus \$4.50 S/H. Virginia residents must add

6 % sales tax. Make check payable to Book Scholarship fund.

A new journal, "Journal of Applied Animal Welfare Science" to be edited by Stephen Zawistoski and Kenneth J. Shapiro, will begin publication in 1998. SVME member **David B. Morton**, will be the section editor of the Laboratory Animal Section of the Journal. Manuscript submissions relating to a variety of animal welfare issues are now being solicited. For additional information regarding manuscript submissions contact Stephen Zawistoski, ASPCA, 424 East 92nd St., New York, NY 10128, or Kenneth Shapiro, PSYETA, P.O. Box 1297, Washington Grove, MD 20880.

The 36th Annual Conference of the Canadian Association for Laboratory Animal Science / L'association canadienne pour la science des animaux de laboratoire (CALAS/ACSAL) will be held from **07-09 July 1997**, at the Hotel du Parc, Montreal, Quebec, Canada. The theme of the Conference is: Reduce, Refine, Replace; The Road to the Future. The program includes workshops, scientific sessions in laboratory animal science, a poster session, and an autotutorial section.

The scientific sessions will include a seminar on Transgenics (CALAM sponsored), and an Ethics/Regulation Forum. Scheduled workshops include: Horseback Riding As A Means for Stress Release and Fun; Introduction and Use of the Internet; Cost Accounting and Rate Setting for An Animal Facility; Macaque Facility Tour; Basic Techniques in Animal Use Methodology; Technology and Practical Use of Mouse Embryo Transfer; Pain Management for the Research Animal Model; Dealing with Death and Euthanasia; the Care and Use of Plastic Cages.

For more information please contact:

Dr. Don McKay, CALAS/ACSAL National Office, Biosciences Animal Service, CW 401 Biological Sciences Building, The University of Alberta, Edmonton, Alberta, Canada T6G 2E9
Telephone: 403-492-5193 Fax: 403-492-7257
Email: dmckay@gpu.srv.ualberta.ca
Web Site: <http://www.utoronto.ca/calas/>

APPLICATION FORM SOCIETY FOR VETERINARY MEDICAL ETHICS

NAME:

BUSINESS
ADDRESS:

HOME
ADDRESS:
(Optional):

ELECTRONIC MAIL ADDRESS:

PLEASE SEND MAIL TO: Office ☐ Home ☐

Phone:
Business:

Phone
Fax:

Phone:
Home:

OCCUPATIONAL AND PRESENT POSITION:

PROFESSIONAL DEGREES:

PROFESSIONAL MEMBERSHIPS:

INTERESTS IN VETERINARY ETHICS:

MAJOR OBJECTIVES OF THE SOCIETY ARE:

- A. To encourage ethical practices and professional behavior of veterinarians in all aspects of the profession.
- B. To increase the understanding of the philosophical, social, moral and ethical and value issues encountered by the veterinary profession.
- C. To sponsor seminars and other presentations on ethics and value issues at local, state, regional and national meetings of veterinarians and other interested individuals.
- D. To promote the teaching of ethical and value issues at colleges of veterinary medicine and to identify speakers on these subjects.
- E. To encourage persons from other professions and disciplines, such as biomedical research, discussions and studies of these issues.
- F. To exchange information about veterinary ethical issues via bulletins, periodicals, and newsletters.
- G. To maintain archives of appropriate documents and materials related to these disciplines.

*I hereby make application to the Society
for Veterinary Medical Ethics*

(Signature of Applicant)

(Date)

*The dues are currently \$20.00 per year. Please mail this application to Dr. Robert Speth,
College for Veterinary Medicine, Washington State University, Pullman, WA 99164-6520*