28th November, 2005.

Committee Secretary

Senate Rural and Regional Affairs and Transport Committee

Department of the Senate

Parliament House

Canberra ACT 2600

Australia

Phone: +61 2 6277 3511 Fax: +61 2 6277 5811

Email: rrat.sen@aph.gov.au

Dear Sir.

Fransport Committee

Regional and parameters and the special a

AUSTRALIA &
NEW ZEALAND
SOCIETY
for
CELL &
DEVELOPMENTAL
BIOLOGY



Submission re: National Animal Welfare Bill 2005

The Australia New Zealand Society for Cell and Developmental Biology (ANZSCDB) Inc represents 230 scientists involved in biomedical and biological scientific research. Our members, who include some of Australia's most prominent scientists and biomedical researchers, conduct scientific and biomedical research using many different animal models, much of which contributes to Australia reputation for excellence in biotechnology.

The draft Bill will significantly impact on many of our members, particularly the provisions in Parts 8 "Animals used for experimental purposes" and 9 "Funding for animal research etc".

ANZSCDB supports the principle that the use of public monies for animal research should be subject to reasonable oversight and endorses the community expectation that this will involve legislated regulation, monitoring, and compliance requirements. We also support in principle the concept of a single-tier, uniform, national mechanism for this.

We make the following general comments regarding the National Animal Welfare Bill 2005.

- (1) The responsible use of federal funds overall requires that the impact of regulatory requirements on the compliance effort and cost for researchers must be considered, and kept as simple as possible.
 - Compliance effort and cost represents resources that are not spent on productive research.
 - In a large proportion of cases, those resources are provided by government granting bodies such as the Australian Research Council and National Health and Medical Research Council (NHMRC).
 - There should not be multi-layered layered government regulation (i.e. at both state and federal levels). Multi-layered regulation at least duplicates researcher's compliance effort, and if requirements are not exactly the same, greatly increases it, without achieving any benefit for animal welfare, and at the cost of decreasing research productivity.

There are already State regulations with reporting requirements integrated into a system of local Animal Ethics Committees as required by the NHMRC Australian Code of Practice for

ANZSCDBI Secretariat

C/- Walter and Eliza Hall Institute of Medical Research 1G Royal Parade, Parkville, Victoria 3050, AUSTRALIA Phone: (03) 9345 2555, Fax: (03) 9347 0852 Email: lieschke@wehi.edu.au or Heather.Verkade@ludwig.edu.au the Care and Use of Animals for Scientific Purposes. ANZSCDB submits that the proposed Bill appears to mandate a new Federal level of licensing, monitoring, and reporting which appears not to recognise the validity of what is already in place, and which has not addressed how the two systems will relate to each other.

(2) The scope of the definition of "animal" in the National Animal Welfare Bill 2005 is vastly greater than other definitions in current use and, in particular, is inconsistent with that in the NHMRC Australian Code of Practice for the Care and Use of Animals for Scientific Purposes, to which the draft Bill frequently refers.

• Draft Bill (Part 8, Section 86, line 6): "animal means an invertebrate or vertebrate

animal other than a human being."

• NHMRC Code (page 3): "Animal: any live non-human vertebrate, that is, fish, amphibians, reptiles, birds and mammals, encompassing domestic animals, purpose-bred animals, livestock, wildlife, and also cephalopods such as octopus and squid."

ANZSCDB submits that the definition proposed in the draft Bill is far too broad, and that the inclusion of invertebrates is inappropriate.

We suggest that the regulation of the welfare of animals in scientific research be excluded from the scope of this Bill, which overall seems to have been developed primarily with animal welfare issues pertaining to animals in domestic, agricultural and sporting activities in mind. We recommend that any new federal regulation covering the use animals in scientific research should be purpose-built, and crafted with the intent of facilitating the conduct of highly productive, life science, animal-model research by federally-funded Australian researchers that is both ethically-responsible and internationally competitive.

Yours sincerely,

Graham J. Lieschke MBBS FRACP PhD

President ANZSCDB