

# Speech against animal testing

[Environment](#), [Animals](#)



Now ladies and gentlemen, I would like you guys to have a think about this, without animal research, how long would it take for us to have a breakthrough in order for us to survive through small pox, rabies, malaria or any other severe diseases that had occurred in the past. If it weren't for animal testing, we wouldn't be all sitting here, enjoying our lives. Thank you all for listening. 0 In the case of using primates in animal testing, the National Research and Medical Research Council has stated, ' Some biomedical research is best undertaken on primates in order to allow the greatest relevance to understanding health and disease in humans. ' A PHD student from the University of Sydney, Swetha Murali, is working in a neuropharmacology lab researching about the development of novel therapeutics for treating chronic pain. Murali also raised a number of concerns and argued, ' The first three are not alternatives at all. These animal dealers must be licensed by the United States Department of Agriculture and must adhere to Animal Welfare Act standards of care. Both dealers and research facilities can obtain dogs and cats only from specified sources and must comply with detailed record-keeping and waiting-period requirements. In addition, the United States Department of Agriculture conduct surprising inspections of dealers and research facilities for agreement to help ensure research animals are not missing pets. ' 6

They don't actually lead to the development of novel treatments, just a better understanding of the efficacy of existing ones. Meanwhile the last two are already commonly used in most labs, but prior to and in conjunction with work and animals. ' Murali has also stated that ' and as powerful as modern computers are, there's still simply no comparison – the idea of successfully

simulating the complexity present in organism-level biological systems is a pipe dream at present. ' 9 My third point would be that there is no suitable and reliable substitution to animal testing.

It has been reported that there are situations, where there are no viable alternatives to animal testing in order to enlarge the research of treatments to assist human beings from suffering a wide range of diseases. This has been brought up by the National Health and Medical Research Council which stated, ' Animal experimentation remains crucial to a proportion of the funded research design to find better ways of preventing, treating and curing human diseases, and there are many situations where no alternatives exist. 7 The American Association for Laboratory Animal Science stated that, ' While some research requires that dogs and cats are used, the vast majority of laboratory animals are rodents specifically bred for research. Nearly half of the dogs and cats needed for research are also bred for that purpose. Since state laws and local policies prevent many animal pounds and shelters from providing dogs and cats to research facilities, animal dealers are the primary source for the other half of the animals scientists require. ' 5

Good morning teachers and fellow classmates. Today I will be presenting my point of view towards the issue of animals being used in testing and research. Animals such as mice, rats and primates are used in the further research for the sake of us human beings, either health or cosmetic wise, and also tested on animals to make sure they have no life-threatening side effects. This act has been carried out for years, and to abolish it now would be a real shame and it'll bring an end to the further advancement of human health. I assume that most of you guys think that animal testing will involve

big needles injecting into those little cute, furry rodents. But I assure you, it's not. It has been stated that the procedure throughout the whole testing will keep the animals' distress to a minimal. Also the people who are involved in this project are all animal lovers, which mean that they aren't doing this for enjoyment, but for the health of the greater well. As they say ' Good science and good animal welfare go hand in hand'. In the UK, the experiments that were carried out have been classified as mild, moderate or substantial. In December 2001, licensed experiments that happened in the UK were: 39% mild, 55% moderate, 2% substantial and 4% that are unclassified. Judging from these statistics, it is shown that very few experiments have caused substantial suffering to the animals tested. This also leads to my second point. Many of these animals that were killed in animal testing were specifically bred for this purpose. 3

These animals would not have been alive at all if they weren't needed for animal testing. Also keep in mind that they were bred under humane conditions, which means, they had the right amount of nutrition to be healthy and also in an environment that were close to home for them. In certain parts of the world, purposely-bred animals were not available, and in these cases, animals that were used must be obtained through licensed and regulated dealers that meet standard criteria where it was suitable laboratory research. 4