

5/26/66

- Dr. Dennis: There is a package of things with regard to the Dog Bills, and I have received these, and I think there must be some misunderstanding some place, because this is not the stand of the National Society for Medical Research, and I called Dr. Visscher this morning and had a long talk with him. That the original Magnuson Bill is emphatically not acceptable.
- Dr. Williams: There is not one at.....
- Dr. Dennis: No. S2322 is the one that's dated July 23, 1965. Let me tell you what is not acceptable to Dr. Visscher and the NSMR about it. Do you have a copy of it there?
- Dr. Williams: Oh yes, I've gone over it in detail.
- Dr. Dennis: There is item 2, Section G, which defines a dealer. Now there's trouble with this as they see it. It excludes farmers who happen to have dogs that they want to sell, and unless those farmers get licenses and it does not clarify the situation of the dog pounds, and it would be very - no problem at all for me to see exactly what would happen that these people would point out that this excludes the dog pounds and we would be in a sorry state for instance in N.Y. City where we get a fair number of dogs from the pounds.
- Dr. Williams: Of course this bill has got to be reconciled with the Poage Bill, and I've forgotten whether it was Magnuson or the Poage where they do make an exception of the pound or the small dealer.
- Dr. Dennis: But you see the reason for backing the modified Poage Bill, the new version of the Poage Bill and not the Magnuson Bill is that this has already been modified in the Poage Bill the way NSMR would like to have it. And the Magnuson Bill is not that way and the Magnuson Bill is before a Committee which is not very likely to.... they got some funny people like Monroney, I don't know what they are going to do. Well, let me go on with a couple of the other items.
The Secretary, Section 5, Dr. Visscher dislikes very much also, because this lets them into the laboratory and the Department of Agriculture doesn't belong in the laboratory and Orville Freeman doesn't want any part of being into the laboratory.
- Dr. Williams: Well, we don't want that either.
- Dr. Dennis: Well, that's in the Bill you see.
- Dr. Williams: Well, here's the point that we have attempted to get across. The Magnuson Bill needs to be modified, even the original to some extent. However, it is not too far off as far as the procurement is concerned. This is the part that we said we would support. Even that has got to be modified to include some of the small dealers, but now all of the part that has to do with the

- Dr. Williams: animals once they reach the Research we don't want in the
(continued) Department of Agriculture at all, and in fact, Magnuson has at
times intimated that he would be willing to go along with
Senator Hill's Bill on that regard.
- Dr. Dennis: This would be fine if he would. At Maurice Visscher's suggestion
I wrote to Magnuson and I think I got Joel Baker to talk to him
suggesting that he take only the introductory clauses of the
Magnuson Bill S2322 and wipe out all the rest of the Bill
introducing the Poage Bill, lock, stock and barrel but leave
his name on it so that that gets him out of the rather uncomfortable
position in which he finds himself at the moment where the anti-
vivisectionists have put him unwittingly.
- Dr. Williams: That's exactly what I have in mind and in fact I heard Dr. Shannon
and the others have that in mind too. What I think about all those
interpretations started came from the NIH. We must realize that
in the first place it can't become law unless the Poage Bill and
the Magnuson Bill conform to one another.
- Dr. Dennis: But why have the Magnuson Bill at all? Why not have the Poage
Bill or a version of it, such as the Mondale Bill?
- Dr. Williams: I am working on the same psychology that you mentioned. The part
of his bill in there can be stripped so it conforms to the Poage
Bill that's what we have in mind. For the procurement of animals
are concerned, now there's - once to the laboratory, we are in
favor of the Hill Bill.
- Dr. Dennis: Item 3 that you sent to me says encourage confinement of S2322 to
the regulation of sale and transport of laboratory animals as
originally drafted by Magnuson. And you see this is the thing
that bothers me.
- Dr. Williams: Of course, it is not meant 100% that way because it couldn't
possibly be that it still conform with the Poage Bill. What's
really meant here the basic structure of the Magnuson Bill with
respect to the procurement of animals is O.K. It's got to be
modified some, but it's not too far off from the Poage Bill.
- Dr. Dennis: Yes, but it's got some of the most vicious things still in it and
this is what bothers me and people would write letters that imply
to Magnuson that this is alright. Why don't you talk with Maurice
Visscher, do you mind?
- Dr. Williams: No, I am glad to.
- Dr. Dennis: I think it would be very fruitful.
- Dr. Williams: I think it would be good if you gave Dr. Shannon a ring on it too,
he testified yesterday and he could probably give you a report.
- Dr. Dennis: Well, I have almost word for word what he said from Maurice
Visscher - we talked about a half hour this morning - I am running
up a frightful phone bill with the State.

Dr. Williams: What did he tell you was the latest status of it?

Dr. Dennis: Well, just a minute, they got Albert Sabin to talk and I think your Dean talked, (Hogness) and a fellow Shannon talked. He made a very good presentation for HEW. Philip Lee talked and did very well. A man by the name of Irving from the Department of Agriculture wasn't quite as convincing as he should have been, but he did make it clear that the Department of Agriculture didn't want any part of it, and so it went - and this was essentially what it was. It turned out two perfectly good doctors - it turned out to be helping Christine Stevens which I don't understand at all, but the general impression that was created was that this was going our way. Now, Visscher pointed out some other things about this Bill, let me tell you what they are - Section 12 puts in a perfectly hideous fine which is preposterous and there it is, and I don't think we should have any part in the Bill. Then we got the Section 16 that to finance the Act, the Administration of the Act, they are going to charge fees sufficient to do so, now it's going to be a multi-million dollar business - there are only 7,000 laboratories and if one is going to have to review at the largest, then it is going to turn out that it's going to be a fee for each laboratory in the neighborhood of a \$1,000, that's going to be very costly business and it's going to run most of our animal dealers out of business because they won't be able to stand this either. But the Poage Bill does not have the costs paid for by the fees alone, but makes special reference to the allocation of some federal money for the purpose of administration of the Bill.

Dr. Williams: Yah - Well, I say - I am (?) or Shannon and most of the rest of us worked on that and had no notion of leaving the Magnuson Bill as it originally was per se, but fight with that and having it conform to the Poage Bill and then add the Hill portion of it. That's what we really have in mind.

Dr. Dennis: Yes, but this is what bothers me, I suspect that's what you had in mind, but the notice that you sent to me, Item 3 there, talks about approving the Magnuson Bill as originally drafted, and people are going to write letters that way - Magnuson won't change things at all. Well now there's one other thing that Visscher raised, I am sorry to be picking bones with you, before I shake hands with you, but anyway there are some items about this that he thought it was well worthwhile to bear in mind. Senator Monsdale from Minnesota is a very savvy individual, and he thinks that right at the moment we should not bombard the Committee with more telegrams and letters. He said the NSMR is identifying individuals who know the Senators personally asking them to contact all members of the Commerce Committee, urging them to be present at the Executive Session which comes up a week from today, and that the worst thing that can happen at the present time is to get these fellows annoyed with a whole barrage of letters and telegrams, which they have gotten in the

- Dr. Dennis: past and that they are getting annoyed with - the barrage and (continued) thinking that we don't know anything about it, or a lot of people who aren't hep are snowing them under with communications, and Visscher thinks it's a mistake to send communications to these people at the present time.
- Dr. Williams: Well, I have gotten a certain amount of that too from people who are very close to Magnuson, who called him, and talked with him, and in fact I don't have any plans for stimulating any more barrage at the present, however a certain amount of it has been worthwhile because they are getting barraged from the other side, you see, and the one way the politican is operating to some extent is that they like to think that they are pleasing their constituents. Shannon and Phil Lee and so forth feel very much the same way. Now, however, I think - or a number of us think - that what's already been done has been very important to have done.
- Dr. Dennis: Yes, but this calls for absolutely immediate activity in sending letters to everybody that's concerned, and this makes Visscher unhappy.
- Dr. Williams: Uh huh - well, I don't enter any plans for stimulating any more barrage unless something else comes along. And of course Visscher stimulated part of this.
- Dr. Dennis: Do you think it would be wise to talk with him and think in terms of possibly a follow-up note with regard to this?
- Dr. Williams: Yeah, I'll give him a ring and see what's a good
- Dr. Dennis: I wish you would. I talked with him a little while ago, just let me find out where he was. He must have been in Washington. Well we just got the Minnesota number here and I guess she got it through them. 612 373-3322.
- Dr. Williams: I think you are 100% correct in calling me because of course my whole reason for wanting to get these different people together, is so we would coordinate our activity. I don't know anything more disconcerting than for us to be pulling in different directions.
- Dr. Dennis: Yes, that's how we lose the battle. I've spent the last month or so being on the Council of both the National and the State Societies getting them together, you know, they have been pulling in opposite directions, now and again, and I think we've got all this cemented together, and then it was the AAMC who was out in left field, and we all have got to be together, otherwise I suspect we are not going to be successful.
- Dr. Williams: I'll tell you one thing about the points that I have made that probably is the difficulty, because actually you and I really see eye to eye, but I figure that some people getting this

Dr. Williams: package will see the tremendous amount of material, and all I
(continued) was attempting to do in enumerating those 5 points was to let
them know that there are 5 points for consideration, so that
they wouldn't neglect those 5 points. Now, I didn't utilize
that as a substitute for going through the other material,
but this was a reminder to pay attention particularly to those
5 points. Of course, in the process of being brief this mis-
conception could come along, because what you say is 100% in
accord with my opinion. I'll say of course I talked this over
with the Dean and Associate Dean and so forth in order to fight
for the Magnuson Bill and Poage Bill and so forth, and the
Poage Bill suits us from the point of view of procurement of
animals - delivery to the research door. Now, one could say,
"stop there, why bother about the other?" Well, the point is,
we are certain sooner or later to get measures having to do
with regulations in the research centers, and I would rather
we would take the offense ourselves and come up with something
that is constructive, including support of facilities, financial
and otherwise, and ^{then} we can block some screwballs.

Dr. Dennis: Well, I think the administration bills should do that. S3332.
I think that should be there and that's got a lot of good
support.

Dr. Williams: That's what I have in mind, yeah, in other words the Hill Bill.
That's why I say - take something like the Poage Bill for the
outside activities and the Hill Bill for the inside.

Dr. Dennis: Yes, that would solve our problem.

Dr. Williams: I had in mind modifying the Magnuson Bill so that it conforms
to the Poage Bill for the outside part.

Dr. Dennis: Well, I would appreciate it immensely if you would, because
this bothers me. O.K. thank you.

This has been a conversation with Dr. Robert H. Williams, Professor of Medicine
University of Washington, Seattle, May 26, 1966.

CD:te