THE UK AND ITS OUTDATED ANIMAL TESTING LAWS AND LEGISLATION

The UK has state of the art science and technology that's proven to safely and more accurately predict the human response to new drugs but still allows animals to be used in experiments when tests have been replaced by non animal methods.

Legislation

Animal (Scientific Procedures) Act 1986 - The law clearly states that "wherever possible, a scientifically satisfactory method or testing strategy not entailing the use of protected animals must be used instead of a regulated procedure". It also states that the breeding, accommodation and care of protected animals and the methods used in regulated procedures applied to such animals must be refined so as to eliminate or reduce to the minimum any possible pain, suffering, distress or lasting harm to those animals.

- **IS THIS GOVERNMENT ACTING UNLAWFULLY?**
- **WHY IS THERE NO CHECKING PROCESS TO ENSURE COMPLIANCE WITH THE ACT AS STATED FOR REPLACEMENT WHERE ALTERNATIVES ALREADY EXIST AND ARE AT REGULATORY STANDARDS?**
- **WHY IS THE GOVERNMENT NOT LISTENING TO THE EXPERTS, VARIOUS ORGANISATIONS AND THE PUBLIC TO SIGN THE EDM 278 WHICH CALLS FOR A RIGOROUS PUBLIC SCIENTIFIC HEARING ON ANIMAL EXPERIMENTS, JUDGED BY INDEPENDENT EXPERTS FROM THE RELEVANT FIELDS OF SCIENCE?**

VISIT CBUK OR OUR WEBSITE FOR DETAILS: www.thecampbeagle.co.uk

NAT DATABASE – VALIDATED METHODS

The NAT database (Non-Animal Technologies) which won the Lush Prize in 2022 for its work on non animal methods is intended for scientists and physicians from all disciplines as well as for authorities, politicians and the general public.

Scientists, physicians and students interested in human-based research can explore available NATs and can contact researchers who already work with these methods.
Regulatory authorities can get informed about human-based alternative methods for achieving particular research goals before approving animal testing applications.
Politicians can get an overview of how advantageous and reliable non-animal methods are for predicting the safety and efficacy of chemicals, active ingredients and medicines.
Funding agencies and foundations can see for themselves how efficient these methods are despite currently low funding and shift the (public) funding focus towards these innovative methods.
The general public can get an impression of the variety of human-based, non-animal methods.

- **WHY IS THERE NO MECHANISM FOR A MULTI-YEAR PROJECT LICENSE FOR REVIEW AND CHECKING THAT THE ALTERNATIVES ARE BEING APPLIED AS THEY REACH REGULATORY STANDARDS?**
- **WHY ARE NO ACTIONS RECORDED OF ANY PENALTIES FOR NON-COMPLIANCE IN THE USE OF ANIMALS IN PROCEDURES WHERE ALTERNATIVES ALREADY EXIST?**
- **NON ANIMAL METHODS - WHY ARE THEY NOT COMPULSORY?**

VISIT CBUK OR OUR WEBSITE FOR DETAILS: www.thecampbeagle.co.uk

NATION OF DOG LOVERS AND WE STILL EXPERIMENT ON THEM

MBR Acres are an American company operating within the UK with a criminal history in Italy. The Supreme Court upheld the original judgement against MBR when it was appealed in 2018 but bizarrely, in 2017 the UK government granted them licenses to operate in the UK even when they were guilty of animal cruelty.

This company breeds up to 2,000 beagles a year - mothers being bred to death and puppies in barren cages confined 24 hours a day with little to no enrichment. They are left unattended for 20 hours at weekends and 15 hours weekdays. They never experience daylight until they are 20 weeks old which is when they are taken from their cages and loaded into carriers - they are then transported to the sterile laboratories.

Beagle dogs endure oral gavage, which involves passing a tube directly into the stomach of these poor animals up to three times a day for up to 90 days with no anaesthetic or analgesic (pain killer) and this is classed by the Home Office as a "mild" procedure. If they do not die from toxic poisoning they will be euthanised at the end of the experiment and will be chopped up to examine the 'impact' of those drugs on their tiny bodies.

- **WHY IS THE GOVERNMENT DEALING WITH COMPANIES THAT HAVE A CRIMINAL HISTORY?**
- **IS THE STANDARD OF 'CARE' AT MBR ACRES ACCEPTABLE?**
- **HAS USING ANIMALS EVER BEEN SCIENTIFICALLY VALIDATED?**

VISIT CBUK OR OUR WEBSITE FOR DETAILS: www.thecampbeagle.co.uk

THE COST TO HUMAN HEALTH AND OUR POOR NHS

Drugs that pass animal tests and get through human clinical trials still carry risks to public health. The health and financial implications of adverse drug reactions (ADRs) are significant and need to be taken seriously.

Using animals as "models" to predict human reactions to any drugs or chemicals is worth nothing and have a prediction rate (for harmful side effects) of only 5-25%.

Animals as "models" in science and human disease have misled findings and delayed medical progress for years. The symptoms that are artificially induced in animals are never exactly the same as the real human version and most importantly, the cause isn't the same – therefore any potential cure wouldn't be the same either, meaning years of wasted research and unnecessary pain to the thousands of animals.

According to The Medicines and Healthcare products Regulatory Agency (MHRA), ADRs contribute towards increased costs of patient care, they can lengthen hospital stays and they may mimic disease, resulting in unnecessary investigations and delays in treatment. The amount of hospital admissions due to ADRs in the UK has been estimated to be as high as 6–7% costing the NHS between £500 million-£2 billion per year.

- **SHOULD THE UK REDIRECT FUNDING TOWARDS METHODS OF RESEARCH WHICH ARE HUMAN RELEVANT?**
- **SHOULD THE NHS PICK UP THE ADRs BILL OR SHOULD THIS BE PASSED ONTO THE PHARMACEUTICAL COMPANIES?**

VISIT CBUK OR OUR WEBSITE FOR DETAILS: www.thecampbeagle.co.uk