

The European Convention for the Protection of Pet Animals and tail docking in dogs

D. Lefebvre⁽¹⁾, D. Lips⁽²⁾ & J.M. Giffroy⁽³⁾

(1) Animal Welfare Council of Belgium, Ministry of Social Affairs, Food Chain Security and Environment, DG4 (CITES and Animal Welfare), 40 Place Victor Horta, 1060 Brussels, Belgium. Present affiliation: Institut National de la Recherche Agronomique, UAR 1266, RD10, 78026 Versailles Cedex, France.

E-mail: diane.lefebvre@versailles.inra.fr

(2) Centre for Science, Technology and Ethics, Kasteelpark Arenberg 30, 3001 Leuven, Belgium

(3) Department of Anatomy and Ethology of Domestic Animals, University of Namur, 6 rue Muzet, 5000 Namur, Belgium

Submitted for publication: 29 November 2006

Accepted for publication: 13 August 2007

Summary

The European Convention for the Protection of Pet Animals was opened for signature in Strasbourg on 13 November 1987 and entered into force on 1 May 1992. This Convention states that: 'Surgical operations for the purpose of modifying the appearance of a pet animal or for other non-curative purposes shall be prohibited and, in particular: the docking of tails'. At present, 15 of the 27 States in the European Union have ratified this Convention (with or without reserving their position on tail docking) and have prohibited cosmetic surgical operations. In addition, four European States have prohibited these operations, even though they did not ratify the Convention. These policy positions agree with both the current knowledge on tail amputations in dogs and the opinions of official veterinary associations in Europe and North America.

Keywords

Amputation – Animal welfare – Canine – Companion animal – Cosmetic surgery – Docking – Dog – European Union – Legislation – Suffering – Surgical intervention – Tail docking – Welfare.

Introduction

The European Convention for the Protection of Pet Animals (12) was opened for signature in Strasbourg on 13 November 1987. The Convention entered into force on 1 May 1992, after ratification by four countries (Belgium, Finland, Germany and Luxembourg).

The Convention states (Article 10 – Surgical operations) that: 'Surgical operations for the purpose of modifying the appearance of a pet animal or for other non-curative purposes shall be prohibited and, in particular: the docking of tails [...]. Exceptions to these prohibitions shall be permitted only: if a veterinarian considers non-curative procedures necessary either for veterinary medical reasons

or for the benefit of any particular animal; [...] Operations in which the animal will or is likely to experience severe pain shall be carried out under anaesthesia only by a veterinarian or under his supervision. Operations for which no anaesthesia is required may be carried out by a person competent under national legislation.'

The question of amputations on companion animals, chiefly tail docking in dogs, illustrates the delicate balance between arguments about animal welfare and some 'traditional' procedures. Such conflict is partly why legislation is necessary in these types of issues. This paper summarises the legal position of European Member States towards tail docking, as of 2006, and briefly surveys the relevant issues (reviewed in 5, 6, 34, 52).

Reasons for tail docking in dogs

Arguments for docking canine tails may be roughly classified into four categories:

a) prophylactic docking:

- in gundogs, to prevent tail damage caused by ground hedges (e.g. brambles), etc.;
- in long-haired breeds, to improve hygiene;

b) economic/cosmetic docking to avoid economic loss: some dog breeders, for instance, fear they will not be able to sell pups with intact tails from breeds whose standard requires tail docking;

c) cosmetic docking: these arguments depend on tradition or aesthetic criteria. In some cases, docking is performed to standardise puppies from a litter in which the pups are born with tails of varying length;

d) docking for convenience: this is performed mainly to prevent large dogs, in particular, from hitting or breaking objects in the home when wagging their tails (5, 13, 34).

The authors could also quote some outdated arguments, such as rabies prevention (rabies germs were supposedly attracted to dog tails) and historical tax avoidance, especially in the United Kingdom and United States of America. These taxes originated in hunting, a sport for the wealthy, in which the tail of a dog was essential. Dogs reserved for such expensive sports were thus taxed (and kept their tails), whereas working dogs were docked, to avoid the tax. It should be noted that this tax could vary according to tail length. In many cases, when the tax was abolished, docking survived (5, 34, 52).

Problems caused by tail docking

Tail docking and pain

Docking the tails of dogs generally occurs before the pups are five days old and can be carried out surgically or by banding (using a rubber ring). The tail is a complex anatomical structure comprising 6 to 23 vertebrae, ligaments, muscles and tendons, the whole tail being innervated and vascularised. It should be stressed that, anatomically, a puppy perceives as much pain in its tail as an adult dog. Indeed, its incomplete myelination does not prevent the conduction of painful impulses, but rather modifies the speed of conduction (27, 34). It is also now established that pain impulses in adults normally pass along unmyelinated nerves. Moreover, recent studies have shown that the nervous system of puppies is indeed immature, but that this immaturity contributes to neonatal animals feeling more pain than when they are adult (20).

There is only one study on the pain felt by puppies at the time of surgical docking, i.e. amputation (36). The study concludes that not only is docking a painful operation, but that the procedure in itself is stressful to the pups. However, there is no study that focuses on the pain experienced when tails are docked by banding. Pain inflicted by this method (and the prolonged ischaemia associated with it) can be compared with the pain caused by 'compartment syndrome' in humans, which can also be experimentally replicated in dogs (42). In the acute form, muscle ischaemia causes so much pain for the human patient that an emergency admission to hospital is necessary. In its chronic form it usually affects sportspeople and leads to the immediate stopping of any effort for 10 to 20 minutes (22). It remains to be determined whether adult pain is similar to the pain experienced by a young member of the same species, placed in the same conditions. This subject is currently being investigated, for example, in humans (2).

In short, all the available evidence supports the claim that docking causes acute pain to dogs. In contrast, no evidence could be found to support the counter-claim that newborn pups do not experience any pain at the time of docking (5).

Complications and other problems which potentially stem from docking

Like most operations, docking operations are associated with complications, such as neuromas – for instance in dogs (24), lambs (21) and piglets (47) – which may, in themselves, be painful (8). Docking operations are also associated with the risk of chronic health problems, such as atrophy and degeneration of the tail and pelvic muscles, in turn leading to an increased risk of faecal incontinence or increased sensitivity to pain in adulthood (5).

It should be noted that tail docking is not generally performed by veterinarians. In Australia, for example, 51% of breeders surveyed docked their own dogs (37). Thus, this operation is likely to be carried out under unsatisfactory hygiene conditions and with no medical control, further increasing the risk of complications (34).

The absence of a tail can also cause balance and communication problems in canines (in particular, aggressive interactions with other dogs) (5, 34, 53), since the tail is very important in both these areas. All these subjects require further study.

Pain management

Tail docking also raises the question of pain management, a fundamental concern in veterinary medicine. Successful pain management relies mainly on the ability of the

veterinarian to perceive animal pain, and on their knowledge (and the quality) of anaesthetics (associated risks). Other factors may intervene, such as:

- the cost of drugs
- the graduation year of the veterinarian (more recent graduates are more likely to prescribe analgesics)
- whether the veterinarian attends continuing education courses
- the experience of the veterinarian in treating cats and dogs (10, 17, 18, 29, 40).

In addition to pain sustained during the operation, post-operative pain following tail docking is likely and should also be taken into account (5, 36). This has been demonstrated in pigs (28) and lambs (41). There is, however, no research yet on pups. At present, 83% of surveyed Canadian veterinarians use no peri-operative analgesia when docking pups (29).

Prophylactic aspects of tail docking

One major argument for retaining tail docking in puppies is that it may have a preventive role against hunting wounds in adulthood. However, this argument should be placed in context, since hunting induces a whole variety of health problems, trauma being just one of them (7, 11, 30, 33). Dogs should be sufficiently prepared for hunting, otherwise the physical strain can cause muscle injuries. Indeed, as in human athletes, physical performances generate specific physiological responses in dogs (50). As a consequence, insufficient preparation of a dog and/or adverse working conditions are likely to induce muscle disorders in the legs as well as the tail (for example, 'limber tail syndrome', also called 'cold' or 'dead tail') (48, 51). Appropriate training, warming up (e.g. walking for a few minutes) and cooling down (a 10-to-20-minute walk) may prevent most muscular disorders. This is particularly important for dogs that may be left in a cage for several hours (as a temporary kennel or for transportation) (49). Other problems may stem from inadequate dog management during hunting, for instance, 'exhaustion syndrome' from strenuous activity (7).

Moreover, hunting may cause a great variety of other injuries to the dog (haematomas, scratches, wounds of varying depth, fractures) on all parts of the body (7, 30, 33). These injuries are mainly due to interactions with other animals (wild boar, badgers, dogs, snakes) and are seldom caused by the terrain. When terrain does cause wounds, they are primarily located on the cushiony pads of their paws or on the body as scratches. Ear injuries

seldom occur (that is, injuries only to the ear – rather, the injuries occur to the whole face) and tail damage happens even less often (O. Bertrand, personal communication). It would be useful to conduct an epidemiological study to quantify this empirical information.

Tail docking is supposed to prevent wounds caused during hunting. It could be argued that this explains why tail damage is rare. However, docked dogs are not the only ones to hunt in terrain with undergrowth that could damage them. Undocked dogs of the same and other breeds also go hunting. In other words, not all dogs destined to hunt in damaging terrain are systematically docked (34, 52).

Finally, to the knowledge of the authors, and in accordance with previous articles (5, 34), there are no figures on the number of dogs that are currently used in high-risk situations (supposing that such situations are more likely to induce tail damage), or on the amount of tail damage sustained by these dogs (owing to the length of their tail) in comparison with dogs sold as companion animals. The only study which focuses on this question (13, see also 31) demonstrates that, in 12,129 veterinary cases, there was no statistically significant correlation between tail damage and undocked tails. (These figures come from a database started in 1965.) In other words, tail docking cannot be recommended as a prophylactic procedure against tail injuries. Nevertheless, more precise epidemiological studies (of individuals rather than breeds) are needed.

It should be noted that the authors, like other researchers, have found no epidemiological studies that focus on the other objectives of tail docking (hygiene, in particular) (5, 34).

Alternatives and associated risks

A possible alternative to tail docking is breeding for congenital taillessness (anury) or short-tailed individuals (brachyury). Such phenotypes have been detected in one breed of cat (Manx cats) and several dog breeds (27). Several genes lead to the loss of caudal vertebrae and then to shortening of the tail, as shown, for example, in mice (23). The T-gene, responsible for normal posterior mesoderm development, has been located in dogs and sequenced (27). In cats, a single gene with dominant inheritance is strongly suspected (16, 43), but genetic analyses are necessary. Owing to embryonic lethality of the homozygous genotype, the expression of the short-tailed or tailless phenotype must occur through heterozygotes (16, 23, 27). In viable, heterozygous genotypes, incomplete tail development may be associated with often

serious anatomical anomalies, such as idiopathic megacolon and spina bifida. These anomalies are usually concentrated in the rear part of the animal, as, for instance, in cats (14, 16, 32, 39, 54), and primarily observed in tailless individuals, again as in cats (16, 43). The short tails of those animals which are not completely tailless have been attributed to a lower expression of the 'Manx gene', leading to a weaker disturbance of early embryonic growth, in comparison with the disturbance in homozygous individuals (16, 43). Such an association has not been detected in dogs. However, anecdotal observations of tailless dogs (two tailless Cairn terriers) (26) and calves (two Holstein, one Limosin) (15) reported signs similar to those observed in tailless cats. These suggest that anury is likely to be associated with major anatomical malformations in mammals.

We should, therefore, be very cautious before selecting short-tailed animals as a breeding objective. Nonetheless, this has been suggested for sheep, to improve their well-being (the underlying hypothesis being that tailless sheep are less prone to fly strike) (46). In relation to gundogs, an alternative would be to focus on the quality of the fur, possibly at tail level (if, that is, it can be proved that the tail is particularly likely to get damaged). The presence of a 'brush' (a tuft of denser and thicker hairs at the end of the tail, as observed in some dog breeds) could become a breeding objective.

Positions taken by official veterinary associations

In various countries, official veterinary associations are opposed to routine and/or cosmetic tail docking. They do not systematically rule on prophylactic docking. When associations do address prophylactic docking, they are opposed to it, at least for ethical reasons if not for scientific ones (given the lack of data). They all accept therapeutic docking for diagnosed medical problems. Listed below are some examples of these positions.

a) In Australia, the Australian Veterinary Association (AVA) states: 'Cosmetic tail docking of dogs is an unnecessary, unjustifiable surgical alteration and is detrimental to the animal's welfare [...]. Official policy of the AVA, which represents the veterinary profession, is that tail docking should be declared illegal in all States and Territories, except for professionally diagnosed therapeutic reasons, and only then by registered veterinarians under conditions of anaesthesia that minimise pain and stress [...]. The fashion-driven procedure is generally performed on young puppies and usually without any anaesthetic, using scissors or a very tight rubber band. The cut goes through many highly sensitive nerves. Put simply, tail docking is

the needless mutilation of a dog, usually a puppy, and is passionately opposed by most veterinarians in Australia. There is absolutely no scientific basis for continuing with amputation of dogs' tails [...]; indeed there are definite signs that it is cruel and the animals suffer. The AVA encourages Kennel Control Councils throughout Australia to phase tail-docking requirements out of the relevant breed standards. The AVA also considers breeding standards should favour natural tails over docked tails and discourages the showing of dogs with docked tails' (4).

b) In Canada, the Canadian Veterinary Medical Association does not mention tail docking in dogs as a prophylactic method. It is only mentioned in the 'cosmetic surgery' category: 'The Canadian Veterinary Medical Association (CVMA) opposes surgical alteration of any animal, for purely cosmetic purposes. The CVMA believes that cosmetic surgery is unnecessary. Surgical alterations in cases of injury or for reasons of health are not considered cosmetic. Examples of cosmetic procedures include: tail docking in the [...] canine species' (9).

c) In Europe, the Federation of Veterinarians of Europe (FVE) confirms that: 'FVE considers that surgery for cosmetic reasons should be prohibited. FVE urges Member States of the Council of Europe to sign, ratify and ensure proper implementation of the European Convention for the Protection of Pet Animals and in particular of its Article 10, if they have not done so already. [...] FVE also encourages breed associations and authorities to modify their breed standards so that surgery for cosmetic reasons is no longer required and to promote this change to all show judges, breeders and the pet-owning public. FVE also calls on the authorities to introduce rules to ban the exhibition of animals that have been subject to these operations' (19).

d) In the United Kingdom, the Royal College of Veterinary Surgeons (RCVS) states: 'Currently, the RCVS Guide to Professional Conduct for veterinary surgeons accepts that docking may be permissible if it is for therapeutic or truly prophylactic reasons [...] yet evidence suggests a lot of non-therapeutic docking is still carried out, whether by veterinary surgeons or others' (35). As a consequence, 'the RCVS welcomes the new clause and amendments to the Animal Welfare Bill, [...] which tend to make it unlawful to dock a dog's tail except for the purpose of medical treatment [...]. In the view of RCVS, [...] there is insufficient evidence to support [tail docking as a preventive measure against later injuries in working dogs]. It would be better to ban docking altogether, and then look to see whether a problem in fact emerges' (45).

e) In the United States of America, the American Veterinary Medical Association (AVMA) reports that: 'ear cropping and tail docking in dogs for cosmetic reasons are

not medically indicated nor of benefit to the patient. These procedures cause pain and distress, and, as with all surgical procedures, are accompanied by inherent risks of anaesthesia, blood loss, and infection. Therefore, veterinarians should counsel dog owners about these matters before agreeing to perform these surgeries.' AVMA does not mention tail docking in dogs as a prophylactic measure (1).

Additional opinions

Several studies, conducted among breeders and veterinarians (29, 34, 37) in Canada, the United Kingdom and Australia, respectively, show that opinions are divided between these two professions. Indeed, whereas most veterinarians state that tail docking causes significant or severe pain and should not be continued (despite its potential as a source of income), most breeders believe that docking is not painful or causes little pain, and want it to continue. It is reasonable to assume that veterinarians, being in closer contact with animals that are suffering through being ill or wounded, are better informed on tail damage than breeders. Moreover, veterinarians are trained to recognise typical pain behaviour, and this recognition significantly increases the ability to distinguish between painful and less painful treatments, for instance in rats (44). Such divided opinions raise questions about the vested interests of the breeders, the breed societies which set the breed standards and the information which they distribute to their members and elsewhere. It is noteworthy that most veterinarians and breeders seem to agree that breed standards are the main reason for tail docking, but some breeders also state that this is a precautionary measure against diseases and injury, or damage to objects in the house.

Legal positions in European Member States

States that have signed the European Convention for the Protection of Pet Animals

At present, two countries have signed the Convention without ratifying it: Italy (1987) and the Netherlands (1987). In the Netherlands, tail docking is prohibited (Gezondheid in Welzijnswet voor Dieren [Animal Health and Welfare Act], 1996), whereas it is still permitted in Italy. Seven countries have signed and ratified the Convention without reservation:

- Austria
- Cyprus
- Greece

- Lithuania
- Sweden
- Bulgaria
- Romania.

It should be noted that Switzerland has also ratified the Convention without reservations: tail (and ear) docking is prohibited, docked dogs cannot be shown, and it is forbidden to export dogs temporarily with the aim of docking their tails (Ordinance on Animal Protection, 27 May 1981; Ordinance on the Importation, Transit and Export of Animals and Livestock Products, 20 April 1988).

States that have signed the Convention with reservations

Eight European Union Member States (Belgium, the Czech Republic, Denmark, Finland, France, Germany, Luxembourg and Portugal) signed and ratified the Convention with reservations on tail docking. However, in most of these countries, tail docking is no longer allowed. In Belgium, tail docking in dogs was prohibited on 1 January 2006 (Arrêté Royal [Royal Decree] of the 17 May 2001; Law of the 18 October 1991). In the Czech Republic, surgical changes to the appearance of an animal are forbidden. Nevertheless, the law (no. 246/1992) only mentions ear cropping, so tail docking is still practised, according to the Czech Canine Union (CMKU), which is affiliated to the World Canine Organisation (FCI) (A. Kostalova, Head of the CMKU, personal communication). In Denmark, tail docking to change the appearance of a dog is forbidden and docked dogs born after 1 June 1996 cannot be shown, no matter in which country the dog was born (Danish Animal Welfare Act, 1991). Tail docking is, however, still authorised for five gundog breeds:

- the Weimaraner
- the Brittany spaniel
- the German shorthaired pointer
- the wirehaired pointer
- the Vizsla.

An amendment, still in discussion, was submitted to the Danish Parliament in 2003 to abolish these exceptions.

In Finland, tail docking was prohibited on 1 July 1996 (the Animal Welfare Act). Since that date, docked dogs born in Finland cannot be shown. In France, tail docking is still allowed (Law no. 2003 628, 2003). In Germany, tail docking was prohibited in 2006 (Neufassung des Tierschutzgesetzes [Revised version of the Animal Protection Law]), but is still permitted for medical reasons (with veterinary justification) and for some gundog breeds (which must pass a test). Since 2001, docked dogs can no

longer be shown (Tierschutz-Hundeverordnung [Animal Protection – Dog Regulation]). In Luxembourg, tail docking in dogs was prohibited in 1992 (Règlement Grand-ducal du 31 juillet 1992 [Luxembourg's Law of the 30th July 1992]). In Portugal, amputations modifying the appearance of animals are only allowed when performed by a veterinarian for medical purposes or in the best interests of the animal. A veterinary certificate is required, whether the animal is domestic or imported (Decreto-Lei [Decree-Law] no. 276/2001).

States that have not signed the Convention

Situations in these countries vary. Neither Ireland (the Protection of Animals Act, 1965) nor Slovenia (P. Košir, Chief Veterinary Officer, personal communication) have prohibited tail docking. In Spain, docking is still performed because the national law permits mutilations for breed standard requirements. Only Catalonia (DOGC no. 3926, 16/07/2003) and Andalusia (BOJA no. 237, 10/12/2003) have specific laws forbidding mutilation for cosmetic purposes. Docked dogs are allowed to be exhibited at shows, according to the Royal Spanish Canine Society, which is also affiliated to the FCI. In Estonia, tail docking is prohibited (Animal Protection Act, 2000). In the United Kingdom, tail docking is forbidden, except for medical reasons or for working dogs (including gundogs) of less than five days old, for prophylactic reasons. This operation must be performed by a veterinary surgeon (Animal Welfare Act, January 2006). The Bill submitted to Parliament on 26 January 2006 to abolish the clause on working dogs was rejected, but the veterinarian must certify that he or she docked the tail of a dog that was likely to be a working dog. In Hungary, interventions to change the appearance of animals and other surgical interventions are forbidden unless conducted therapeutically or for a prophylactic purpose, in the interests of the health of the animal. Castration and maintenance of breed characteristics are, however, permitted. In Malta, surgical operations to modify the appearance of an animal, in which any part of the body is removed or damaged, other than for a curative purpose, are illegal. Docked dogs cannot be entered for or admitted to shows or inspections or competitions (Animal Welfare Act, 2002). In Poland, deliberate mutilations of animals are forbidden, except for medical purposes (Animal Protection Act, 2003). The authors are unaware of the legal positions of Latvia and Slovakia.

Discussion and conclusions

This paper underlines the need for further precise studies on tail docking in dogs and its medical consequences, to add to the existing body of literature (5, 34, 52).

Nevertheless, by examining studies on the newborn of other species, such as calves (3), humans (25), lambs (41) and piglets (38), it is reasonable to assume that docking the tails of puppies is painful. In addition, this pain may continue for a few days or up to several years, as there can be long-term side effects from the operation (neuroma, incontinence). Therefore, when docking is conducted, pain must be managed both at the time of the operation and post-operatively. At present, neither of these issues is being adequately addressed.

Like previous studies, this review demonstrates that, to date, there has been no scientific study, comparing docked and undocked dogs of the same breed before and after a docking ban, to illustrate or support the supposed animal health objectives of tail docking. Can it then be assumed that the evidence is not there? It would certainly have been in the interests of proponents of docking to come forward with such data. Moreover, the particular problem of preventing tail damage in gundogs should be evaluated in the overall context of preventing all hunting wounds. Indeed, hunting generates a large variety of health problems, including superficial lesions to the tail. It would be more useful to consider additional prevention methods, such as binding the tail or providing education programmes for hunters that include safety and first aid for wounded dogs (33). Where docking is permitted for working dogs, there is a practical difficulty in knowing which puppy from a litter will actually hunt, as most will become companion animals. More generally, the number of animals within a hunting breed that will indeed be involved in hunting is not known (31, 34). Considering the global population of identified dogs in Belgium, an estimation shows that about 5% of these dogs may hunt, whereas about one third of them were traditionally docked before the tail-docking prohibition (Lefebvre, 2006).

Based on current knowledge and ethical considerations, authors of many previous articles, as well as official veterinary associations, have concluded that tail docking cannot be considered as a prophylactic measure to prevent damage caused by practices such as hunting. From an ethical point of view, these articles and opinions examine which item carries most weight: the suffering of the whole newborn population of traditionally docked breeds or the pain felt by the few individuals possibly requiring an amputation in adulthood. Some of these papers suggest a global ban on tail docking with individual authorisations for medical purposes or pups that will actually be exposed to risky activities in adulthood.

Most European countries have integrated these conclusions into their legislation: 15 of the 27 European Union countries have ratified this Convention, with or without reserving their position on tail docking, and have also prohibited this operation. In addition, four European States have prohibited the operation (except for medical

reasons) even though they did not ratify the Convention. As a result of the lack of scientific data, the countries that have introduced legislation have adopted one of two legal positions: either a total prohibition (e.g. Switzerland) or a prohibition with exceptions for several gundog breeds (e.g. Belgium).

Acknowledgements

The authors gratefully thank Catherine Decraene and the referees for their careful reading of this text and improvements to the English.



La Convention européenne pour la protection des animaux de compagnie et l'écourtage de la queue des chiens

D. Lefebvre, D. Lips & J.M. Giffroy

Résumé

La Convention européenne pour la protection des animaux de compagnie, ouverte à la signature des États membres du Conseil de l'Europe le 13 novembre 1987 à Strasbourg, est entrée en vigueur le 1^{er} mai 1992. Cette Convention stipule que : « les interventions chirurgicales destinées à modifier l'apparence d'un animal de compagnie ou à d'autres fins non curatives doivent être interdites et en particulier : la coupe de la queue ». À l'heure actuelle, 15 des 27 États membres de l'Union européenne ont ratifié cette convention, avec ou sans réserves quant à l'interdiction de l'écourtage de la queue, et ont proscrit les interventions chirurgicales à des fins esthétiques. En outre, quatre États européens parmi ceux qui n'ont pas ratifié la Convention ont néanmoins interdit ces interventions. Ces dispositions législatives concordent avec les connaissances actuelles sur l'écourtage de la queue chez les chiens ainsi qu'avec la position des associations vétérinaires officielles en Europe et en Amérique du Nord sur le sujet.

Mots-clés

Amputation – Animal de compagnie – Bien-être animal – Bien-être animal – Canin – Caudectomie – Chien – Chirurgie à des fins esthétiques – Coupe de la queue – Intervention chirurgicale – Législation – Souffrance – Union européenne.



El "Convenio europeo para la protección de los animales domésticos" y la amputación de la cola en perros

D. Lefebvre, D. Lips & J.M. Giffroy

Resumen

El Convenio europeo para la protección de los animales domésticos quedó abierto a firmas el 13 de noviembre de 1987 en Estrasburgo, y entró en vigor el 1 de mayo de 1992. En él se afirma que "deberán prohibirse las operaciones quirúrgicas practicadas con el fin de modificar la apariencia de un animal de compañía o con otros fines no terapéuticos y, en particular, la amputación de la cola". Por ahora, 15 de los 27 Estados de la Unión Europea han ratificado el texto,

reservándose o no su postura sobre la amputación de la cola, y prohibido esas operaciones quirúrgicas de índole cosmética. Además, cuatro Estados europeos han proscrito este tipo de operaciones pese a no haber ratificado el Convenio. Este principio encaja con lo que actualmente se sabe acerca de la amputación de la cola en perros y coincide con la postura de asociaciones de veterinarios públicos de Europa y Norteamérica.

Palabras clave

Amputación – Amputación de la cola – Animal de compañía – Bienestar – Bienestar animal – Canino – Cirugía cosmética – Intervención quirúrgica – Legislación – Perro – Sufrimiento – Unión Europea.



References

1. American Veterinary Medical Association (AVMA) (2005). – Ear cropping and tail docking. Available at: www.avma.org/issues/policy/animal_welfare/tail_docking.asp (accessed on 30 October 2007).
2. Anand K.J.S., Aranda J.V., Berde C.B., Buckman S.A., Capparelli E.V., Carlo W., Hummel P., Johnston C.C., Lantos J., Tutag-Lehr V., Lynn A.M., Maxwell L.G., Oberlander T.F., Raju T.N., Soriano S.G., Taddio A. & Walco G.A. (2006). – Summary proceedings from the neonatal pain-control group. *Pediatrics*, **117** (3, Pt 2), S9-S22.
3. Aubry P. (2005). – Routine surgical procedures in dairy cattle under field conditions: abomasal surgery, dehorning, and tail docking. *Vet. Clin. N. Am. (Food Anim. Pract.)*, **21** (1), 55-74.
4. Australian Veterinary Association (AVA) (2003). – AVA strongly supports push for national tail docking ban on dogs. Media releases, 13 April. Available at: www.ava.com.au/news.php?c=0&action=show&news_id=61 (accessed on 30 October 2007).
5. Bennett P. & Perini E. (2003). – Tail docking in dogs: a review of the issues. *Aust. vet. J.*, **81** (4), 208-218.
6. Bennett P. & Perini E. (2003). – Tail docking in dogs: can attitude change be achieved? *Aust. vet. J.*, **81** (5), 277-282.
7. Bertrand O. (2006). – La prise en charge des traumatismes du chien de chasse. In Proc. FormaVet : Formation sur le chien de chasse et le gibier, Libramont, Belgium, 21 September (<http://www.formavet.be> – accessed on 30 October 2007). Proc. available on request (corresponding author).
8. Blumberg H. & Jänig W. (1984). – Discharge pattern of afferent fibers from a neuroma. *Pain*, **20** (4), 335-353.
9. Canadian Veterinary Medical Association (CVMA) (2000). – Cosmetic surgery. Available at: www.canadianveterinarians.net/ShowText.aspx?ResourceID=46 (accessed on 30 October 2007).
10. Capner C.A., Lascelles B.D.X. & Waterman-Pearson A.E. (1999). – Current British veterinary attitudes to perioperative analgesia for dogs. *Vet. Rec.*, **145** (4), 95-99.
11. Collin B. (2006). – Le gibier comme réservoir et vecteur de pathogènes. In Proc. FormaVet : Formation sur le chien de chasse et le gibier, Libramont, Belgium, 21 September (<http://www.formavet.be> – accessed on 30 October 2007). Proc. available on request (corresponding author).
12. Council of Europe (CoE) (1987). – The European Convention for the Protection of Pet Animals, European Treaty Series No. 125. Available at: <http://conventions.coe.int/Treaty/Commun/QueVoulezVous.asp?NT=125&CM=8&CL=ENG> (accessed on 30 October 2007).
13. Darke P.G., Thrusfield M.V. & Aitken C.G. (1985). – Association between tail injuries and docking in dogs. *Vet. Rec.*, **116** (15), 409.
14. De Haan J.J., Ellison G.W. & Bellah J.R. (1992). – Surgical correction of idiopathic megacolon in cats. *Feline Pract.*, **20** (2), 6-11.
15. Dean C.E., Cebra C.K. & Frank A.A. (1996). – Persistent cloaca and caudal spinal agenesis in calves: three cases. *Vet. Pathol.*, **33** (6), 711-712.
16. Deforest M.E. & Basrur P.K. (1979). – Malformations and the Manx syndrome in cats. *Can. vet. J.*, **20** (11), 304-314.
17. Dohoo S.E. & Dohoo I.R. (1996). – Factors influencing the postoperative use of analgesics in dogs and cats by Canadian veterinarians. *Can. vet. J.*, **37** (9), 552-556.
18. Dohoo S.E. & Dohoo I.R. (1996). – Postoperative use of analgesics in dogs and cats by Canadian veterinarians. *Can. vet. J.*, **37** (9), 546-551.

19. Federation of Veterinarians of Europe (FVE) (2001). – Surgery for cosmetic and other non-curative purposes. Available at: www.fve.org/papers/pdf/aw/position_papers/00_66.pdf (accessed on 30 October 2007).
20. Fitzgerald M. (1994). – The neurobiology of fetal and neonatal pain. In A textbook of pain (P.D. Wall & R. Melzack, eds), 3rd Ed. Churchill Livingstone, Edinburgh, 153-163.
21. French N.P. & Morgan K.L. (1992). – Neuromata in docked lambs' tails. *Res. vet. Sci.*, **52** (3), 389-390.
22. Godon B. & Crielaard J.M. (2005). – Compartment syndrome and sport traumatology [abstract available in English]. *Rev. méd. Liège*, **60** (2), 109-116.
23. Greco T.L., Takada S., Newhouse M.M., McMahon J.A., McMahon A.P. & Camper S.A. (1996). – Analysis of the vestigial tail mutation demonstrates that Wnt-3a gene dosage regulates mouse axial development. *Genes Dev.*, **10** (3), 313-324.
24. Gross T.L. & Carr S.H. (1990). – Amputation neuroma of docked tails in dogs. *Vet. Pathol.*, **27** (1), 61-62.
25. Gunnar M.R., Connors J., Isensee J. & Wall L. (1988). – Adrenocortical activity and behavioral distress in human newborns. *Dev. Psychobiol.*, **21** (4), 297-310.
26. Hall D.S., Amann J.F., Constantinescu G.M. & Vogt D.W. (1987). – Anury in two Cairn Terriers. *JAVMA*, **191** (9), 1113-1115.
27. Haworth K., Putt W., Cattanach B., Breen M., Binns M., Lingaas F. & Edwards Y.H. (2001). – Canine homolog of the T-box transcription factor T; failure of the protein to bind to its DNA target leads to a short-tail phenotype. *Mammal. Genome*, **12** (3), 212-218.
28. Hay M., Vulin A., Génin S., Sales P. & Prunier A. (2003). – Assessment of pain induced by castration in piglets: behavioral and physiological responses over the subsequent 5 days. *Appl. anim. Behav. Sci.*, **82** (3), 201-218.
29. Hewson C.J., Dohoo I.R. & Lemke K.A. (2006). – Perioperative use of analgesics in dogs and cats by Canadian veterinarians in 2001. *Can. vet. J.*, **47** (4), 352-359.
30. Krepper M. (2003). – Premiers soins pour chiens de chasse blessés. Gerfaut, Paris.
31. Lefebvre D. (2006). – La caudotomie des chiens [Tail docking in dogs], 76 pp. Report for the Animal Welfare Council of Belgium. Available on request.
32. Lekcharoensuk C., Osborne C.A. & Lulich J.P. (2001). – Epidemiologic study of risk factors for lower urinary tract diseases in cats. *JAVMA*, **218** (9), 1429-1435.
33. Moreau C. (2002). – Les accidents du chien de chasse. Thesis, Ecole Nationale Vétérinaire, Nantes, France.
34. Morton D. (1992). – Docking of dogs: practical and ethical aspects. *Vet. Rec.*, **131** (14), 301-306.
35. Nolte I. (2006). – Begutachtung von tierärztlichen Bescheinigungen zum Rutenkürzen bei Hunden [Analysis of veterinary certificates on tail docking in dogs]. *Dtsch. tierärztl. Wochenschr.*, **113** (3), 102-104.
36. Noonan G.J., Rand J.S., Blackshaw J.K. & Priest J. (1996). – Behavioural observations of puppies undergoing tail docking. *Appl. anim. Behav. Sci.*, **49** (4), 335-342.
37. Noonan G.J., Rand J.S., Blackshaw J.K. & Priest J. (1996). – Tail docking in dogs: a sample of attitudes of veterinarians and dog breeders in Queensland. *Aust. vet. J.*, **73** (3), 86-88.
38. Noonan G.J., Rand J.S., Priest J., Ainscow J. & Blackshaw J.K. (1994). – Behavioural observations of piglets undergoing tail docking, teeth clipping and ear notching. *Appl. anim. Behav. Sci.*, **39**, 203-213.
39. Plummer S.B., Bunch S.E., Khoo L.H., Spaulding K.A. & Kornegay J.N. (1993). – Tethered spinal cord and an intradural lipoma associated with a meningocele in a Manx-type cat. *JAVMA*, **203** (8), 1159-1161.
40. Price J., Marques J.M., Welsh E.M. & Waran N.K. (2002). – Pilot epidemiological study of attitudes towards pain in horses. *Vet. Rec.*, **151** (19), 570-575.
41. Rhodes R.C., Nippo M.M. & Gross W.A. (1994). – Stress in lambs (*Ovis aries*) during a routine management procedure: evaluation of acute and chronic responses. *Comp. Biochem. Physiol., A, molec. integr. Physiol.*, **107** (1), 181-185.
42. Ricci M.A., Corbisiero R.M., Mohamed F., Graham A.M. & Symes J.F. (1990). – Replication of the compartment syndrome in a canine model: experimental evaluation of treatment. *J. Invest. Surg.*, **3** (2), 129-140.
43. Robinson R. (1993). – Expressivity of the Manx gene in cats. *J. Hered.*, **84** (3), 170-172.
44. Roughan J.V. & Flecknell P.A. (2006). – Training in behaviour-based post-operative pain scoring in rats. An evaluation based on improved recognition of analgesic requirements. *Appl. anim. Behav. Sci.*, **96** (3-4), 327-342.
45. Royal College of Veterinary Surgeons (RCVS) (2006). – RCVS welcomes amendments to Animal Welfare Bill to ban tail-docking of dogs, 10 March. Available at: www.rcvs.org.uk/Templates/Internal.asp?NodeID=94537 (accessed on 30 October 2007).
46. Scobie D.R., Bray A.R. & O'Connell D. (1999). – A breeding goal to improve the welfare of sheep. *Anim. Welf.*, **8** (4), 391-406.
47. Simonsen H.B., Klinken L. & Bindseil E. (1991). – Histopathology of intact and docked pigtails. *Br. vet. J.*, **147** (5), 407-412.

48. Steiss J. (1997). – What is limber tail syndrome? *Canine Pract.*, **22** (5-6), 1.
49. Steiss J. (2002). – Muscle disorders and rehabilitation in canine athletes. *Vet. Clin. N. Am. (small Anim. Pract.)*, **32** (1), 267-285.
50. Steiss J., Ahmad H.A., Cooper P. & Ledford C. (2004). – Physiologic responses in healthy Labrador Retrievers during field trial training and competition. *J. vet. internal Med.*, **18** (2), 147-151.
51. Steiss J., Braund K., Wright J., Lenz S., Hudson J., Brawner W., Hathcock J., Purohit R., Bell L. & Horne R. (1999). – Coccygeal muscle injury in English Pointers (limber tail). *J. vet. internal Med.*, **13** (6), 540-548.
52. United Kingdom Department for Environment, Food, and Rural Affairs (DEFRA), Animal Welfare Division (2002). – Information on dog tail docking provided for the Animal Welfare Division, DEFRA. Available at: www.defra.gov.uk/animalh/welfare/domestic/awbillconsulttaildocking.pdf (accessed on 30 October 2007).
53. Wada N., Hori H. & Tokuriki M. (1993). – Electromyographic and kinematic studies of tail movements in dogs during treadmill locomotion. *J. Morphol.*, **217** (1), 105-113.
54. Washabau R.J. & Holt D. (1999). – Pathogenesis, diagnosis, and therapy of feline idiopathic megacolon. *Vet. Clin. N. Am. (small Anim. Pract.)*, **29** (2), 589-603.
-