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When considering clinical research and participation there are many different resources to refer to for an ethical and moral code of conduct. For example, the Tri-Council Policy Statement (TSCPS) emphasizes maintaining human dignity through upholding inherent worth of human participants in research. The Canadian Council on Animal Care (CCAC) Ethics of Animal Investigation highlights the ethical code of conduct surrounding animal research. Although both documents underscore the importance of ethical obligations, however they find themselves grounded in different outlooks: ethical responsibilities towards animals in CCAC as compared to the inherent worth found in human dignity in TCPS.

The CCAC highlights moral obligations towards the humane treatment of animals through the three R framework: reduction, replacement and refinement (Canadian Council on Animal Care, 2020). Reduction refers to using methods that will limit the number of animal subjects to attain sufficient data (Canadian Council on Animal Care, 2020). Replacement alludes to mechanism that can replace the use of animals with inanimate systems, or even with other animals less receptive to pain (Canadian Council on Animal Care, 2020). Refinement refers to altering experimental methods to reduce pain and stress to increase animal welfare (Canadian Council on Animal Care, 2020).

In my perspective the factors of inherent worth and dignity are not significantly instilled in the CCAC, as both documents emphasize different factors. The TCPS focuses upon inherent worth, which prompts researchers to find value in human beings, without weighing them to scientific need, however the CCAC balances on animal welfare with the scientific aspect, without prioritizing inherent worth. The CCAC does not grant animals a status, or an inherent worth that is morally equivalent to humans. The justification of the proposed framework in CCAC is more pragmatic, where when deemed absolutely necessary animals may be subjected to interventions when done humanely. This emphasis on necessity is not seen in TCPS, where the respect for dignity and autonomy are prioritized. This primary difference in approach to establishing ethical and moral responsibilities in both documents leads to a discrepancy in the how the CCAC addresses their principles when describing how animal subjects should be used.

Although the CCAC presents ethical guidelines to ensure humane treatment of animal subjects, it does not emphasize their inherent worth in the same manner TCPS does regarding human subjects. The CCAC focuses on a balance between ethical and morals to scientific advancement, whereas TCPS recognizes an inherent dignity of humans, an aspect CCAC does not account for in the provided framework.
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