January 2004 Lab Animal Volume 33, No. 1 **EDITORIAL**

Editorial Board

Kathryn Bayne, MS, PhD, DVM

Associate Director for Accreditation, Association for Assessment and Accreditation of Laboratory Animal Care International, Bethesda, MD

Joseph T. Bielitzki, MS, DVM

Program Manager, Defense Sciences Office, Defense Advanced Research Projects Agency, Arlington, VA.

J. Roger Broderson, DVM, PhD

Director, Animal Care and Use, The University of Georgia, Athens, GA.

Cyndi Brown, DVM

epartment of Avian and Exotic Pets, The Animal Medical Center

Thomas M. Donnelly, DVM
The Kenneth S. Warren Institute, Ossining, NY.

Nina Hahn DVM, PhD, DACLAM

Associate Director, Office of Laboratory Animal Care, University of California Berkeley, Berkeley, CA.

Victoria Hampshire, VMD

Advanced Veterinary Applications, Bethesda, MD.

John M. Hicks, DVM, MPH

Paul Houghton

imate Products. Redwood Citv. CA

Robert F. Hoyt, Jr., DVM, MS

Chief, Laboratory Animal Medicine and Surgery, National Heart Lung and Blood Institute, NIH, Bethesda, MD

Mary Lou James, BA, RLATG

liance, St. Louis, MO.

Bruce W. Kennedy, MS, RLATG

Transgenic Core Facility, California Institute of Technology,

Joseph Knapka, PhD

Consultant, Laboratory Animal Nutrition, Brookeville, MD

C. Max Lang, DVM

ofessor and Chairman, Department of Comparative Medicine, Milton S. Hershev Medical Center, Pennsylvania State University, Hershev, PA

Richard H. Latt, DVM Director, Animal Resources Centre, McGill University, Montreal, Quebec, Canada

Sherry M. Lewis, PhD

earch Scientist, National Center for Toxicological Research,

Carol Cutler Linder, PhD Assistant Director of Genetic Resources, The Jackson Laboratory, Bar Harbor, ME

John A. Maher, MS, MBA, CMAR, RLATG

Gary R. Novak, RLATG

Research Associate and Manager, Johns Hopkins Oncology Center Laboratory Animal Resources, Baltimore, MD.

Fred W. Quimby, VMD, PhD

Director, Lab Animal Research Center, Rockefeller University, New York, NY,

John Curtis Seely, DVM, ACVP

nary Pathologist, Experimental Pathology Laboratories, Research Triangle Park

Moshe Shalev, MSc, VMD

Jo Ellen Sherow, BS, LATG

ice, Ohio University, Athens, OH

Jerald Silverman, DVM

Professor and Director, Department of Animal Medicine, University of Massachusetts Medical School, Worcester, MA.

Michael K. Stoskopf, DVM, PhD

Professor and Director of Environmental Medicine Consortium, College of Veterinary Medicine, North Carolina State University, Raleigh, NC

Paul J. Upman, PhD

cientist, NAMSA, Northwood, OH

Robert H. Weichbrod, PhD. MBA, RLATG

Animal Program Administrator, National Eye Institute, NIH, Bethesda, MD

Steven H. Weisbroth, DVM

Axel Wolff, MS, DVM

Senior Assurance Officer, Division of Assurances, OLAW, NIH, Bethesda, MD

Is There Something Fishy About **GM Pets?**

The zebrafish (Brachydanio rerio)—the black- and silver-striped workhorse of developmental genetics—has been causing a great deal of commotion lately. In early January, Austin-based Yorktown Technologies intends to start selling GloFish, a genetically modified (GM) strain of zebrafish that glows red under ultraviolet or black-light. If all goes according to the company's plans, this will be the first GM species sold as pets in the United States—which is now causing opponents to cry foul.

A research team at the National University of Singapore first developed these glowing critters by injecting the gene for red fluorescent protein, which had been isolated from the sea anemone, into fertilized zebrafish eggs. These fish were originally intended for use in detection of environmental pollutants.

Yorktown is not the first company to test the waters with regard to selling GM fish to private owners. Beginning in the summer of 2003, Taikong International, a Taiwanese company, has been selling similar genetically engineered zebrafish under the name 'Night Pearl' — hailed by *Time* magazine as one of 2003's 'Coolest Inventions' — in a number of Asian countries. In that strain, developed by a group at the National Taiwan University that was looking for a way to make the fish's organs easier to visualize, the transgene is the jellyfish green fluorescent protein gene.

Although Yorktown is providing data to back up their claims that these fish are safe, some environmentalists, public interest groups, and commercial fishermen are opposing their sale. Many of these opponents fear that despite claims that the fish are sterile and more temperature-sensitive than wild-type strains, they will eventually manage to make their way into the wild and crossbreed with naturally occurring populations, and they are calling on various government agencies to block the sale of these fish.

There are other concerns as well. Anyone familiar with the study of transgenic mice knows that genetic modification is not always a straightforward science, and that the addition of a gene can result in unexpected phenotypes by the disruption of endogenous genes, or by other mechanisms.

An even larger problem may be if this sets the precedent for the unregulated distribution of other GM animals as pets. For purposes of research and food production, the USDA and FDA oversee the use of GM models. However, since GloFish will be sold as pets, the USDA and FDA claim to have no jurisdiction. California, which is the only state with a ban on the release of GM animals, is blocking the sale of GloFish. In the rest of the country, however, there is a regulatory void with regard to such uses for GM species.

Who should control the release of transgenic species? What steps can be taken to fill this gap in the regulations? How serious is the potential threat posed by the sale of such animals, and should something be done before they reach the pet store shelves? It seems clear that the fuss over this 'cool' new fish could soon have significant repercussions in the research community, the marketplace, the environment, and the regulatory arena.