



NATIONAL ANTI-VIVISECTION SOCIETY
53 W. JACKSON BLVD. SUITE 1552
CHICAGO, IL 60604
PHONE (312) 427-6065
FAX (312) 427-6524
EMAIL NAVS@NAVS.ORG
WEB WWW.NAVS.ORG

February 20, 2018

Re: SUPPORT of S. 161, which would require a non-animal alternative test method to be used instead of a test method relying on a vertebrate animal if the non-animal alternative provides information that is of equivalent or better scientific quality and relevance.

Dear Senator Sirotkin and Members of the Senate Committee on Economic Development, Housing and General Affairs,

On behalf of the National Anti-Vivisection Society (NAVS), and our Vermont-based supporters, please accept this testimony **in support of SB 161**, a bill that proposes to prohibit the use of vertebrate animals in nonmedical research testing if there is an alternative test method that does not use a vertebrate animal available.

An abundance of evidence proves that animal testing does not contribute to consumer safety, nor does it provide information for the effective treatment of injuries that may result from the use or misuse of a product. While testing on animals does not reliably predict allergic reactions or other adverse responses in humans, products that have been found to be safe for animals have caused serious problems when used by humans. Animal testing is not required by the U.S. Food and Drug and Cosmetic Act, and cosmetics, personal care and other product manufacturers in the U.S. are already using non-animal alternatives that have been proven to be more reliable and cost-effective than animal tests.

There are many alternatives to animal tests now in use by industry. Some of these tests have been validated by the Interagency Coordinating Committee on the Validation of Alternative Methods, while others have been in use by various industries for decades. A majority of manufacturers of cosmetics and personal care items have ceased testing on animals altogether, while the remaining companies have substantially reduced their reliance on animal tests.

While the ideal would be for the federal government to pass a law, such as an expanded Humane Cosmetics Act, in the absence of federal action, states, like Vermont, have taken action to ensure that manufacturers in their states no longer rely on animal models for safety testing when effective and predictive non-animal methods

are available. California ([CAL. CIV. CODE § 1834.9](#) (2002)), New Jersey ([N.J. STAT. ANN. § 4:22-59](#) (2007)) and New York ([N.Y. Pub Health Law § 505](#) (2014)) have already adopted their own laws regarding personal care/cosmetics testing without endangering the health and well-being of their residents.

We hope that Vermont chooses to adopt this legislation and give more, not less, assurance to its residents that the products they use are truly safe for humans.

Thank you for our consideration of S.161.

A handwritten signature in cursive script that reads "Marcia Kramer".

Marcia Kramer
Director of Legal & Legislative Programs