



January 2004

The Honorable _____
U.S. House of Representatives
Washington, DC 20515

Dear Representative _____:

A few days ago, you received a letter from Rep. Jim Moran regarding the need to modernize the toxicity-testing policies of federal regulatory agencies by upgrading to test methods that do not require the use of animals. We would like to elaborate on Congressman Moran's points and suggest how you can help to make these suggested improvements a reality.

Please allow us to introduce ourselves. We are writing on behalf of People for the Ethical Treatment of Animals (PETA) and our more than 750,000 members and supporters. Prior to coming to PETA, Federal Agency Liaison Jessica Sandler developed enforcement policy for the U.S. Occupational Safety and Health Administration (OSHA) for the handling of hazardous chemicals in the workplace. Her experience in federal regulatory policy and chemical safety spurred her to lead PETA's efforts to reduce federal regulators' reliance on animal tests. PETA Science Policy Advisor Troy Seidle has served on the Environmental Protection Agency's (EPA) Pesticide Program Dialogue Committee since 2001, and represents a 30-million member strong coalition of animal-protection organizations at high-level meetings of the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD) concerning international chemical-testing policies. He is also a former director of the Canadian Council on Animal Care, which assesses and governs the care and use of animals used in research, testing, and education.

As Congressman Moran explains in his letter, regulations established by the EPA, Food and Drug Administration (FDA), and several other federal agencies require extensive animal testing to evaluate the toxicity of everything from pesticides and industrial chemicals to pharmaceuticals and food additives. For the past several years, PETA has been participating in meetings with international chemical regulators through the OECD—an economic alliance of 30 countries, including the U.S., all member countries of the European Union, Canada, Japan, and Australia. Through these meetings, we have learned of non-animal test methods in use in other countries that have not yet achieved widespread acceptance in the U.S. Therefore, we developed the "Give the Animals 5" campaign to highlight five of these methods and promote their acceptance by U.S. regulatory agencies. Please refer to the enclosed "Give the Animals 5" kit for an overview of the non-animal test methods we are advocating.

From a humane standpoint, the benefits of using non-animal methods are obvious. And there are many economic and scientific benefits as well. For example, using tissue-culture methods (instead of animals) allows researchers to study a broader range of doses, including those at the actual level of exposure that occurs in the occupational or ambient environment. Another benefit is increased efficiency: Unlike

traditional rabbit-skin tests, which can take two to four weeks, there is a non-animal method called Corrositex™ that can provide a classification determination in less than four hours.

This raises the question, “If non-animal methods are often faster, cheaper, and more accurate, why aren’t U.S. researchers using them?” There are several reasons: 1) animal testing has been used for decades and is very ingrained, even though applying animal data to humans is problematic; 2) there is strong opposition from those with a vested interest in animal testing (e.g., animal suppliers and contract laboratories); 3) switching to non-animal methods would require an initial outlay of expenditures (removing old lab equipment and cages, installing new equipment, developing new protocols, re-training or hiring staff); and 4) corporations have no incentive to implement changes if federal agencies won’t accept data from the new methods, and federal agencies have not provided corporations with any incentive to use non-animal methods.

As reflected in language in the NIH Revitalization Act of 1993 and the ICCVAM Authorization Act of 2000, Congress has directed federal agencies to develop and/or accept test methods that can replace animal tests. **However, there is almost no momentum in most federal agencies to develop new or promote existing non-animal methods.**

Congress is in a powerful position to move the acceptance of non-animal methods forward. This is the positive wave of the future. Let the federal government affirm ethical, forward-thinking science and corporate responsibility. We hope that the enclosed materials will motivate you to take the following actions to ensure that animals will no longer die in the aforementioned five tests:

- 1) The next time you craft bill language requiring toxicity testing, please include language emphasizing the need for non-animal methods. When you allocate appropriations for toxicity testing, please direct a substantial portion to the development of non-animal methods.
- 2) Please contact the seven agencies listed in the attached materials, urge them to refuse to accept animal data for the tests described in the enclosed materials, and ask them to require data from the non-animal methods instead.
- 3) Please request that report language be included in the FY 2005 appropriations bills, stating that no funds for these agencies may be used for the purpose of assessing data from an animal-based test method when a non-animal test for the desired endpoint has been validated and/or accepted by the OECD or its member countries.

Thank you for considering these requests. As Dr. Albert Schweitzer wrote: “Very little of the great cruelty shown by men can really be attributed to cruel instinct. Most of it comes from thoughtlessness or inherited habit. ... But the time must come when inhumanity protected by custom and thoughtlessness will succumb before humanity championed by thought.” Let us not allow habit (i.e., our customary reliance upon animal testing) to keep us from actively seeking new methods that benefit all living beings.

Sincerely,

/s/
Jessica Sandler
Federal Agency Liaison

/s/
Troy Seidle
Science Policy Advisor

Enclosures