

February 21, 2019, 2pm, Room 325

Dear Chairs Lee & Takumi and Members of the Committees on Judiciary and Consumer Protection

RE: Strong Support, HB704; relating to Cosmetics; Cruelty Free Cosmetics Act

The West Hawaii Humane Society asks for your support of HB704, which would prohibit the sale of cosmetics if the ingredients in the products involve testing on animals, **AFTER 2020**.

Numerous polls show that across the US and around the world, consumers want cosmetics that have not been unnecessarily tested on animals and support laws that protect animals from unnecessary cruelty. Attached is a chart that outlines the numerous alternative ingredients and testing methods available and in use today, **that are more effective, safe, efficient and inexpensive, and that DO NOT involve animal testing.**

Last year Cruelty Free International along with The Body Shop collected a record record-breaking 8.3 million petition signatures from all over the world calling for a global end to cosmetics animal testing. Hawaii-born Actress Maggie Q joined us in delivering this call to the United Nations Headquarters in New York last October.

Worldwide, many countries have taken steps to end cosmetics testing on animals. In 2013, the European Union which accounts for nearly half of the global cosmetics market, completely banned the importation and sale of cosmetics that have been tested on animals and last year, the California Cruelty Free Cosmetics Act was signed into law, taking effect in 2020. Per the attached, the bill had broad support from industry, including the Personal Care Products Council and other businesses.

A bill at the federal level, the Humane Cosmetics Act would end the sale of animal tested cosmetic across the US national level and last year 169 bipartisan cosponsors including Hawaii Representatives Tulsi Gabbard and Colleen Hanabusa. The bill has also garnered the support of over 150 cosmetic companies of all sizes. Unfortunately, the bill has been slow to advance in Congress thus states are enacting their own laws that would complement any future federal prohibition on sales.

With passage of the Cruelty Free Cosmetics Act, Hawaii can set a national example by matching global progress and meeting consumer demand for safe and humane cosmetics.

Thank you for your consideration.

Inga Gibson

On behalf of West Hawaii Humane Society

Westhawaiihumanesociety@gmail.com; 808.922.9910

Personal Care Products Industry Shares Goal with Governor Brown to Protect Consumer & Animal Welfare in California

Sep 28, 2018

For Immediate Release

Contact: Lisa Powers, (202) 466-0489, powersl@personalcarecouncil.org

Jewel Jones, (202) 454-0302, jonesj@personalcarecouncil.org

<https://www.personalcarecouncil.org/news-release/personal-care-products-industry-shares-goal-with-governor-brown-to-protect-consumer-animal-welfare-in-california/>

Washington, D.C. – The Personal Care Products Council (PCPC) appreciates Governor Brown’s signing of Senate Bill 1249 (Galgiani), the California Cruelty-Free Cosmetics Act – another step forward in product safety testing that considers consumer protection and animal welfare.

“On behalf of the 415,000 Californians employed by the personal care products industry and our coalition of health, labor, science, and business organizations, we thank Governor Brown for signing this important bill into law. The California Cruelty-Free Cosmetics Act is pragmatic legislation that balances animal welfare, regulatory requirements, and decades of science,” said Lezlee Westine, President and CEO of the Personal Care Products Council.

SB 1249 bans the sale of personal care products developed using animal testing by the manufacturer or their direct suppliers after January 1, 2020. The bill makes important exemptions, including for products and ingredients already available for sale in California, for example, or those that need to comply with U.S. Food and Drug Administration (FDA) or foreign governments’ testing requirements.

“The Personal Care Products Council and its member companies have worked with policy makers to achieve regulatory and scientific advancements that will move the world closer to eliminating the need for animals in product safety testing. For nearly four decades, both in the U.S. and globally, our companies have been at the forefront of the movement to develop viable alternative safety assessment methods, and we will continue to work towards this important charge,” Westine added.

When advocating for this legislation that advances animal welfare without sacrificing jobs and public health, **PCPC** was joined by a broad coalition, which included the **United Food & Commercial Workers, California Retailers Association, California Chamber of Commerce, California Teamsters Public Affairs Council, California Manufacturers & Technology Association, the Congress of California Seniors, and the California Life Sciences Association, among many others.**

Governor Brown's signature on the final version of the California Cruelty-Free Cosmetics Act achieves critical goals to:

- Keep existing products on California's shelves by applying the law only to new products and ingredients that come to market after January 1, 2020;
- Protect public health by making select exemptions for products that undergo animal testing mandated by the U.S. Food and Drug Administration or other regulators;
- Hold personal care products manufacturers accountable for ensuring animal testing is not performed by their direct suppliers;
- Allow California companies to continue operating in international markets;
- Protect 415,000 California jobs in the personal care products industry; and
- Allow Californians to continue using the personal care products they rely on every day.

The full text of the bill can be found [here](#).

Based in Washington, D.C., the Personal Care Products Council (PCPC) is the leading national trade association representing global cosmetics and personal care products companies. Founded in 1894, PCPC's approximately 600 member companies manufacture, distribute, and supply the vast majority of finished personal care products marketed in the United States. As the makers of a diverse range of products millions of consumers rely on and trust every day – from sunscreens, toothpaste, and shampoo to moisturizer, lipstick, and fragrance – personal care products companies are global leaders committed to safety, quality, and innovation.

###

TABLE 1. STANDARD COSMETIC SAFETY TESTS: ANIMALS VS. ALTERNATIVES - TIME, COST, ACCURACY

ANIMAL TEST	TIME	COST, \$	ACCURACY	ALTERNATIVE TEST	TIME	COST, \$	ACCURACY
Skin absorption: Substance is rubbed onto shaved backs of rats who are killed	1 day	1000-5000	Over predicts by a factor of 3	Ex vivo human skin-based tests for this are well established	1 day	1000-5000	Highly accurate as uses human skin
Irritation/ corrosion (skin): Substance is rubbed into the shaved backs of rabbits and they may then be killed	2 weeks	1,800	56%	Reconstituted human epidermis (RHE) skin models are accepted	1 day	500-850	76%
Irritation/ corrosion (eye): Substance placed into the eyes of live rabbits and they may be then be killed	3 weeks	1,800	Very unreliable, low to moderate correlation with humans	Eyes from animals killed for food can detect non-irritants and severe irritants (BCOP and ICE ex vivo eye models). Human corneal epithelial models (HCE) can detect non-irritants	1 day	1,400 (BCOP)	82% (HCE predictive of rabbit test)
Skin sensitisation: Substance is rubbed onto the shaved skin of guinea pigs or painted into ears of mice who are then killed	3-4 weeks for guinea pigs or 6 days for mice	9,300 (LLNA)	72-82% (for mouse test)	Several tests based on human skin cells have been accepted (DPRA, Keratinocyte assay, and h-CLAT)	1-2 days	8,400	90-100% (using strategy of 1-3 tests)
Acute toxicity: Rats are exposed to very high dose of substance such that a number of them are expected to die	14 days	1,800	Results can differ between species by several orders of magnitude	Cell based tests such as the NRU3T3 can predict lack of toxicity very accurately	1 day	1,300	81% (predicting non-toxic substances)
Mutagenicity/ genotoxicity: Substance force-fed or injected into mice or rats who are then killed	14 days	20,000-32,000	Not known	A testing battery of 2 or 3 cell-based tests. Positives should be assumed to be genotoxic	1-3 days	8,000-20,000	85-90% (predictive of the rat test)
Repeated dose: Rats are force-fed, forced to inhale or have substance rubbed onto their skin daily before they are killed	28 or 90 days	140,000 (90-day)	40-60%	TTC concept or read across from similar substances with test data	1-2 days	3000 for expert time	n/a



Please Support The Hawaii Cruelty Free Cosmetics Act S.B. 756 (Gabbard) & H.B. 704 (Lee)

Summary: Prohibits the sale of any cosmetic product that has been tested on animals AFTER 2020.

- For more than 50 years animals have been used in painful tests to assess the safety of certain chemicals used in cosmetics products. Today modern alternatives that are cheaper, faster, and can better predict human reactions are widely available and more than 30 countries around the world now require their use.
- In 2013, the European Union – the world’s largest cosmetic market – ended importation and sale of any new cosmetics that have been tested on animals. Most, if not all, cosmetic companies that sell products in the states also sell products in the European Union and must comply with no-new-animal testing laws.
- Modern non-animal tests for cosmetics safety are accurate, efficient, and affordable. The tests usually carried out on animals for cosmetics ingredients have alternatives at similar or lower costs which have been approved by the Organization for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD) as official Test Guidelines. The tests have comparable or higher predictive value for effects on humans than the animal tests that they replace.
- Only NEW animal testing is impacted. Animal testing that took place in the past, prior to enactment of the law, would not be considered a breach of the cruelty free cosmetics requirement.
- The bill does not target specific ingredients or products from specific countries. Companies may still sell in China (where animal testing is currently required) and products may be imported from China provided safety is assured without relying on *new* animal tests. Products made locally in Hawaii will not be impacted as small companies use existing ingredients whose safety data is grandfathered in.
- Multiple polls show that US consumers support ending animal testing for cosmetics and, a 2015 Nielsen poll found that “not tested on animals” was the most important consumer packaging claim for respondents across all age groups.
- In September 2018, the California Cruelty Free Cosmetics Act was signed into law and goes into effect January 2020. The bill was supported by industry, consumers and animal protection organizations.

Support Alternatives to Animal Testing SB. 239 (Gabbard, Harimoto, Keith-Agaran)

Summary: Prohibits manufactures and contract testing facilities in the state from using animal testing methods for the testing of cosmetics or household products WHEN a scientifically valid alternative to the animal test is available. Medical research is exempted from the requirement.

- In the past 35 years, due to innovations in science, animal tests for cosmetics and household products and other chemicals are increasingly being replaced with alternatives that are cheaper, faster and can better predict human response. Unfortunately, there is no US law that requires that available non-animal tests be used in favor animal tests. In contrast, European Union has required that available scientifically satisfactory non-animal tests be used instead of animal tests since 1986. Hawaii would join California, New York, New Jersey and Virginia in ensuring that animals are not harmed in outdated cosmetic and chemical product tests when accepted modern alternatives are available.

For more information contact: Inga Gibson, ponoadvocacy@gmail.com or 808.922.9910



February 19, 2019

Representative Lee
Chair, House Judiciary Committee
Hawaii State Capitol

RE: Support for HB 704 – An Act concerning animal tested cosmetics

Aloha e Representative Lee and Committee

On behalf of Cruelty Free International, I write in support of HB 704. This bill would make it unlawful for any cosmetic manufacture to knowingly import for profit, sell at retail, or offer for sale at retail any cosmetic in the state if the final product or any component of the cosmetic was developed or manufactured using animal testing that was performed after January 1, 2020.

For more than 50 years animals have been used in painful tests to assess the safety of chemicals used in cosmetics products. Today, modern approaches that are cheaper, faster, and can better predict human reactions are widely available and more are becoming available each year. Alternative methods are tests that use simple organisms like bacteria, or tissues and cells from humans (vitro tests), and sophisticated computer models or chemical methods (in silico and in chemico tests). For example, human skin cells can be grown in vitro to test ingredients for skin irritation and companies can use computer models to predict toxicity based on the known chemical structure and behavior of the existing ingredient.

In addition, companies have thousands of existing cosmetic ingredients with histories of safe use that can be utilized. Numerous polls show that across the US and, around the world, consumers want cruelty free cosmetics and support laws that protect animals from senseless cruelty.

Worldwide, many countries have taken steps to end cosmetics testing on animals. Five years ago, the European Union, our nation's largest trading partner, which accounts for nearly half of the global cosmetics market, completely banned the importation and sale of cosmetics that have been tested on animals. Most, if not all, cosmetic companies that sell products in Hawaii also sell products in the European Union and must already comply with a no-new-animal testing requirement so, compliance with a harmonized cruelty free cosmetics requirement in Hawaii can be easily achieved.

A bill at the federal level, the Humane Cosmetics Act would end the sale of animal tested cosmetic across the US national level. Last year the bill had 186 bipartisan cosponsors including Hawaii Representatives Tulsi Gabbard and Colleen Hanbusa. Unfortunately, the bill has been slow to advance. In action at the federal level provides an opportunity for states to lead the way. California passed a law last year that matches the language of HB 704 and was supported by industry, consumers and animal protection organizations.

With passage of a Hawaii Cruelty Free Cosmetics Act, Hawaii can set a national example.

Me ka 'oia'i 'o

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Monica Engebretson", with a long, sweeping horizontal line extending to the right.

Monica Engebretson
North America Campaign Manager



February 20, 2019

Via Electronic Mail

The Honorable Chris Lee, Chair, House Committee on Judiciary
The Honorable Joy A. San Buenaventura, Vice Chair, House Committee on Judiciary
The Honorable Roy M. Takumi, Chair, House Committee on Consumer Protection & Commerce
The Honorable Linda Ichiyama, Vice Chair, House Committee on Consumer Protection & Commerce
Hawaii State Capitol
415 South Beretania Street
Honolulu, HI 96813

Re: HB 704- OPPOSE UNLESS AMENDED

Chair Lee and Chair Takumi:

On behalf of the members of the Personal Care Products Council (PCPC), I am writing to oppose House Bill 704 as currently written.

PCPC is the leading national trade association for the global cosmetics and personal care products industry. Founded in 1894, PCPC's 600 member companies manufacture, distribute, and supply the vast majority of finished personal care products marketed in the United States. As the makers of a diverse range of products that millions of consumers rely on every day, from sunscreens, toothpaste and shampoo to moisturizer, lipstick and fragrance, member companies are global leaders committed to product safety, quality and innovation.

Cosmetics and personal care products companies have been strong leaders in the search for and development of alternative testing methods for safety assessments, and have worked with regulators in the U.S. and globally for acceptance of these procedures as valid non-animal alternatives for toxicity testing methods. For nearly four decades, our member companies have been at the forefront in significantly reducing the use of animals in product safety testing. Our member companies firmly believe eliminating animal testing is the right thing to do. Personal care products companies ceased animal testing on finished products in the 1980s.

We all share in the goal of making animal testing for cosmetics and personal care products obsolete globally. While HB 704 is well intentioned, we have serious concerns over some provisions in the bill. We would like the opportunity to work with you on proposed amendments that would align this legislation with industry's commitments and that would assure Hawaii's consumers are offered products that meet the highest standards of safety and innovation.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in cursive script that reads "Francine Lamoriello".

Francine Lamoriello
Executive Vice President



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

Testimony in Support of Bill HB 704

House Committee on Judiciary
House Committee on Consumer Protection & Commerce

February 21, 2019

To the Honorable Chris Lee, and members of the Committee on Judiciary;

To the Honorable Roy Takumi, and members of the Committee on Consumer Protection & Commerce

On behalf of the National Anti-Vivisection Society and our supporters in Hawaii, **I would like to state our strong support for HB 704**, legislation that would end the use of live animals for chemical safety testing when a non-animal alternative is available.

The Federal Food, Drug and Cosmetic Act does not *require* manufacturers of cosmetics, personal care and other household products to test their products and ingredients on animals for safety. In fact, the Food and Drug Administration (FDA), which administers the Act, actually encourages the use of testing techniques that do not use whole living animals.

While some progress has been made at the federal level with regard to fostering the development of alternatives to animal testing, especially through the Interagency Coordinating Committee on the Validation of Alternative Methods (ICCVAM), the U.S. Congress has failed to act to require manufacturers to end the use of animals where alternatives already exist to establish reliable safety standards. We applaud the Hawaii legislature for taking up this issue and joining other states to move forward on this matter.

NAVS' opposition to the use of animals in cosmetics testing is based on credible scientific evidence that animal testing can produce invalid, misleading results that can ultimately be harmful to people. Animals are used in scientific experimentation based on a presumption that similarities between animals and humans enable data from animal models to be extrapolated to humans. However, the differences between other species and humans make translating data from animals to people problematic, as different species can respond to the same chemicals in different ways. Therefore, overreliance on animal models is actually counterproductive; it often

sidetracks meaningful scientific progress while wasting millions of taxpayer dollars and other resources.

Innovative, animal-free alternative cosmetics testing methods, including human cell-based tests and sophisticated computer models, are available and offer advantages over traditional animal tests. Animal-free alternatives offer significant cost savings benefits over animal models, are able to generate data more quickly and are better able to predict how these products will affect people.

NAVS' opposition to the use of animals in cosmetics testing is also based on compelling ethical arguments against animal testing, as these tests are cruel and unnecessary and can cause high levels of animal suffering.

We commend the sponsors of this legislation and urge members of both committees to follow the example of California, New Jersey, New York and Virginia, as well as the entire European Union and countless other countries around the world, in ending the unnecessary cruelty of using animals for chemical safety testing.

Thank you very much for your consideration.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in cursive script, reading "Marcia Kramer". The signature is written in dark ink and is positioned above the typed name.

Marcia Kramer
Director of Legal/Legislative Programs
312-427-6073



THE HUMANE SOCIETY
OF THE UNITED STATES

To: Representative Chris Lee, Chair
House Judiciary committee members

Representative Roy M. Takumi, Chair
House Consumer Protection & Commerce committee members

In Support Of: HB 704 HD1

Date: February 20, 2019

Testimony By: Heather Carpenter, Western Regional Director, The Humane Society of the United States

My name is Heather Carpenter. I am the Western Regional Director for The Humane Society of the United States (HSUS) and I appreciate the opportunity to submit this written testimony on behalf of our Hawaii members and supporters urging the committee to pass HB 704 HD1, which prohibits a manufacturer from importing for profit, selling, or offering for sale in Hawaii any cosmetic, for which an animal test was conducted or contracted by or on behalf of the manufacturer, or any supplier of the manufacturer, on or after January 1, 2021.

There are no animal testing requirements for cosmetic safety substantiation in the United States. Last Congress, the Humane Cosmetics Act (H.R. 2790), bipartisan legislation to end the production and sale of animal-tested cosmetics, received 187 sponsors and cosponsors in the House of Representatives and has been endorsed by more than 260 companies in the cosmetics industry.

In traditional animal tests, rabbits, guinea pigs, mice and rats have substances forced down their throats, dripped into their eyes, or smeared onto their skin before they are killed. These test methods are unreliable predictors of human safety. Different species can respond differently when exposed to the same chemicals. Consequently, animal tests may under- or over-estimate real-world hazards to people. In addition, results from animal tests can be quite variable and difficult to interpret.

Fortunately, animal testing for cosmetics is completely unnecessary. Companies can already create great products using thousands of available ingredients that have a history of safe use and do not require new testing. For new ingredients where animal testing may currently be used, many non-animal methods have been, and continue to be, developed. Non-animal methods can combine human cell-based tests and sophisticated computer models to deliver human-relevant results at less cost and in less time than the animal tests.

HB 704 HD1 does contain four exceptions that allow for animal testing under certain conditions including testing (1) Required by a federal or state agency when there is a specific human health concern and there is no available alternative test or alternative ingredient; (2) Required by a foreign regulatory authority, if no evidence derived from such test was relied upon to substantiate the safety of a cosmetic sold within Hawaii; (3) Conducted on a product or ingredient classified as a drug by the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act ; or (4) Conducted for a noncosmetic purpose in response to a regulatory requirement, if no evidence derived from such test was relied upon to substantiate the safety of a cosmetic sold within Hawaii.

There has been a global trend toward eliminating cosmetic animal testing. California became the first state in the country to ban the sale of cosmetics newly tested on animals (effective January 1, 2020). Historically, the

European Union (EU) began the trend in 2013 by finalizing a ban on the sale of cosmetics tested on animals, creating the world's largest cruelty-free cosmetics marketplace. This ban compelled cosmetic companies around the world to end animal testing and invest in the development of alternatives in order to sell in the EU. Similar bans have also been enacted in Israel, Norway, India, and Switzerland and are under consideration in several other countries, including Canada, which passed a bill in the Senate last year. In order to sell their products in any of these countries, cosmetic companies must already comply with bans on animal testing.

The Humane Society of the United States requests that HB 704 HB1 be reported favorably.

A handwritten signature in black ink that reads "H Carpenter". The "H" is stylized with a large loop, and the rest of the name is written in a cursive, flowing script.

Heather Carpenter
702-929-2999

HB-704-HD-1

Submitted on: 2/20/2019 1:48:22 PM

Testimony for JUD on 2/21/2019 2:00:00 PM

Submitted By	Organization	Testifier Position	Present at Hearing
Melodie Aduja	O`ahu County Committee on Legislative Priorities of the Democratic Party of Hawai`i	Support	No

Comments:

LATE

HB-704-HD-1

Submitted on: 2/21/2019 7:57:47 AM

Testimony for JUD on 2/21/2019 2:00:00 PM

Submitted By	Organization	Testifier Position	Present at Hearing
Cathy Goeggel	Animal Rights Hawai'i	Support	Yes

Comments:

HB-704-HD-1

Submitted on: 2/19/2019 5:36:48 PM

Testimony for JUD on 2/21/2019 2:00:00 PM

Submitted By	Organization	Testifier Position	Present at Hearing
carole richelieu	Individual	Support	No

Comments:

HB-704-HD-1

Submitted on: 2/19/2019 7:38:20 PM

Testimony for JUD on 2/21/2019 2:00:00 PM

Submitted By	Organization	Testifier Position	Present at Hearing
Gerard Silva	Individual	Oppose	No

Comments:

This is not in the Best interest of our State.

HB-704-HD-1

Submitted on: 2/20/2019 6:30:45 AM

Testimony for JUD on 2/21/2019 2:00:00 PM

Submitted By	Organization	Testifier Position	Present at Hearing
Rosemary Karlsson	Individual	Support	No

Comments:

No need for animal testing, there are others tests & computer models that are available.

HB-704-HD-1

Submitted on: 2/20/2019 8:50:28 AM

Testimony for JUD on 2/21/2019 2:00:00 PM

Submitted By	Organization	Testifier Position	Present at Hearing
Ryuko Miura	Individual	Support	No

Comments:

HB-704-HD-1

Submitted on: 2/20/2019 9:03:33 AM

Testimony for JUD on 2/21/2019 2:00:00 PM

Submitted By	Organization	Testifier Position	Present at Hearing
naomi egami	Individual	Support	No

Comments:

Definitely supporting this bill. Animal testing has been done over and over on the same products for decades when there is no need. We all know that safe, organic and natural products benefit human health.

HB-704-HD-1

Submitted on: 2/20/2019 10:46:05 AM

Testimony for JUD on 2/21/2019 2:00:00 PM

Submitted By	Organization	Testifier Position	Present at Hearing
Suzanne Watanabe	Individual	Support	No

Comments:

I support bill 704 which would ban the sale of cosmetics which engage in testing its products on animals. This has been going on for DECADES, and if the cosmetic industry has not cleaned up its act by now, then ALL COSMETICS WHICH HAVE BEEN TESTED ON ANIMALS SHOULD BE BANNED FROM SALE IN HAWAII! To continue doing so is absolutely cruel to the animals used in these testings since they are bred SOLELY for this purpose.

HB-704-HD-1

Submitted on: 2/20/2019 1:36:36 PM

Testimony for JUD on 2/21/2019 2:00:00 PM

Submitted By	Organization	Testifier Position	Present at Hearing
Rene Umberger	Individual	Support	No

Comments:

LATE

HB-704-HD-1

Submitted on: 2/20/2019 4:22:00 PM

Testimony for JUD on 2/21/2019 2:00:00 PM

Submitted By	Organization	Testifier Position	Present at Hearing
Lois Crozer	Individual	Support	No

Comments:

LATE

HB-704-HD-1

Submitted on: 2/20/2019 5:16:20 PM

Testimony for JUD on 2/21/2019 2:00:00 PM

Submitted By	Organization	Testifier Position	Present at Hearing
Frank DeGiacomo	Individual	Support	No

Comments:

HB-704-HD-1

Submitted on: 2/20/2019 10:00:08 PM

Testimony for JUD on 2/21/2019 2:00:00 PM

LATE

Submitted By	Organization	Testifier Position	Present at Hearing
Ted Bohlen	Individual	Support	No

Comments:

LATE

HB-704-HD-1

Submitted on: 2/20/2019 10:40:19 PM

Testimony for JUD on 2/21/2019 2:00:00 PM

Submitted By	Organization	Testifier Position	Present at Hearing
Nick Pecoraro	Individual	Support	No

Comments:

Aloha,

I currently do my best to not buy any products tested on animals because it is an inhumane and outdated practice. It serves no practical purpose, as time and again these tests show that products tend to react differently to humans anyway. Aside from this, it is downright cruel to keep animals in laboratory cages for the purpose of experimenting on them. They have no ability to advocate for themselves in our legislatures or elections, so we must do it for them. If the experiments done to “lab animals” (rabbits, mice, rats, etc) were performed on dogs, many of the experimenters and heads of companies performing the tests would be jailed for charges of animal cruelty. To give you an example, rabbits are often used for product testing because they don’t have tear ducts; experimenters will drip sometimes toxic products in their eyes to see the somatic reaction. Since they do not produce tears and have no hands or access to water for washing, they have little hope of expelling the chemicals from their eyes.

I repeat: this kind of cosmetic testing on animals is cruel and unnecessary. There is no place for it in civilized society.

Mahalo for your consideration.

LATE

HB-704-HD-1

Submitted on: 2/20/2019 11:14:05 PM

Testimony for JUD on 2/21/2019 2:00:00 PM

Submitted By	Organization	Testifier Position	Present at Hearing
Anonymous	Individual	Support	No

Comments:

I am into korean skincare and they are just starting to enter our market through Target (Whamisa and Pixi) and they have already decided to legally ban it by 2018. Read more in this article :<https://theklog.co/cruelty-free-skin-care-products-from-korea/> . Although this is not a factor I think about first when buying skincare (price, natural ingredients, purpose, & packaging but now I am adding nonplastic containers/recyclable/eco containers then animal cruelty) since I have heard rumors that the beauty industry is going away from it. I am more willing to try and buy products that are animal cruelty free when comparing the labels in store.

Please draft a bill for recycling cosmetics or similar solution. It limits buying power and the good choices. Thank you!.

LATE

HB-704-HD-1

Submitted on: 2/21/2019 7:53:24 AM

Testimony for JUD on 2/21/2019 2:00:00 PM

Submitted By	Organization	Testifier Position	Present at Hearing
Leilani M Angel	Individual	Support	No

Comments:

“I did then what I knew how to do. Now that I know better, I do better.”• Maya Angelou

Humans have evolved past our barbarian ways. We are smarter now, therefore, it is imperative to make better, more enlightening decisions about what type of world we are creating. We share this planet with our animal companions. It is not necessary to torture, abuse, and murder them for any reason at all ever. It's beneath us.

Rabbits, mice, rats, and guinea pigs are usually the victims of this horrendous practice of cosmetic testing which includes many torturous procedures including being burned, shaved, and force-fed to determine what a lethal consumption amount would be. These animals suffer blindness, swollen eyes, and internal bleeding before they are put to death by asphyxiation...yes, they break their necks or decapitate their heads. According to the [Humane Society International](#), approximately 100,000 to 200,000 animals die every year in the U.S. due to animal testing.

Some brands actually use animal by-products in their formulas such as crushed beetles, guanine (which is bat poop, yes, you read that correctly), animal fat, and, gelatin which consists of boiled animal skin, ligaments, tendons, and bones. Urine from pregnant horses is extracted for estrogen in cream based products.

No living being deserves to be treated in such a manner. They are beautiful, intelligent creatures that deserve to enjoy their lives on this planet free from slavery and abuse. We have the power to create positive change in the world. To ignore that would be a great travesty.

There are several brands that are creating quality successful, plant-based based, vegan, cruelty free products that do not involve the suffering of animals in any way. The future of our planet and the overall morality of the human race is at stake. Now that we know better, it's time to do better.

Photo from: <https://ceasevivisection.wordpress.com/2014/03/>