



Animal Defenders International

5455 Wilshire Boulevard, Suite 2015, LOS ANGELES, CA 90036, USA. Tel: +1 323 935 2234 Fax: +1 323 935 9234
www.adiusa.org usa@ad-international.org

Chair John Hunt
Vice Chair John Potucek
Committee on Commerce and Consumer Affairs
33 N. State St., GP Room 229
Concord, NH 03301

Dear Members of the Committee on Commerce and Consumer Affairs,

Animal Defenders International, on behalf of our New Hampshire supporters, submits the following testimony in strong support of Senate bill 444: An Act prohibiting the use of animal testing when other comparable methods are available.

This bill would prohibit most animal testing used for developing cosmetic products. This bill does not limit biomedical research and allows animal testing if there is no other viable method of testing for the relevant purpose. Still, when animal testing is allowed, this bill would require facilities to use the fewest possible number of animals and to reduce the level of pain, suffering, and stress for each animal.

ANIMAL RESEARCH IS UNRELIABLE FOR HUMANS: SPECIES DIFFERENCES

“Species differences” is the fundamental flaw of animal testing. Each species responds differently to substances; therefore, animal tests are an unreliable way to predict effects in humans. Just because a substance or drug has a negative or positive effect on a nonhuman does not mean the same is true for humans.

Studies have shown that living in a laboratory environment can affect the outcome of an experiment, with test results varying depending on the animal’s age, sex, diet, and even their bedding. Results have also been found to vary from laboratory to laboratory.

Animal Defenders International investigations exposed terrible torment endured by animals in product testing, which typically involves the following:

- Repeat dose toxicity tests, to observe chronic, long-term effects on organs: a product may be pumped down an animal’s throat or applied to its skin, or an animal might be forced to inhale it. The investigations have found racks of rabbits restrained in stocks while products are dripped into their eyes, and guinea pigs suffering raw, inflamed skin lesions.
- Skin sensitization tests, to assess potential allergic reactions: may involve abrading the skin and deliberately causing painful damage.
- Carcinogenicity tests: animals are exposed to carcinogens and monitored for cell changes related to the development of cancer during or after exposure.

- Reproductive toxicity tests: animals are exposed to substances before and during pregnancy to test for poisonous effects, including the animal's ability to reproduce, as well as damage to the fetus or its development.

The research is generally conducted in secret, so the pain and suffering of these animals are not subjected to wider scientific and public scrutiny, nor does it promote the use of modern, advanced techniques.

MORE RELIABLE TEST METHODS

Scientific innovation provides an expanding arsenal of humane and effective alternative testing methods.

New Approach Methodologies (NAMs) are cutting-edge methodologies that offer more advanced scientific tools and technologies, and focus on humans, rather than other species. Governments and regulators must drive research toward modern methods to benefit people, such as sophisticated analytical techniques, databases, organ-on-a-chip models, microdosing, computer simulations and modeling, and human tissue and 3D cell cultures.

Advanced non-animal techniques are faster, more accurate, and of more direct relevance to humans. It is better science for animals and people.

PUBLIC OPINION

Public opinion disfavors animal testing.

A 2024 Morning Consult survey found that 85% of US adults agree that animal experimentation should be phased out in favor of more modern research methods.¹ A 2025 Gallup poll found that 53% of US adults find testing on animals to be morally unacceptable.²

Nearly 40 countries have ended the use of animals in cosmetics testing. Twelve US states have already passed similar legislation. California was the first to do so in 2018, followed by Nevada, Illinois, Virginia, Maryland, Maine, Hawaii, New Jersey, Louisiana, New York, Oregon, and most recently, Washington banned the sale of cosmetics tested on animals in 2024, which took effect January 1, 2025. Additionally, at least 140 personal care products companies have endorsed the US Humane Cosmetics Act.³

As it stands, cosmetics manufacturers must meet cruelty-free requirements for 1.5 billion consumers in the global marketplace. Hundreds of cruelty-free cosmetic companies thrive in North America, and the market increasingly demands humane products.

¹ *U.S. Gen Pop Beliefs on Animal Testing*, MORNING CONSULT & PHYSICIANS COMM. FOR RESPONSIBLE MED. ((Sept. 2024), <https://pcrm.widen.net/s/qzfxth7bw/animal-testing-survey>).

² Frank Newport, *Trends in U.S. Adults' Acceptance of Moral and Values Behaviors* (Sept. 04, 2025), <https://news.gallup.com/opinion/polling-matters/694550/trends-adults-acceptance-moral-values-behaviors.aspx>.

³ Michael Markarian, *Pretty Doesn't Have to Hurt: Humane Cosmetics Act Introduced*, <https://explore.britannica.com/explore/savingearth/pretty-doesnt-have-to-hurt-humane-cosmetics-act-introduced> (last visited Jan. 12, 2026).

As such, we urge you to support **Senate bill 444**. It is time to end unreliable, unethical, and unnecessary animal experiments in New Hampshire. Thank you.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in blue ink that reads "Drew McCormick". The signature is written in a cursive, flowing style.

Drew McCormick
Policy Advisor
Animal Defenders International
drewmccormick@ad-international.org
www.ad-international.org