

January 14, 2003

Christine Todd Whitman
U.S. Environmental Protection Agency
1200 Pennsylvania Ave. N.W.
Washington, DC 20460

Dear Ms. Whitman:

First, we are sorry to hear of Coors' death from cancer. Second, how wonderful that she died in the company of those who cared for and loved her, presumably, and who made sure that she did not suffer unnecessarily. Would that the millions of animals deliberately poisoned in EPA laboratories were as lucky. If you could somehow find it in your heart to recognize that they all feel pain, loneliness, fear, and distress, just as Coors did, you would not wish them to spend their final days and hours alone in a small, barren metal cage, writhing in unrelieved agony.

Third, rather than bury your head in the sand and imagine that—if the unfettered use of animals over the last 100 or more years hasn't been enough for you—Coors might have been saved as a result of even more animal experiments, please consider that in fact, she and countless human beings and other animals might have been spared pain and premature death if the EPA and other government agencies did their jobs—by which I mean taking known carcinogenic chemicals off the market and restricting their use, instead of kowtowing to the industries that profit from their production. Furthermore, if you would only learn a little about the worthlessness of the animal tests that the EPA is currently using, you would realize that they are far from state-of-the-art and are perhaps designed, like the tobacco-industry experiments that tried to disprove the harmful effects of nicotine, tar, and tobacco, to confound and confuse, rather than clarify, the effects of various substances on human beings, the Earth, and wildlife. Year after year, we sit down at the table with EPA officials and meet with obstinacy, ignorance, and indifference to the suffering of animals and the steps that need to be taken to replace their use in these unsatisfactory, painful tests with modern, humane test methods.

You are misinformed as to the state of the art of chemical testing. Moreover, the U.S. Congress ordered the agency that you now head to spend money on alternatives to animal use, to modernize, but it has not done so. In this regard, your tenure is a disgrace and a disservice, and the American public and the animals who depend upon the mercy of humankind are not only poorly served by it but betrayed. If you have any interest in looking at this issue in a new light, please give us a sign.

Sincerely,



Ingrid E. Newkirk
President

P.S. Your claim that “less than 10% of new chemical testing [in the HPV chemical-testing program] requires the use of animals” merely reflects the sloppy work and lack of interest in animal welfare of the EPA bureaucrats working on the HPV chemical program. In fact, between 33 and 100 percent of the test plans in any given month call for new tests on animals. Of the test plans submitted to the EPA in November and December 2002, fully 63 percent plan to conduct new animal tests. Close to 100,000 animals have already been killed in this do-nothing testing program.



PETA

PEOPLE FOR THE ETHICAL
TREATMENT OF ANIMALS

501 FRONT ST.
NORFOLK, VA 23510
Tel. 757-622-PETA
Fax 757-622-0457

PETA.org
info@peta.org

AN INTERNATIONAL
ORGANIZATION DEDICATED
TO PROTECTING
THE RIGHTS OF ALL ANIMALS