ANIMAL WELFARE POLICY

This Proposal is submitted by Gloria J. Eddie.

RESOLVED, that the Board adopt and post an Animal Welfare Policy online which addresses the Company’s commitment to (a) reducing, refining and replacing its use of animals in research and testing, and (b) providing for the social and behavioral needs of those animals used in such research and testing, both by the Company itself and by all independently retained laboratories. Further, the shareholders request that the Board issue a report to shareholders on the extent to which in-house and contract laboratories are adhering to this policy, including the implementation of enrichment measures.

Supporting Statement:

The Boards of many companies have adopted and prominently published animal welfare policies on their Web sites committing to the care, welfare, and protection of animals used in product research and development. Our Company should be an industry leader with respect to animal welfare issues, and yet it has no publicly available animal welfare policy and is therefore below the industry standard.

However, the disclosure of atrocities recorded at Covance, Inc., an independent laboratory headquartered in Princeton, New Jersey,¹ has made the need for a formalized, publicly available animal welfare policy that extends to all outside contractors all the more relevant, indeed urgent.² Filmed footage showed primates being subjected to such gross physical abuses and psychological torments that Covance sued to enjoin People for the Ethical Treatment of Animals in Europe

¹ PETA’s undercover investigator videotaped the systematic abuse of animals at Covance’s laboratory in Vienna, VA over a six month investigation.
² In October 2005, Covance’s Director of Early Development stated that “We’ve worked with just about every major company around the world” (http://www.azcentral.com/arizonarepublic/eastvalleyopinions/articles/1021er-edit21.html)
from publicizing it. The Honorable Judge Peter Langan in the United Kingdom refused to stop
PETA from publicizing the film and instead ruled in PETA’s favor. The Judge stated in his
opinion that the “rough manner in which the animals are handled and the bleakness of the
surroundings in which they are kept … even to a viewer with no particular interest in animal
welfare, at least cry out for explanation.”

Shareholders cannot monitor what goes on behind the closed doors of the animal testing
laboratories, so the Company must. Accordingly, we urge the Board to commit to promoting
basic animal welfare measures as an integral part of our Company’s corporate stewardship.

We urge shareholders to support this Resolution.

3 The case captioned Covance Laboratories Limited v. PETA Europe Limited was filed in the High Court of Justice,
Chancery Division, Leeds District Registry, Claim No. 5C-00295. In addition to ruling in PETA’s favor, the Court
ordered Covance to pay PETA £50,000 in costs and fees.