



**Informational Statement HB611**  
**Public Health –Prohibition on Testing Cosmetics on Animals**  
By Laura Bogley-Knickman, JD  
Director of Legislation, Maryland Right to Life

On behalf of our members across the state, we applaud the intentions of the sponsor to protect the rights and dignity of animals against exploitation, abuse and death for cosmetic purposes. However, we must take issue with the fact that the sponsor specifically excluded human beings, who deserve at least equal protection as do other animals from inhumane testing practices.

We strongly oppose any policy or funding that allows the procurement of and research on human embryonic or fetal tissue obtained through the brutality of abortion. While no disease has been cured as a result of unnecessary use of human fetal tissue, this research artificially increases the demand for aborted babies and especially late-term aborted babies. See more about this research [HERE](#).

**Humane Disposal of Human Remains**

In the case of abortion, we oppose any and all uses of aborted embryonic and fetal remains, whether for public or commercial purposes, and support only the humane disposition of embryonic and fetal remains by cremation or burial. In all cases, whether through miscarriage or abortion, we believe the mother must first make an affirmative anatomical gift of her unborn child's remains only after she has given fully informed consent as to the options for humane disposition or the intended public or commercial use of her unborn child's remains. In no case do we believe an aborted human being should suffer the indignities of being used for cosmetic or food production testing.

**No public funding for abortions**

Fetal and embryonic tissue harvesting and research creates and artificial demand for aborted babies. State funding for abortion on demand with taxpayer funds is in direct conflict with the will of the people. A 2020 Marist poll showed that 60% of Americans, both "pro-life" and "pro-choice" oppose the use of tax dollars to pay for a woman's abortion. Never has more than 40% of the American public supported taxpayer funding of abortion regardless of the context or way in which the question is asked.

**Funding restrictions are constitutional**

The Supreme Court has held in the case of *Harris v. McRae (1980)*, that the government may distinguish between abortion and other procedures in funding decisions -- noting that "*no other procedure involves the purposeful termination of a potential life*" -- and affirmed that *Roe v. Wade* had created a limitation on government, not a government funding entitlement.

We respectfully ask for your specific amendment to remove incentives for the harvesting, procurement or research on human embryonic and fetal tissue obtained through abortion. Thank you.