

October 22, 1996

E. EDWARD KAVANAUGH  
PRESIDENT

Legislative Counsel  
c/o Phil Lynch  
311 State Capitol  
Santa Fe, NM 87503

**RE: Report to the Legislature on Multiple Chemical Sensitivity (MCS)**

To the Members of the Health and Human Services Committee:

The Cosmetic, Toiletry and Fragrance Association (CTFA) appreciates this opportunity to comment on the referenced August 27, 1996 Report prepared by the Governor's Committee on Concerns of the Handicapped. CTFA is the national trade association representing the cosmetic, toiletry, and fragrance industry. Founded in 1894, CTFA has an active membership of more than 270 companies that manufacture or distribute the vast majority of finished personal care products marketed in the United States. CTFA also includes approximately 280 associate member companies, including manufacturers of raw materials, trade and consumer magazines and other related materials.

Our chief concern with the report centers on recommendation 3 (page 6) and the accompanying "Suggested Public Meeting Policy." That recommendation calls for New Mexico public entities to include the following "fragrance free" statement on meeting notices and at meeting sites:

"In order to allow chemically sensitive persons to participate in the meeting, it is necessary that all attendees refrain from wearing perfume, cologne, essential oils, aftershave, scented body lotions, hair mousse, or strongly fragrant products."

We must respectfully oppose this policy recommendation for three reasons:

- First, there is no credible scientific or medical evidence linking fragrances or scented products to any serious health problem.
- Second, restricting the wearing of scented products at public meetings puts government in the improper role of regulating matters of personal hygiene, good grooming, and individual choice.

*Bying more  
List of ingredients*

*Also...  
in...  
...  
...  
...  
...*

1101 17TH ST., N.W., SUITE 300 WASHINGTON, D.C. 20036-4702

202.331.1770 FAX 202.331.1969

SECURING THE INDUSTRY'S FUTURE SINCE 1894

- Third, restrictions on fragrances and scented products are ultimately unenforceable and unfair to the millions of individuals who enjoy and benefit from scented personal care products.

The Committee report correctly concedes that there is "no consensus definition" of Multiple Chemical Sensitivity (MCS) and "considerable debate regarding its causation" (page 1). In fact, numerous medical groups, including the American Medical Association, the American Academy of Asthma, Allergy, and Immunology, and the American College of Occupational and Environmental Medicine have all rejected MCS as an organically based disease. Given the skepticism that MCS has received in the mainstream medical community, we think it improper to call on governmental entities to restrict the use of products that play a most important part in promoting personal hygiene and good grooming.

*If this meeting is to be with anyone or government - that's a huge issue - not which issues*  
 Aside from the physical and psychological benefits that scented products convey, fragrances make a wide variety of personal care and household products more pleasant to use. For example, fragrances can mask unpleasant natural odors of ingredients that are essential to the efficacy of a product. Toothpaste is one example. Moreover, some "fragrance free" products are formulated not by omitting fragrance ingredients, but by adding fragrance to neutralize odors already present in the products. *yeah, what's your point?*

*yeah right*  
 We certainly sympathize with anyone who experiences adverse reactions to stimuli in the environment. But it's a fact of life that just about everyone reacts adversely to something in the environment. Society cannot be called upon to ban or restrict everything that certain individuals claim to be objectionable. MCS advocates cite a wide variety of factors as alleged barriers to everyday life, including flowers, noise, fluorescent light, and electromagnetic fields. Yet the proposed public meeting policy calls for no restrictions on these entities. *So you feel pulled on?*

There is simply no evidence that ingredients in scented products have any greater potential for triggering adverse reactions than any number of other objects and substances encountered on a daily basis. *we're getting to work - but yours is the worst*  
 It is therefore simply unfair -- let alone scientifically unjustifiable -- to single out specific categories of cosmetic products in the text of the proposed meeting notice.

*we say so "any other strongly fragrant product" - by the way not products*  
 The list of products mentioned in that notice raises a number of questions. What products are covered by "essential oils"? Are menthol shaving creams permitted when "aftershave" products are not? Do "scented body lotions" include deodorants and antiperspirants? Why is "hair mousse" targeted and not styling gels and hairsprays? *It's the oil - beard - not the coloration - not with a beard - call for details*  
 Who would determine what "strongly fragrant products" include? Subjecting attendees at public meetings to an arbitrary checklist that includes supposedly objectional products makes no sense. Many proposed attendees will undoubtedly be offended by such a list. Indeed, the imposition of the proposed meeting notice could well discourage, rather than encourage, greater participation at public meetings.

*no one*  
 All, people just ignore the request + come anyway.  
 So easily offended people should be expected to walk down aisles are prevented from participating?

*Every time you industry goes ahead with - when you should be asked the question first?*

*The Smell*

In closing, we would urge that government not be asked to intrude into the sensitive area of banning or discouraging the use of scented personal care products. Rather than calling for government regulation of matters of personal choice, we urge the use of common sense and courtesy as a much more effective response to some of the concerns raised in the report.

*year of it only worked // And for some time for some reason...  
re-arranging subject to government agency!*

If you have any questions or need additional information, please contact our local consultant Marla Shoats at 505-890-0306. Thank you.

Sincerely yours,



Michael J. Petrino, Jr.  
Vice President - Legislative Relations