



**Support for SB682 SD1, Prohibiting the Sale of Fur Products  
House Committee on Judiciary & Hawaiian Affairs  
Susan Rhee, Hawai'i State Director  
The Humane Society of the United States  
March 16<sup>th</sup>, 2023**

Good afternoon Chair Tarnas and Members of the Committee,

My name is Susan Rhee and I am the Hawai'i State Director for the Humane Society of the United States. On behalf of my organization and our Hawai'i supporters, I ask you to please vote in favor of SB 682 SD1. This important bill will end the sale of new fur products in Hawai'i, while providing commonsense exemptions such as for used fur products as well as for cultural use.

Recent polling shows that a supermajority of Hawai'i voters support legislation in our state to end the sale of new fur products, including at least 80% of Democrats and 75% of Republicans.<sup>1</sup> The bill upholds the values of the majority of Hawai'ians who care about animal welfare and environmental health.

Each year, more than 100 million animals are killed solely to be turned into fur coats, keychains, poms on hats, and other novelty items. Fur factory farms are not subject to required inspections and little to no federal regulations hold these facilities accountable to basic animal welfare standards that other farm-raised animals benefit from. The majority of these animals, like foxes, mink, and chinchillas, are held captive by the thousands in fur factory farms where they suffer from extreme neglect in cramped cages.

Investigations from multiple countries, including China, the world's largest exporter of fur products, show these animals in deplorable conditions, riddled with disease, injuries, and dead animals left for extended periods of time in cages alongside other animals. The methods for killing these animals are just as gruesome, including electrocution and gassing, to keep costs low and not damage pelts.

In the wild, fur-bearing animals are caught in cruel and indiscriminate steel-jawed leghold traps, where they often languish for days without food or water and typically suffer severe injuries. Every trapping season, we hear of endangered or threatened species, as well as people's pets, that are killed or maimed in these archaic traps.

The fur industry also causes major environmental pollution. Not only does the tanning and dyeing process use toxic chemicals to prevent skin decay, but the runoff from animals on fur factory farms pollutes waterways and soil. Many of these chemicals are known carcinogens and are harmful to their surrounding communities. Additionally, fur farms enable dangerous diseases, like COVID and avian flu, to spread like wildfire, threatening public health.

The concern for animal welfare continues to grow in Hawai'i and across the States, and consumers increasingly want products that do not involve animal cruelty. Major fashion brands across the world are hearing this consumer demand and ending their use of fur, along with developing innovative materials that can easily replace fur with humane, environmentally friendly alternatives without hurting businesses.



**THE HUMANE SOCIETY  
OF THE UNITED STATES**

With this bill, Hawai'i has a chance to take an affirmative stand against the cruel practices and environmental harm inherent in the fur industry, and no longer support these products. And by passing this bill, Hawai'i would join numerous countries across the world, as well as the entire state of California and multiple cities across the U.S., in the effort to end the sale of new products. For all of these reasons, we respectfully ask that the members of this Committee support the passage of SB 682 SD1. Thank you for your consideration.

Susan Rhee  
Hawaii State Director, The Humane Society of the United States

---

<sup>1</sup> Remington Research Group, 2023. Hawai'i Public Opinion, February 2023. Survey conducted February 1 through February 5, 2023. 801 likely 2024 General Election voters participated in the survey.

**SB-682-SD-1**

Submitted on: 3/15/2023 11:18:12 AM

Testimony for JHA on 3/16/2023 2:00:00 PM

<b>Submitted By</b>	<b>Organization</b>	<b>Testifier Position</b>	<b>Testify</b>
Challis Hobbs	Fur Commission USA	Oppose	In Person

Comments:

Dear Hawaii Committee members,

I hope this finds you well. As the Executive Director of the FCUSA, which represents fur farmers across the United States, I am writing to express my strong opposition to Hawaii SB682 that aims Prohibits the sale, offer for sale, display for sale, trade, or distribution of certain animal fur products in the State.

The bill is based on misinformation about animal welfare and the role of mink farming in public health and the environment. The animal welfare concerns raised in the bill are not supported by facts and evidence. In fact, mink farmers in the United States adhere to strict operating guidelines and certification protocols, including those developed with input from scientists, veterinarians, and animal welfare experts. These guidelines ensure the well-being of the animals and have been peer reviewed and received certification from the Professional Animal Auditors Certification Organization (PAACO). Mink farms are independently inspected by Validus Verification Services for compliance and are subject to state, federal, and local laws, including environmental regulations. Mink are harvested according to methods recommended by the American Veterinary Medical Association (AVMA) to ensure the process is humane and compassionate.

The claim that fur farms are reservoirs and transmission vectors for dangerous zoonotic diseases, including SARS coronaviruses, is also not supported by evidence. The U.S. mink farming industry, in conjunction with governmental health agencies, has taken action to protect against SARS-CoV-2, including vaccination of the mink population and implementation of strict biosecurity protocols. These efforts have been successful in preventing outbreaks of the virus on mink farms, and the CDC, USDA, National Veterinary Services Laboratory (NVSL), State Animal Health Agencies, State Veterinarians, and other medical experts all agree that there is no significant threat to the general population from U.S. farm-raised mink.

Not only does mink and fur farming prioritize animal welfare, but it also has positive environmental impacts. Mink farms serve as a way for animal agriculture processors to convert byproducts into revenue and decrease waste in landfills. Across the United States, mink farms consume over 300 million pounds of byproducts, such as dairy, poultry, eggs, beef, and fish, as feed each year. Without mink farms, these byproducts would likely be sent to landfills, resulting in additional expenses for producers and communities.

Furthermore, mink fur is often considered a sustainable product. After being harvested, mink pelts are sold on the market, and the rest of the animal is put to good use, including as organic compost, artisanal pet food, crab bait, and for medical research. It is even transformed into oils that can be used in products like conditioners for tire care. Additionally, mink manure is a highly sought-after crop fertilizer due to its rich nutrient content. In short, no part of the animal goes to waste. Mink fur is durable, biodegradable, and can last for many years, making it a more sustainable option compared to synthetic fibers, which are made from chemicals, do not occur naturally, are not biodegradable, and can take hundreds of years to break down in landfills.

In conclusion, I strongly urge you to reconsider the proposed bill and its negative impact on the U.S. mink farming industry and the environment. I would be happy to provide additional information or answer any questions you may have. Thank you for your time and consideration.

Sincerely,

Challis Hobbs Executive Director, FCUSA



**Laurence J. Lasoff**

Kelley Drye & Warren LLP  
Washington Harbour, Suite 400  
3050 K Street, NW  
Washington, DC 20007

Tel: (202) 342-8530  
Fax: (202) 342-8451  
llasoff@kelleydrye.com

March 15, 2023

**Via Email**

Honorable Committee on Judiciary and Hawaiian Affairs  
Hawaii State Capitol  
415 South Beretania Street  
Honolulu, HI 96813

**Re: Comments in Opposition to Senate Bill No. 682**

Dear Honorable Members of the House Committee on Judiciary and Hawaiian Affairs:

These comments in opposition to Senate Bill No. 682 (the “Proposed Fur Ban”) are submitted on behalf of the International Fur Federation (“IFF”), Fur Commission USA (“FCUSA”) and the American Fur Council (“AFC”). If adopted, the Proposed Fur Ban would make it unlawful to import, manufacture, sell, offer for sale, trade, give, donate, or otherwise distribute a fur product in Hawaii. The Honorable Members of this body should vote against the Proposed Fur Ban.

The undersigned firmly believe that the Proposed Fur Ban is bad public policy and bad economic policy. Notwithstanding the policy and economic implications of the bill, however, the proposed legislation should not pass through your body due to its significant legal—including constitutional—violations. A number of the most pertinent legal problems with the legislation, as currently drafted, are highlighted below.

**I. Introduction**

**A. The Commenters & Their Membership**

Collectively, the IFF, AFC and FCUSA represent the global fur industry, including the tens of thousands of small businesses and workers in the U.S., including in [State], whose livelihoods directly or indirectly depend on the fur industry.

The IFF was established in 1949 and is the only organization to represent the international fur industry and regulate its practices and trade. The IFF promotes the business of fur, facilitating certification and traceability programs on welfare and the environment. The IFF represents fifty-six

member associations in over forty countries around the world. These members encompass all parts of the fur trade, including farmers, trappers, dressers, manufacturers, brokers, auction houses, retailers and designers.

FCUSA is a U.S. national, non-profit trade association representing more than 200 U.S. mink farms. FCUSA provides leadership in government relations, research, best farm practices, marketing and the promotion of the mink-farming sector with the goal of ensuring the permanent prosperity of the U.S. mink farming industry.

AFC represents fur retailers and manufacturers across the country. AFC's members account for over 80 percent of U.S. fur sales. AFC provides the public with information on the fur industry, fashion trends, and responsible animal care to which the fur retail sector is committed. AFC also promotes the sale of fur products to the public, as well as to the fashion, design and retail sector as a whole.

## **B. Opposition to the Proposed Fur Ban Already Voiced By the Fur Industry**

Aside from the legal fallacies of the Proposed Fur Ban discussed in Section II below, there are some significant and major economic, environmental, and practical considerations triggered by the proposed ban. Among those:

**First**, the Proposed Fur Ban, if adopted, could have a devastating economic impact on small retailers and manufacturers and the people they employ within Hawaii. Many jobs have the potential to be lost directly as a result of the proposed ban. Businesses that sell fur products, many of which have existed through multiple generations, will be closed. Many will face substantial liability resulting from default on long-term lease obligations. Moreover, the ban will simply drive sales, jobs and tax revenues to other states. Closing of the Hawaii fur market could also cause many small family fur farms throughout the United States to shutter their doors. The closure of those small family fur farms, in turn, will waste the hundreds of thousands of dollars in investments that many such farmers have to meet some of the most challenging animal welfare standards that exist anywhere in the world, as fur farming is heavily regulated at the international, federal, state and local level.

**Second**, it is a policy objective of Hawaii to promote environmentally sound and sustainable agriculture and industry – and fur farming is among the most sustainable form of animal agriculture there is. In the U.S., animals raised on fur farms are typically fed leftover proteins from food processing plants that humans do not eat, thereby diverting 390 million pounds of waste that would otherwise go to landfills. The manure generated by animals raised on fur farms is used as a rich fertilizer on agricultural crops. The by-products from the animal are used in many ways, *e.g.*, the meat of the animal is used as bait for the crab fishing industry and as a biofuel and the oil from the animal is used in the cosmetics industry or as a leather conditioner. As with the other animals produced for food and/or fiber – such as cattle – virtually no part of a fur-farmed animal goes to waste.

If adopted, the Proposed Fur Ban would contravene these environmental and sustainability principles and objectives as it will encourage the increased use of fake fur. In contrast to real fur—which is a natural and sustainable product—fake fur is made from petrochemicals and plastics, and thus is not biodegradable and can promote pollution of our oceans and waterways. Curiously, the Assembly has done nothing to evaluate the environmental impact of the increased use of “alternative products.”

**Third**, the Proposed Fur Ban is the product of anti-animal use advocates who have presented what have been proven through affidavit to be staged videos, made disparaging and defamatory fur industry-wide allegations of cruelty, and have grossly misrepresented the fur industry. They have done this by, among other things, ignoring the fact that the industry works with scientists and veterinarians on an ongoing basis to identify and implement codes of practice to insure the welfare of animals raised on fur farms. A slapdash ban on all fur products will do nothing to enhance that welfare.

**Fourth**, even putting aside the fact that purported alternatives to fur—most of which are petrochemical based—fly in the face of sustainability principles, the reality is that animal use, be it in fashion, food, research or elsewhere, is a personal choice, and one that is treasured by some traditionally discriminated communities, such as African Americans and Jews. Legislatures and administrative agencies can improve animal welfare and address cruelty, but they should not be in the business of legislating morality, especially where such legislation’s affects (if not intent) are discriminatory.

**Fifth**, some proponents of proposed fur bans have provided false testimony, stating that there is no manner in which to track foreign furs which are not produced in accordance with the same strict standards as American and European furs. This is simply not true. In fact, the Fur Products Labeling Act (“FPLA”) **requires** that every garment display the country of origin of the fur included in the garment. A retailer can be civilly or criminally prosecuted on the federal level for failing to comply with the FPLA. Moreover, each and every importer of a fur product must declare the country of origin of the species to the Fish & Wildlife Service.

The Proposed Fur Ban would be harmful to many persons and counter-productive to the promotion of animal welfare and environmental and sustainability objectives. Moreover, if adopted, the bill would establish a precedent that, in the name of the anti-animal use agenda, will empower the bill’s advocates to dictate some of the more every day personal choices: the clothes an individual wishes to wear and the food an individual wishes to eat. That is not the nanny state in which the commenters believe most citizens of Hawaii wish to live.

### **C. The Purpose of the Instant Comments**

While the fur industry is in favor of sensible efforts to promote legitimate animal welfare and other sustainability objectives, including the use of independent certification programs, the Proposed

Fur Ban’s blanket prohibition on the manufacture and sale of fur products within Hawaii will do nothing to achieve those objectives. As explained below, the bill suffers from several legal deficiencies. The purpose of the instant comments is to reinforce the opposition the fur industry has already voiced to this and/or similar proposals by summarizing some of the Proposed Fur Ban’s legal deficiencies, many of which could be subject to judicial review. The end goal of these efforts is to demonstrate to this body that the Proposed Fur Ban should not be made law. It is legally deficient, and subject to constitutional challenge.

## **II. Pertinent Legal Issues Raised By The Proposed Fur Ban**

### **A. The United States Constitution’s Dormant Commerce Clause**

The Commerce Clause of the United States Constitution confers on Congress the power “to regulate commerce with foreign Nations and among the several States, and with the Indian tribes.” U.S. CONST. Art. I, § 8, cl. 3. As is clear from its text, the Commerce Clause grants Congress the power to regulate trade between and among the 50 states and foreign countries. Although not explicit in the text, the Commerce Clause prohibits states from unreasonably regulating interstate and foreign commerce. This is the Dormant Commerce Clause, which restricts the states from unreasonably regulating such commerce, and is particularly applicable when such restrictions are applied discriminatorily to create an inordinate burden on out-of-state commerce. The Supreme Court is, at this exact moment, currently reviewing the extent to which States can unreasonably regulate interstate and foreign commerce through the imposition of bans similar to those that would result from S. 682.

As recent background, in 2019, the United States Supreme Court – in striking down legislation that prohibited out of state individuals from owning Tennessee liquor stores – affirmed the long-held position of the Federal judiciary that the Constitution’s Commerce Clause “prohibits state laws that unduly restrict interstate commerce.” *Tennessee Wine and Spirits Retailers Ass’n v. Thomas*, slip op. at \*6 (June 26, 2019). The Supreme Court went on to explain the history of the Dormant Commerce Clause, explaining that “removing state trade barriers was a principal reason for the adoption of the Constitution . . . when the Constitution was sent to the state conventions, fostering free trade among the States was prominently cited as a reason for ratification.” *Id.*, slip op. at \*7-\*8.

The Supreme Court’s recent affirmance of the Constitution’s opposition to “state trade barriers” and the Dormant Commerce Clause’s aim to “foster[] free trade among the States,” calls the very essence of SB 682 into question. The stated aim of the bill would to be to completely wall off the State of Hawaii from the free trade of fur, including fur produced and manufactured in the other 49 states. Such an aim is facially in conflict with the Dormant Commerce Clause, as recently interpreted by the Supreme Court in *Tennessee Wines*.



More importantly, the Supreme Court, is at this time, addressing the issue of state-wide restrictions that impact interstate commerce in the case *National Pork Producers v. Ross* (Docket Number: 21-468). *The Ross* case involves a challenge to a California law that prohibits the in-state sale of pork from animals confined in a manner inconsistent with California standards. The case specifically addresses whether the restrictions violate the “Dormant” component of the Commerce Clause, where the law has dramatic economic effects largely outside of the state and requires pervasive changes to an integrated nationwide industry’s channels of trade.

The very essence of laws similar to SB 682 are at issue in this Supreme Court case, and a decision by the Court in favor of the Complainants would likely render a state-wide ban, as proposed in SB 682, a dead letter. The Judiciary Committee should not report out a bill that so dramatically targets interstate commerce without taking the current state of the Dormant Commerce Clause, and the pending *Ross* case into account.

#### **B. The United States Constitution’s Establishment Clause**

The First Amendment of the Constitution provides, *inter alia*, that “Congress shall make no law respecting the establishment of religion.” U.S. CONST. amend. I. In the seminal case of *Lemon v. Kurtzman*, 403 U.S. 602 (1971), the Supreme Court explained that, in order to avoid violating the Establishment Clause, a law must have (1) a “secular legislative purpose,” (2) a primary effect that “neither advances nor inhibits religion,” and (3) “must not foster ‘an excessive government entanglement with religion.’” *Id.* at 612-13.

As currently written, the SB 682 clearly violates prongs 2 and 3 of the “*Lemon* test.” The law, as currently written, prohibits the sale of all new fur *except* for fur products (1) required for use in the practice of a religion or (2) used for tribal, cultural, or spiritual purposes by a member of a federally recognized Native American tribe. The bill thereby clearly and unambiguously advances religion. Religious users of fur may wear fur apparel for religious purposes. Secular citizens of the State may not.

In 1994, in overturning New York legislation providing special privileges to a religious group, the Supreme Court explained: “A proper respect for both the Free Exercise and the Establishment Clauses compels the State to pursue a course of neutrality toward religion, **favoring neither one religion over others nor religious adherents collectively over nonadherents.**” *Bd. of Educ. of Kiryas Joel Vill. Sch. Dist. v. Grumet*, 512 U.S. 687, 696 (1994) (emphasis added). By favoring furs used for religious purposes, the Proposed Fur Ban directly conflicts with the Supreme Court’s clear and explicit establishment clause precedent. This alone makes the law unconstitutional.

Furthermore, by excluding “fur product[s] used for religious purposes” from the otherwise comprehensive ban, the proposed bill will necessarily foster “an excessive government entanglement

with religion,” which is exactly what the Supreme Court in *Lemon v. Kurtzman* proscribed against. 403 U.S. at 613.

The bill’s language imposes a religious test, one which must be administered, in this instance, by a secular government within the State. By placing the onus on the secular government to continually survey and monitor fur apparel sales, and determine whether a particular piece of fur apparel is used for religious people, the Proposed Fur Ban poses a significant risk of inconsistent treatment on the part of the government. Moreover, empowering public officials to pass judgment on the relative merits of claims to the customary religious importance of particular garments—and authorizing the secular government to penalize *only* secular, but *not* religious, wearers of fur—presents precisely the sort of government embroilment with religion that the Establishment Clause proscribes.

Finally, it is noteworthy that while *some* religious and cultural uses of fur are protected by the proposed fur ban, *others* are not. Particularly, African Americans—a community of individuals who have historically been discriminated against in the United States—are left out of the Proposed Fur Ban’s exemptions. As Jasmine Sanders, an African American writer and critic recently explained, “[m]any black women felt that the cultural disavowal of fur suspiciously coincided with their ability to get it.”<sup>1</sup> By ignoring the African American relationship to fur while providing express exemptions for other minority groups, the Proposed Fur Ban, if adopted, will likely face a constitutional Equal Protection challenge as well.

### C. International Trade Considerations

In effectuating a State ban on the retail sale of fur products, the Proposed Fur Ban would prohibit the sale of imported fur products in the State. A large share of the fur products that are sold in Hawaii are manufactured overseas. Therefore the legislation, if enacted, would constitute an implicit import ban with a direct economic impact on manufacturers of fur garments throughout the European Union and Canada, as well as fur farmers in Europe, particularly Denmark and Finland, as well as fur farmers in Canada. Such an action triggers issues relating to U.S. obligations under the World Trade Organization, including the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade (GATT), as well as various bilateral and regional trade agreement such as the North American Free Trade Agreement (NAFTA), which embody the same principles.

The pending fur prohibition in the Proposed Fur Ban would specifically violate GATT Art. XI, which prohibits quantitative restrictions on the importation or exportation of any product.<sup>2</sup> Article XI of the

---

<sup>1</sup> WBUR, “The Significance of Black Women Owning Fur” (March 4, 2019), available at <https://www.wbur.org/hereandnow/2019/03/04/sanders-black-women-owning-fur>.

<sup>2</sup> Article XI extends to “prohibitions or restrictions other than duties, taxes or other charges” on imports and exports of goods that can be “made effective through quotas, import or export licenses or other measures.” *See*

GATT provides, “No prohibitions or restrictions other than duties, taxes or other charges, whether made effective through quotas, import or export licenses or other measures, shall be instituted or maintained by any contracting party on the importation of any product of the territory of any other contracting party or on the exportation or sale for export of any product destined for the territory of any other contracting party. The Proposed Fur Ban, which explicitly prohibits the sale or offer for sale of fur apparel, directly violates Article XI’s provisions on “no prohibitions or restrictions” on the “importation of any product of the territory.” As previously noted, much of the fur that is sold in the United States is imported. As such, the ban constitutes a direct violation of Article XI.

Importantly, the Article XI prohibition on quantitative restrictions extends to provisions enacted at a sub-federal level when sub-federal agencies control imports, and, thus, would also apply to a ban imposed at the state level in the United States, such as the Proposed Fur Ban.<sup>3</sup> The WTO Appellate Body has confirmed that a federal government can and should apply the GATT to regional and local governments. Article XXIV:12 of the GATT states, “Each contracting party shall take such reasonable measures as may be available to it to ensure observance of the provisions of this Agreement by the regional and local governments and authorities with its territories.”<sup>4</sup> The Appellate Body also concurred that “Article XXIV:12 should be interpreted in a way that meets the constitutional difficulties which federal States may have in ensuring the observance of the provisions of the General Agreement by local governments, while minimizing the danger that such difficulties lead to imbalances in the rights and obligations of contracting parties.”<sup>5</sup>

Although certain exceptions to the quantitative restriction prohibition exist under GATT Art. XX(a), (b), or (g), such exceptions are unlikely to apply in the case of the Proposed Fur Ban at issue here. These exceptions are addressed below.

---

*United States – Restrictions on Imports of Tuna*, DS29/R (June 16, 1994) (WTO panel finding that import restrictions at issue were governed by Art. XI, not Art. III).

<sup>3</sup> See *Canada – Import, Distribution and Sale of Alcoholic Drinks by Canadian Provincial Marketing Agencies*, L/6304-35S/37 (March 22, 1988) (WTO panel concluding that the enactment of different standards for listing and point of sale practices for foreign and provincial alcohol by provincial marketing agencies – which completely controlled the import of alcohol into those provinces – violated GATT Art. XI). The Panel also noted that the systematic discriminatory practices effected by the provincial agencies should be considered as restrictions made effective through “other measures,” contrary to Article XI:1’s prohibition on quantitative restrictions.

<sup>4</sup> See GATT Analytical Index:: [http://www.wto.org/english/res\\_e/booksp\\_e/gatt\\_ai\\_e/art24\\_e.pdf](http://www.wto.org/english/res_e/booksp_e/gatt_ai_e/art24_e.pdf). The WTO Appellate Panel explained, “[I]f Article XXIV:12 is to fulfill its function of allowing federal States to accede to the General Agreement without having to change the federal distribution of competence, then it must be possible for them to invoke this provision not only when the regional or local governments’ competence can be clearly established but also in those cases in which the exact distribution of competence still remains to be determined by the competent judicial or political bodies.”

<sup>5</sup> *Id.*

First, the proposed ban is not “necessary” to protect public morals or animal life. While there is precedent for reliance on these exceptions in prior WTO disputes involving animal products,<sup>6</sup> the Proposed Fur Ban is limited in geographical scope and impact—farmed mink and fox, for example, are not raised in-state—while the potential economic ramifications for foreign fur manufacturers and farmers are substantial.<sup>7</sup> Furthermore, the state-wide ban does nothing to “contribute to the realization of the end pursued” to a great extent, because fur sales are still permitted both state and country-wide. The Appellate Body has specifically said that a measure does not need to be “indispensable” to be “necessary”, but cannot be simply “making a contribution to” an end result to qualify under these provisions.<sup>8</sup> This is relevant in the case of farmed mink or fox, which are not even raised in-state. The welfare of these animals are, accordingly, unaffected by the retail ban. Moreover, the proposed legislation does not consider the extensive efforts and commitments fur farmers, particularly those in Canada, Denmark and Finland (and the United States), have made toward animal welfare and environmental sustainability, including through the adoption of WelFur™ or Furmark protocols.

The WTO has also found that conservation of resources pursuant to Article XX(g), extends to “living” resources, *i.e.*, animals. This exception cannot apply to the State, however, because it would have to show, (1) that the species being protected by the ban were “exhaustible”, (2) that the ban “relate[s] to” the conservation of exhaustible natural resources, and (3) that the measure is “made effective in conjunction with restrictions on domestic production or consumption.” The farmed animals being used to produce fur are not endangered, thus the Article XX exception does not apply.<sup>9</sup> No endangered species are used in the production of fur garments.

Finally, it is likely that the nature and scope of the Proposed Fur Ban will trigger a direct challenge to the U.S. from its trading partners. If incapable of resolution, such a challenge could result in the imposition of retaliatory actions against the United States. Those retaliatory actions could, in fact, be directed at products exported from the State.

---

<sup>6</sup> The WTO has indicated that the protection of animal (dolphin) life or health is a policy that could fall under GATT Art. XX(b). *United States – Restrictions on Imports of Tuna*, DS21/R-39S/155 (not adopted, circulated Sept. 3, 1991). The WTO has also found, in extreme cases, that a regime enacted to protect animals (seals) could be considered “necessary to protect public morals” under GATT Art. XX(g). *European Communities – Measures Prohibiting the Importation and Marketing of Seal Products*, WT/DS400/AB/R (May 22, 2014) (“*EU-Seals*”).

<sup>7</sup> See *Korea – Measures Affecting Imports of Fresh, Chilled and Frozen Beef*, WT/DS161/AB/R (Dec. 11, 2000) at para. 161 (the Appellate Body finding that a measure cannot be simply “making a contribution to” an end result to qualify under these provisions).

<sup>8</sup> *Korea – Measures Affecting Imports of Fresh, Chilled and Frozen Beef*, WT/DS161/AB/R (Dec. 11, 2000) at para. 161.

<sup>9</sup> See *United States – Import Prohibition of Certain Shrimp and Shrimp Products*, WT/D58/AB/R (Nov. 6, 1998).

Honorable Members of the House Judiciary Committee  
March 15, 2023

### III. CONCLUSION

The Proposed Fur Ban is bad policy. It will shutter small, family-owned businesses, and has the potential to cripple aspects of Hawaii's economy. The proposed legislation is also bad law, and that fact could be reaffirmed by the U.S. Supreme Court in the next few months when it reviews the principles underlying the Dorman Commerce Clause. Assuming Hawaii chooses to adopt it, the Proposed Fur Ban would likely be found to be unconstitutional and violative of the United States' treaty obligations.

Please contact the undersigned or Mr. Michael Brown (contact information below) with additional questions.

Respectfully submitted,

KELLEY DRYE & WARREN LLP

By: /s/ Laurence Lasoff  
*Attorney for the International Fur Federation,  
Fur Commission USA and the American Fur Council*

cc: Michael Brown  
International Fur Federation  
Americas Region  
(202) 618-1689  
[mbrown@iftf.com](mailto:mbrown@iftf.com)



Chair Tarnas, Vice Chair Takayama, and members of the Committee on Judiciary & Hawaiian Affairs,

My name is Jason Wisniewski and I am submitting this testimony on behalf of the Fur Takers of America, a national organizations representing more than 2,900 trappers from across the United States and Canada including 6 members from Hawaii.

I am testifying to express our opposition to Senate Bill 682 which seeks to prohibit the trade of certain animal fur products in the State as this bill is founded on misrepresentations, oversimplifications, and complete omissions of other significant arguments to allow the representatives considering this bill to make an informed decisions on whether this bill is beneficial to the people of Hawaii and the nation. Fur is a sustainable and renewable natural resource that has provided clothing to man since the dawn of creation. Regulated fur trapping is the only effective approach for wildlife management agencies across the nation to manage and control the populations of animals that would not otherwise be managed. When populations are uncontrolled, over-population leads to increased human-wildlife conflicts, increased prevalence of zoonotic diseases such as parvo, rabies, and distemper, increased threats to human health, and increased predatory pressure on livestock and wildlife including endangered species. The importance of furbearer management is best exemplified in our nation's capital in 2022 when a rabid fox bit 9 people and it had to be euthanized along with its kits. Additionally, there have been 71 documented coyote attacks on people in California alone since November 2022 and such "rare" cases of such events occur daily across our country.

The marketability of fur caught through regulated trapping is the secondary product of this wildlife management tool which is regulated by state wildlife agencies in their respective jurisdictions. Furthermore, trapping is a participant funded service with the trappers paying for licenses that fund wildlife agencies, thus reducing the needs for state and federal agencies to utilizing tax revenues to complete these tasks. The equipment, licenses, training, experience, and fuel needed to effectively trap and control wildlife is costly and marketing fur is the primary incentive for trappers to provide this service at no cost to the American public. Enacting this bill will further limit demand and marketability of fur across the country causing many trappers to cease providing these services to the public.

Section 1 of this bill is laden with misinformation, over-dramatization, and ignorance of the subject. Specifically, the section fails to acknowledge that fur farming and fur trapping are heavily regulated in the United States and trapping is supported by The Wildlife Society and the Association of Fish and Wildlife Agencies. This statement also accuses the fur industry of being harmful to the environment without documented support but fails to provide the environmental ramifications of alternative materials such as "faux fur" and other synthetic, micro-fiber laden materials that are increasing pollution across the globe including 83% of public drinking water. In addition, wastewater discharge from fur tanneries has been shown to be environmentally benign to the extent that municipalities recognize it as a municipal rather than industrial effluent. Lastly, this section argues that fur farming may be a health risk as mink can catch and transmit COVID-19. However, the CDC has recently reported that there are



only 4 documented cases of COVID-19 transmission to humans at mink farms since the introduction of the pathogen in the US.

In addition to the shortcomings of section 1 of the bill, this bill fails to recognize that fur is used in far more products than identified in the bill which brings up the concern of enforcement of the bill if passed. Such products include fishing gear, cosmetics, and any felt products including pens, markers, hats, etc. This may also serve as the vessel for which legal challenges to the bill could arise. Hence, this bill could have a far larger impact to its people than currently believed.

I strongly request that the Committee on Judiciary & Hawaiian Affairs oppose SB 682 as it is not in the best interest of Hawaiian residents, nor will it solve any meaningful problems. However, this bill will proliferate emerging environmental issues of national and global concern.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in blue ink that reads "Jason M. Wisniewski". The signature is written in a cursive style with a clear, legible font.

Jason Wisniewski  
President

March 15, 2023

Written testimony opposing SB 682

As a lifelong furrier at Anamoda, Inc., one of New York's premier wholesale fur companies, I cannot believe any intelligent group of people, yet alone elected officials would even consider SB 682 – Prohibiting the sale, offer for sale, display for sale, trade, or distribution of certain animal fur products in the State of Hawaii.

Fur fashions do not break any laws. They do not harm people. They are not a hazard. Like any solid business, the fur industry boasts a long-time mark in fashion, employing a host of uniquely talented fur workers and related skills. The artisan craft of making a fur garment is irreplaceable by any chemical contaminating impostor material. The fur trade acts responsibly in breeding, harvesting and trapping our natural resource which is 100% renewable, responsible to wildlife conservation and “green” before anyone started using that trendy catch phrase.

For any government entity to make our product illegal to make or sell or possibly even wear is unconstitutional and against any consumer's freedom of choice. People have donned fur fashions since the beginning of civilization. And unlike the animal activist bullies, furriers do not go around harassing and forcing people to wear fur. It is a product that reveals a person's individual style; a choice to wear a natural hand crafted everlasting product for years on end and a very practical choice to keep warm – something synthetic impostor polyplastic based fabric cannot do.

If you read the biased reasoning in this proposed act, the exemptions alone cannot qualify banning one type of fur over another. It is clear the sponsors of SB 682, Representatives Keohokalole, McKelvey and Rhoads did not bother to research the fur industry. Some animal rights propaganda is no justification for this bill. It is nothing more than kowtowing to animal-rights extremists and their so-called “feel-good” rhetoric. Instead of recognizing that the sale of furs is part of vital wildlife management, anti-sportsmen and anti-animal husbandry legislators want to join with animal extremists to decimate the fur trade. The impact of this legislation will be felt far and wide, including any items that utilize fur in production, such as fishing lures, boots or other clothing, jewelry, toys and home accessories.

Contrary to what this legislative body is coerced into believing, the “wide array of alternatives for fashion and apparel” are harmful synthetics and imitation poly-based fabric. Impostors are not natural fur. The misinformation they got is just the bullying technique to force legislators to make divisive decisions on a free market and free enterprise which does no harm to the general population.

Not only are these extremist legislators seeking to destroy the proud history of fur, but they evidently want to control citizens by telling them what they can and cannot wear or have available for sale in Hawaii. I believe this is what is referred to as a’a Makehewa.

I love my job and the communistic thought of banning any consumer product that eradicates businesses and employment and crushes the livelihood of those earning an honest living to support our families and contribute to the economy is as un-American as you can get.

I implore this body of government for a vote of NO and to OPPOSE this mockery of our right to make, sell, purchase or wear fur fashions and related items made from natural fur.

Thank you for your attention and opposition to SB 682.

Sincerely,

Kim Salvo

Fur Fashion Director

ANAMODA, Inc.

247 West 30th Street

Suite 4R

New York, NY 10001

212-695-6936

[anamoda.nyc](http://anamoda.nyc)







**TESTIMONY OF TINA YAMAKI, PRESIDENT  
RETAIL MERCHANTS OF HAWAII  
March 16, 2023  
Re: SB 682 SD1 Relating to Animal Fur Products**

Good afternoon, Chair Tarnas and members of the House Committee on Judiciary. I am Tina Yamaki, President of the Retail Merchants of Hawaii and I appreciate this opportunity to testify.

The Retail Merchants of Hawaii was founded in 1901 and is a statewide, not for profit trade organization committed to supporting the growth and development of the retail industry in Hawaii. Our membership includes small mom & pop stores, large box stores, resellers, luxury retail, department stores, shopping malls, on-line sellers, local, national, and international retailers, chains, and everyone in between.

While we understand the intent, we are **OPPOSED** to SB 682 SD1 Relating to Animal Fur Products. This measure prohibits the sale, offer for sale, display for sale, trade, or distribution of certain animal fur products in the State.

**We do not feel this measure is necessary as stores in Hawaii are already phasing out fur items and trying to liquidate their current inventory.** Retailers are no longer the driving engine for trends. Customers determine the trends, and the type of inventory items retailers have in their stores.

**We recognize that many top designer brands are already ceasing to use fur in their designs.** We are seeing more faux fur being used or no fur like products at all in their collections. We want to also point out that many of the alternatives to fur – faux/vegan fur – are more hazardous to the environment as they are made from petroleum-based materials like liquid plastic. We are also aware that **many of the animals are humanely raised on farms**, just like cows, chickens and pigs that end up in our grocery stores. It is also our understanding that the other parts of the animals are used for consumption.

With Hawaii's average temperature in the 80s, **there is NOT a large demand for fur in Hawaii and is mostly purchased by visitors who live in colder climates.** Unlike the mainland, there are NOT a lot of stores in Hawaii who are selling fur items. **We are already seeing more and more stores throughout Hawaii no longer carrying fur and are trying to liquidate their current inventory.** This includes **not only coats, and fur trim on clothing, but shoes, hair accessories, purses, belts, adornment on keepsakes, and more.**

**This measure would also impose hardship for those retailers who are unable to comply with the January 2024 deadline.** Not all stores are able to send their fur merchandise outside of Hawaii to a sister store. This would mean that the goods would either have to be sold at loss or trashed. We have seen since last year that sales are down and awfully slow for many of our retailers who are dependent on the foreign customer. Certain types of merchandise are not moving fast due to the lack of visitors to our islands.

Retailers are one of the hardest hit industries due to the pandemic and this type of ban would hurt our retailers during a time when many are still struggling to remain open. Stores had to endure astronomical increases in shipping costs and in the price of goods from manufacturers and wholesalers. And last year with the unexpected increase in employee wages at the end of the year when the minimum wage was raised. Many retailers are still struggling to pay back the debt incurred during the pandemic. **Businesses cannot afford any more hardship as we are seeing more and more retailers closing their doors forever.** And as a result, many of our friends, family and neighbors no longer have jobs and are contributing to Hawaii's unemployment.

We hope that you will hold this bill.

Mahalo again for this opportunity to testify.



**Hawaiian Humane Society**  
People for animals. Animals for people.

2700 Waiālae Avenue Honolulu, Hawaii 96826  
808.356.2200 • [HawaiianHumane.org](http://HawaiianHumane.org)

Date: March 14, 2023

To: Chair Rep. David A. Tarnas  
Vice Chair Rep. Gregg Takayama  
and Members of the Committee on Judiciary and Hawaiian Affairs

Submitted By: Stephanie Kendrick, Director of Community Engagement  
Hawaiian Humane Society, 808-356-2217

RE: Testimony in support of SB 682, SD1: Relating to Animal Fur Products  
Thursday, March 16, 2023, 2 p.m., Room 325 & Via Videoconference

---

On behalf of the Hawaiian Humane Society, thank you for considering our support for Senate Bill 682, SD1, which prohibits the sale, offer for sale, display for sale, trade, or distribution of certain animal fur products in the State.

The Hawaiian Humane Society works to protect animals from cruelty, neglect and suffering. The fur industry confines animals in inhumane conditions only to slaughter them for use by the fashion industry.

Most of the animals harvested for their pelts are undomesticated. Hawaiian Humane believes that wild animals generally should be permitted to exist undisturbed in their natural environments. While this is primarily out of concern for animal welfare, it is also appropriate from a One Health perspective, which recognizes the relationships between threats to people, domestic animals, wildlife, and their shared environment. Shrinking the consumer market for these goods discourages the existence of fur farms, protecting people and animals from a source of zoonotic disease transmission.

Mahalo for your consideration of our support for this measure.

**SB-682-SD-1**

Submitted on: 3/14/2023 1:34:42 PM

Testimony for JHA on 3/16/2023 2:00:00 PM

<b>Submitted By</b>	<b>Organization</b>	<b>Testifier Position</b>	<b>Testify</b>
Stephen MacKinnon	Maui Humane Society	Support	Written Testimony Only

Comments:

While some may feel initially that this proposed bill is "silly" by virtue of us living in a tropical climate, we can't emphasize strongly enough that this bill should be given due consideration. Your support will add to the growing list of states that seek to ban the inhumane practices and eliminate another outlet for such distributions to take place.

We appreciate your consideration and support.

Stephen MacKinnon, CEO

Maui Humane Society



**HUMANE SOCIETY  
VETERINARY MEDICAL  
ASSOCIATION..**

**BOARD OF DIRECTORS**

Michael Blackwell, DVM, MPH  
*Knoxville, TN*

Gary Block, DVM, MS, DACVIM  
*East Greenwich, RI*

Barry Kellogg, VMD  
*North Port, FL*

Barry Kipperman, DVM,  
DACVIM, MSc  
*San Ramon, CA*

Paula Kislak, DVM  
*Santa Barbara, CA*

Nicole Paquette, JD  
*Washington, DC*

Gwendy Reyes-Illg, DVM  
*Milwaukie, OR*

Meredith Rives, DVM  
*Evanston, IL*

**LEADERSHIP COUNCIL**

Holly Cheever, DVM  
*Voorheesville, NY*

Nicholas Dodman, BVMS,  
DACVB, DACVAA  
*Grafton, MA*

Anne Fawcett, BVSc,  
MVetStud GradCertEd,  
MANZCVS, DipECAWBW  
*NSW, Australia*

Brenda Forsythe, MD, PhD,  
DVM, CAAB  
*Guadalupe, CA*

Zarah Hedge, DVM, MPH,  
DACVPM, DABVP  
*San Deigo, CA*

Joann Lindenmayer, DVM, MPH  
*North Grafton, MA*

Sheila (D'Arpino) Segurson,  
DVM, DACVB  
*Pleasanton, CA*

Erin Spencer, M.Ed.,  
CVT, VTS (ECC)  
*Derry, NH*

March 14, 2023

**House Committee on Judiciary & Hawaiian Affairs**

Representative David Tarnas, Chair

State Capitol

415 South Beretania Street

Honolulu, HI 96813

**RE: VETERINARY SUPPORT: SB 682 SD1, Relating to Fur Products**

Dear Chair Tarnas and Members of the Committee:

On behalf of the Humane Society Veterinary Medical Association (HSVMA), I am writing to express our strong support for banning fur sales and manufacturing in the state of Hawaii. HSVMA is an association of more than 9,000 veterinary medical professionals worldwide focused on the health and welfare of all animals, including those species raised for their fur.

As experts in the field of animal health and welfare, we recognize that there are severe animal welfare deficiencies inherent in the fur trade, including the ways in which the animals are cruelly trapped, housed, and killed. We also have serious concerns about disease transmission through susceptible fur-farmed animal populations, such as mink, fox and raccoon dogs, as well as the possibility of contagious disease spread between these animal species and humans. For these reasons, we support ending this archaic and inhumane industry and strongly endorse passage of a statewide fur sales ban in Hawaii.

**Inhumane Housing and improper Husbandry at Fur Farms**

More than 100 million animals worldwide, including foxes, chinchillas, minks, raccoon dogs and rabbits, are killed for their fur every year. The majority of these animals (around 85%) are raised in very small cage systems that fail to satisfy many of their most basic needs, particularly their need to display normal behaviors essential to their mental and physical well-being.

Investigations on fur farms worldwide--including those considered "certified" to maintain higher animal welfare standards--reveal distressing evidence of persistently poor welfare conditions. Species such as fox and mink retain their basic wild needs regardless of being bred and kept in captivity, and it is highly inaccurate for the fur industry to refer to an arctic fox bred on a fur farm as a 'domesticated' animal that has environmental and behavioral needs different from its wild relatives.

Wild animals on fur farms spend their lives in wire-floored cages thousands of times smaller than their natural territories. They are denied the opportunity to express natural behaviors such as hunting, digging and swimming. They are often kept in unnatural social groups; for example, mink are forced to live in extremely close proximity to one another which would be highly unlikely in the wild. The contrived and inhumane living conditions on fur farms inevitably lead animals to suffer severe psychological distress. Instances of unproductive repetitive behaviors, a sign of



compromised psychological well-being, have been well-documented on fur farms, as have cannibalism, untreated wounds, foot deformities and eye infections.

**Cruel Trapping of Fur-Bearers in the Wild and Inhumane Slaughter on Fur Farms**

Other welfare deficiencies inherent in the fur industry include the trapping methods used to capture animals in the wild. Some species are targeted with crippling leg-hold traps which are not sanctioned by the American Veterinary Medical Association (AVMA) or the HSVMA. Once trapped, animals are often left to languish for long periods of time without food or water before they are killed. Meanwhile, fur factory farms crudely gas or even anally electrocute animals.

**One Health Concerns for Disease Transmission through Fur Farming**

During the current global pandemic, SARS-CoV-2, the virus which causes COVID-19 in humans, has spread through hundreds of fur farms in 11 countries – including the U.S. – and has resulted in government-ordered killing of nearly 20 million mink to date in order to try to stem the outbreak. Genetic analysis from some of these fur farms has shown that sick workers introduced SARS CoV-2 to mink and, at least in the Netherlands and Denmark, that mink had passed it back to fur farm workers. In addition, USDA-confirmed outbreaks on farms in Oregon, Utah, Wisconsin, and Michigan have similarly resulted in the deaths of thousands of mink.

Given the structural design of fur farms SARS-CoV-2 can not only circulate on the farms but the farms could also spread the virus to wild mink and other species in the local environment, creating the potential for a reservoir for the disease. This creates a long-term risk of the virus recirculating--not only in mink, but in people as well. Based on all these factors, mink farms present a serious public health hazard in the United States.

**Fashion Industry Turns to Fur Alternatives to Satisfy Consumer Demand**

Consumer concern for animal welfare has already led many fashion brands to stop using animal fur once and for all. These companies recognize that contemporary alternatives to fur provide luxury, warmth and style without animal cruelty. In 2018 alone, well-known brands such as Chanel, Coach, Burberry, Versace and Donna Karan joined Gucci, Michael Kors and Armani in announcing fur-free policies. Legislative bans help hasten and solidify this positive transition while driving the development of more humane alternatives to fur.

Hawaii has a progressive history regarding animal welfare measures, and we hope it will soon include banning fur sales in the Aloha State.

Sincerely,

Barbara Hodges, DVM, MBA  
HSVMA Program Director, Advocacy & Outreach



525 East Cotati Avenue  
Cotati, California 94931

T 707.795.2533  
F 707.795.7280

info@aldf.org  
aldf.org

March 16, 2023

**Memorandum of Support – SB682 SD1**

*An Act relating to animal fur products.*

Dear Chair Tarnas, Vice Chair Takayama, and Members of the House Committee on Judiciary and Hawaiian Affairs,

The Animal Legal Defense Fund (ALDF), the nation's preeminent legal advocacy organization for animals, appreciates the opportunity to submit this memorandum in support of SB682 SD1, a bill to prohibit the sale of new fur products in the state of Hawai'i. The organization's mission is to protect the lives and advance the interests of animals through the legal system. We are working nationwide to combat the cruel fur industry across multiple legal channels.

SB682 SD1 would make it unlawful to sell a new fur product in the state. If passed, Hawai'i would be the second state in the country to take a strong stance against the cruel and unnecessary fur trade within its borders.

**Fur requires significant animal cruelty.**

Millions of animals, including foxes, wolves, minks, and rabbits, are brutally killed every year so people can wear their fur. Whether trapped in the wild or bred to die on fur farms, animals exploited by the fur industry endure tremendous suffering. Animals on fur farms are confined to tiny wire cages for their entire lives.

Oftentimes, these cages are outdoors – stacked in wooden sheds that provide no protection from the heat or cold. Unable to engage in any of their natural behaviors, these animals routinely resort to self-mutilation, obsessive pacing, and infanticide. Fur farms kill animals through gassing, electrocution, neck-breaking, and poisoning. Undercover investigations on fur farms have documented egregious cruelty – including animals being skinned alive.

Wild animals trapped for their fur also suffer. Trapping is largely regulated at the state level, and most states provide minimal protections for fur-bearing animals. In some states, it is legal to set a trap and not check it for days. Desperate and terrified, animals will sometimes chew their own legs off in an attempt to escape. Trappers shoot, strangle, and bludgeon trapped animals.

**Fur puts our environment at risk.**

The fur industry also poses serious environmental threats. On fur factory farms, waste runoff from animals pollutes the soil and waterways. The tanning and dyeing process uses toxic and carcinogenic chemicals, like chromium and formaldehyde, to prevent the skin from decaying.

Studies have found that among synthetic and natural textiles, fur is the worst-offending in 17 of the 18 environmental categories considered. The studies also found that the climate change impact of mink fur is

**All our clients are innocent**

Printed on recycled paper

five times higher than the second worst-offending textile (wool) and six times higher than a faux-fur alternative. This is largely due to the feed, land use, toxicity, and manure of the fur industry.

Fortunately, innovative technology has produced an array of alternatives with the same warmth, look and feel as fur – without the cruelty or environmental concerns.

**Fur alternatives exist.**

There is no justification to continue to breed or trap and kill animals for their fur considering the availability of faux fur and alternative products that are virtually indistinguishable from animal fur. So indistinguishable that, in 2017, we called for a Baltimore furrier to be investigated for false advertising when they used an image of a faux fur jacket from the HBO series Game of Thrones to advertise the animal furs in their store.

**Fur-free policies are on the rise.**

Consumers' concern for the animal cruelty and environmental threats from fur is leading fashion brands and legislators away from animal fur.

Hundreds of retailers, brands, and designers at all price points have announced fur-free policies, including: Macy's, Bloomingdale's, Gucci, Prada, Chanel, Coach, Burberry, Versace, Michael Kors, Armani, Calvin Klein, Kenneth Cole, Ralph Lauren, and JCPenney.

In 2019, California became the first state in the nation to ban the sale of fur, which went into effect this year. Abroad, multiple European countries, including Germany, Austria, Croatia, and the United Kingdom are in the process of phasing out or have already banned fur farming. São Paulo, Brazil also banned the sale of fur products in 2015.

**Hawai'i, time to go fur-free.**

The sale of fur products in Hawai'i is inconsistent with its position as a leader on animal welfare and environmental issues. By passing SB682 SD1, Hawai'i will lead the fur-free charge while reinforcing the shift to fur-free products that is occurring in the fashion industry. Hawai'i should seize this opportunity to more closely align the state's laws with its values. Please help make Hawai'i the next state to go fur-free by advancing this important legislation.

Thank you for your time and consideration.

Sincerely,

Lindsay Vierheilig  
Legislative Affairs Program Fellow  
Animal Legal Defense Fund  
[lvierheilig@aldf.org](mailto:lvierheilig@aldf.org)

**SB-682-SD-1**

Submitted on: 3/15/2023 10:28:49 AM

Testimony for JHA on 3/16/2023 2:00:00 PM

Submitted By	Organization	Testifier Position	Testify
AMANDA FOX	Animal Rights Initiative	Support	Written Testimony Only

Comments:

**Hello Everyone, and thank you for the opportunity to speak on this gravely important legislation, as it is necessary for Hawaii to become a more humane place for animals. Breaches of animal welfare are documented on every fur farm - they frequently suffer from cannibalism, self-mutilation, bent feet and infected wounds. They go insane from the confinement, pace endlessly and attack each other. These animals are not protected by the Humane Slaughter Act nor the Animal Welfare Act. They are killed in heinous ways in order to protect the pelts. Suffocation, electrocution, gassing. I've seen footage of employees breaking the necks of mink they pull out of a gas chamber because the animals survived the gas. All of these kill methods are unreliable, leading to the animals being skinned while still alive. Almost 60% of Hawaiian residents love a furry animal at home - we don't want to be doing this. As if this were not enough, zoonotic diseases spread rampantly on mink farms, as we've seen with COVID-19 and bird flu in 2023. It attacks their respiratory systems, just like humans, causing atrociously painful chest infections. Mink are reservoirs for COVID, providing an opportunity for the virus to mutate, and repeatedly spill back over into humans, forever. This knowledge led to the world's top pelt producer, Denmark, to cull 17 million mink in order to eliminate the risk. Outbreaks occurred on 427 farms across Europe and America. In Oregon, infected mink escaped the farms and in Utah, 72% of the animals surveyed around their farms were infected with a coronavirus - including domestic cats. No zoonotic disease has ever disappeared from the earth when transmission from animals was the case. We can not vaccinate our way out of that. We need to follow the recommendations of infectious disease experts and close fur farms, just like they've done in British Columbia, Poland, France, Italy and Ireland. To continue to manufacture and sell these unnecessary vanity items In light of the consequences for humans and the animals involved would be more than imprudent; it would be depraved. Thank you.**





Animal Welfare.  
Worldwide.

March 15, 2023

**Re: Testimony in support of SB 682 SD1, Relating to Animal Fur Products**

Dear Chair Tarnas and Members of the House Committee on Judiciary & Hawaiian Affairs,

FOUR PAWS USA respectfully urges all committee members to vote yes on SB 682 SD1, which would end the sale of new fur products in Hawaii.

Consumers today have become more aware of how animals are inhumanely treated and cruelly killed for their fur, along with the environmental degradation caused by the fur industry, and they are seeking to buy clothing, shoes, and accessories that are as ethically produced as they are functional and stylish. This momentum is prompting cities, states, and countries around the world to ban the sale and production of fur, and is leading fashion brands, retailers, and designers to end the use of fur in fashion once and for all.

It is well established that animal cruelty is inherent in the fur industry and over 100 million animals are killed annually for their fur. On fur factory farms, wild animals spend their entire lives in cramped cages, deprived of the ability to engage in natural behaviors. These animals are then killed in inhumane ways - such as crude gassing, anal/genital electrocution and neck breaking - to preserve the quality of their pelts.

In the wild, animals are often caught in crippling leg-hold traps for days without food or water. These animals often die slowly by drowning, predation, shock, injury or blood loss. If they are found alive, they are frequently clubbed or suffocated to death in order to preserve their pelt's value. These archaic traps are indiscriminate, often maiming and killing non-target animals, like endangered species and even pets.

The fur industry poses serious environmental threats and risks to public safety as well. On fur factory farms, waste runoff from animals pollutes the soil and waterways. The tanning and dying process uses toxic and carcinogenic chemicals, like chromium and formaldehyde, to prevent the skin from decaying. Furthermore, it is vitally important to consider the zoonotic risk factors and public health concerns posed by fur farms. Like humans, minks are incredibly sensitive to respiratory illnesses, and mink farms have proved to be a perfect breeding ground for the spread of COVID-19. Millions of minks on fur farms around the world, including at least 18 farms in the U.S., were infected with SARS-CoV-2, the virus which causes COVID-19. Mutated strains of the virus in minks then infected dozens of people, resulting in warnings from disease prevention experts that the evolution of the virus in mink could undermine the effectiveness of future vaccines in humans.

By passing SB 682 SD1 and eliminating the sale of new fur products, Hawaii has the opportunity to continue as a leader in supporting animal welfare, public health, and environmental protection in the U.S.

Sincerely,

Melanie Lary  
*Research and Campaigns Officer*

**FOUR PAWS USA**  
36 Bromfield Street Suite 410  
Boston, MA 02108 | USA

phone: +1-617-942-1233  
e-mail: [info@fourpawsusa.org](mailto:info@fourpawsusa.org)  
web: [fourpawsusa.org](http://fourpawsusa.org)



tax ID: 27-4352918

# Animal Fur Product Bill

## Testimony regarding Bill SB 682 SD1, to ban the sale of new fur products

My name is Emma Hakansson, I'm the founding director of Collective Fashion Justice, a not-for-profit working for a total ethics fashion system prioritising the life and wellbeing of people, our fellow animals and the planet before profit. Today I write on behalf of the organisation and our supporters.

I'd like to extend our sincere thanks to Representative David Tarnas, Chair of the House Committee on Judiciary and Hawaiian Affairs and all members of the House, for engaging with a bill as important and progressive as this one. Fashion is often shunned as vapid and unimportant, but fashion is both a powerful form of expression and utterly serious in its impact on the planet and those we share it with. I would like to spend some time highlighting the intersecting harms the fur industry contributes to, and which the House will continue to co-sign until this proposed bill is passed.

As much as 95% of all fur comes from animals who spend their short, miserable lives confined to factory-farms. Foxes are commonly kept in wire cages just a square metre small, despite naturally roaming a territory 10,000 times greater. While mink naturally live nearby the water they so love to dive in, those encaged by the fur industry will never fulfil their most basic and natural instinct of swimming.

The lives of these animals, as well as raccoon dogs, chinchillas and other confined fur-bearing species, are those of total deprivation. The unnatural conditions they suffer through mentally break them, shown through common signs of serious psychological distress like hours upon hours of repetitive head nodding and pacing, severe self mutilation and even cannibalism.

The slaughter of these animals is no better. In SLAY, a documentary film our organisation contributed to, a fur industry CEO refers to what their sector considers 'humane slaughter': for foxes, and I apologise for the confronting nature of this, but really, this is what we're here to discuss the legal acceptability of, this means forcing an electrode into the mouth and anus of the animals, before flicking an 'on-off' switch. For minks, it's death by gassing, taking a whole 15 minutes.

Some American companies have referred to their use of 'farm-free' fur, the implication being that such products may be more ethical. But footage from across the United States shows us trapped animals so frightened they uncontrollably urinate just before their killing. Native animals like coyotes, raccoons and muskrats have been known to break their teeth gnawing their own feet off in frantic efforts to free themselves from metal traps.

Every single product containing fur is a kind of ghost of this unimaginable suffering. They are what these complex, clever, thinking and feeling individuals are reduced to. A fur trim, a bobble on a beanie, a coat, a key ring.

In my opinion, and in the opinion of the organisation I represent, this should be enough to justify unanimously passing this bill. But the fur industry is not done.

The production of fur is also an environmental disaster. Fur trapping is totally indiscriminate, capturing and killing all kinds of native species, including those governments across the US work to protect. Meanwhile, fur factory-farms are major ammonia and phosphorus emissions contributors, and these emissions can lead to eutrophication which can strangle aquatic ecosystems, even creating dead zones.

Once fur has been 'dressed' – the industry term equivalent to 'tanning' for leather, it is no longer biodegradable, even according to industry studies. In France, advertisements referring to fur as 'natural' and 'eco-friendly' have been banned, recognised to be 'strongly misleading'. The carbon equivalent impact of a mink fur coat is nearly 250 kilograms more harmful than even the least sustainable synthetic faux fur, and today we have wholly recycled, even biodegradable and bio-based fur alternatives to take their place.

Finally, fur-dressing is so toxic and filled with carcinogenic substances that people who work processing furs face higher risks of acute and chronic conditions: skin complaints, eye irritation, cancer, and in the most egregious cases of poor workplace safety, death. Across numerous countries, fur products, including those sold for children, have been substantially contaminated with hazardous chemicals at levels which breached legal industry standards.

Today, nearly 70% of the most profitable luxury fashion brands have banned fur, and a number of global fashion week events have too. The vast majority of large retailers and high street fashion brands have also banned fur. Numerous countries have banned fur farming, a growing number of councils have banned fur sales. Just some months ago I spoke at the European Parliament, where a ban on all fur farming and related product sales is being considered. The proposed bill is in line with a global move towards more responsible, just and sustainable fashion production – and we cannot accept anything less than that.

Thank you very much for your time, for your openness and consideration.

*(All information and references available via [collectivefashionjustice.org](http://collectivefashionjustice.org))*



March 15, 2023

The Honorable David Tarnas, Chair  
House Committee on Judiciary and Hawaiian Affairs  
Hawaii House of Representatives

Dear Representative Tarnas and Members of the Committee:

I'm writing on behalf of People for the Ethical Treatment of Animals—PETA entities have more than 9 million members and supporters globally, including more than 21,000 in Hawaii—to urge the House Committee on Judiciary and Hawaiian Affairs to support SB 682 SD1. This lifesaving legislation would ban the sale of new fur products, preventing countless animals from being violently killed.

For decades, PETA entities have exposed horrific cruelty to animals on fur farms around the world. Investigators have documented that animals are electrocuted, bludgeoned, gassed, and even skinned alive—all just to make a coat, a collar, or a trinket. Minks and other animals exploited for fur are typically confined to filthy, cramped wire cages for their entire lives, and the intensive confinement causes many to exhibit symptoms of “zoochosis,” or captivity-induced insanity, such as frantic pacing, circling, gnawing on cage bars, and even self-mutilation. Virologists and epidemiologists confirm that cramming sick and stressed animals together in unsanitary conditions creates the perfect breeding grounds for dangerous zoonotic diseases, which can jump to humans. It's no surprise that the horrid conditions on fur factory farms have led to mink-related outbreaks of COVID-19 in a number of countries, including the U.S. as well as Canada, Denmark, Greece, the Netherlands, and Spain. Denmark alone killed all *17 million* minks on its fur factory farms after a mutant strain of the coronavirus spread from minks to humans.

Passing SB 682 SD1 would send a strong message to the rest of the world that killing animals for their fur has no place in a compassionate society. Even before the pandemic, fur was a dying industry, and the movement against it is gaining momentum. Hundreds of major designers and retailers—such as Dolce & Gabbana, Saks Fifth Avenue, Macy's, Chanel, Prada, Gucci, Versace, and Michael Kors—have banned it, and so has the state of California. In addition, more than a dozen countries have banned fur farming.

Hawaii is forward-thinking, as you've proved by banning wild-animal acts in circuses. You now have another opportunity to set a compassionate example by supporting SB 682 SD1.

Sincerely,

Tracy Reiman  
Executive Vice President

PEOPLE FOR  
THE ETHICAL  
TREATMENT  
OF ANIMALS

[Washington](#)

1536 16th St. N.W.  
Washington, DC 20036  
202-483-PETA

[Los Angeles](#)

2154 W. Sunset Blvd.  
Los Angeles, CA 90026  
323-644-PETA

[Norfolk](#)

501 Front St.  
Norfolk, VA 23510  
757-622-PETA

[Info@peta.org](mailto:Info@peta.org)  
[PETA.org](http://PETA.org)

[Affiliates:](#)

- [PETA Asia](#)
- [PETA India](#)
- [PETA France](#)
- [PETA Australia](#)
- [PETA Germany](#)
- [PETA Netherlands](#)
- [PETA Foundation \(U.K.\)](#)

**SB-682-SD-1**

Submitted on: 3/15/2023 8:45:38 AM

Testimony for JHA on 3/16/2023 2:00:00 PM

<b>Submitted By</b>	<b>Organization</b>	<b>Testifier Position</b>	<b>Testify</b>
Gillian Boss	PETA	Support	Written Testimony Only

Comments:

SOCIALLY concious consumers today know that the fur industry electrocutes gases poison or break the necks of millions of animals before peeling their skin of sometimes while they are still alive  
producing animal fur causes up ten times more damage than producing vegan fur



March 15, 2023

Representative David Tarnas  
Chair House Committee on Judiciary & Hawaiian Affairs  
State Capitol  
415 South Beretania Street  
Honolulu, HI 96813

**RE. In Support of Hawaii Fur Retail Sales Ban SB 682 SD1**

To the Hawaii House Committee on Judiciary & Hawaiian Affairs,

My name is Chris DeRose, Founder and President of Last Chance for Animals (LCA). I am writing to you on behalf of LCA and its supporters. LCA fully supports the Hawaii Fur Retail Sales Ban SB 682 SD1. LCA is an international non-profit organization based in Los Angeles that has advocated for animals through legislation, investigations, education, and media outreach for over 35 years. LCA has an active base of members in Hawaii who support our mandate to eliminate animal exploitation.

The inherent cruelty of the fur industry has been well-documented through undercover investigations, dating back to at least the 1990's, by LCA and other animal advocacy organizations. Animals on fur farms spend their entire lives in tiny cages, subjected to horrendous cruelty and neglect - only to be killed for a piece of fashion. Most recently, in 2018, LCA released an undercover investigation into Millbank, a mink fur farm in Ontario, Canada – the practices documented were so cruel the farm pleaded guilty to failing to comply with prescribed standards of care and was forced to pay a large monetary penalty.


The environmental and public health risks the fur industry poses cannot be ignored either. Fur farming causes environmental damage in surrounding areas, including polluted lakes and watersheds.

LCA believes Hawaii is a compassionate state that cares about the welfare of all animals and the public health of its citizens. By enacting a fur sales ban, Hawaii will join the growing list of cities, states and countries that have taken a stand against fur.

Please do not hesitate to contact me for any information to assist with this matter.

8033 Sunset Blvd, #835 Los Angeles, CA 90046  
tel 310.271.6096 fax 310.271.1890  
[www.LCAanimal.org](http://www.LCAanimal.org)

For the animals,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Chris DeRose". The signature is fluid and cursive, with a long horizontal stroke extending to the right.

Chris DeRose  
Founder and President  
Last Chance for Animals  
[www.LCAAnimal.org](http://www.LCAAnimal.org)  
[derose@lcanimal.org](mailto:derose@lcanimal.org)  
310-271-6096 x28

8033 Sunset Blvd, #835 Los Angeles, CA 90046  
tel 310.271.6096 fax 310.271.1890  
[www.LCAAnimal.org](http://www.LCAAnimal.org)



March 15, 2023

To: COMMITTEE ON JUDICIARY & HAWAIIAN AFFAIRS  
Rep. David A. Tarnas, Chair  
Rep. Gregg Takayama, Vice Chair

Re: Strong Support of SB682 SD1

Hrg: March 16, 2023 at 2:00 PM at Capitol Room 325 and Videoconference

Healthy Pets United is a 501(c) (3) non-profit organization dedicated to promoting animal health and well-being. HPU acts as an advocate on behalf of animals and as an enforcer of their rights and protection through education and advocacy.

Healthy Pets United supports the passage of SB682, SD1, which prohibits the sale, offer for sale, display for sale, trade, or distribution of certain animal fur products in the State.

As central to Healthy Pets United's mission in working to protect animals from cruelty and suffering, the fur industry confines animals in inhumane conditions only to slaughter them for use by the fashion industry. This is unacceptable.

The passage of this bill will further the shrinking of the consumer market for these goods.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide testimony on this important issue affecting the health and welfare of animals in Hawai'i.

Respectfully submitted,

Chase Kessler  
President





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

**In support of Hawaii SB682 SD1  
to prohibit the sale, offer for sale, display for sale, trade, or distribution of certain  
animal fur products in the State**

[Animal Defenders International](#) (ADI)<sup>1</sup> offers the following in strong support of SB682 SD1, to prohibit the sale, offer for sale, display for sale, trade or distribution of certain animal fur products in the state, with our thanks to its numerous introducing sponsors (Senators Keohokalole, McKelvey, and Rhoads). If passed, Hawaii would join a growing list of nations,<sup>2</sup> the state of California, and numerous fashion leaders in saying no to fur industry cruelty and its public health risks.

[Michael Kors and Jimmy Choo debuted a luxurious cruelty-free alternative](#) in 2018, noting that with “*technological advances in fabrications, we now have the ability to create a luxe aesthetic using non-animal fur.*”<sup>3</sup> Other design icons who have committed to innovative fur-free fashion include Armani, Banana Republic, Burberry, Burlington Coat Factory, Calvin Klein, Coach, Diane von Furstenberg, DKNY, Dolce and Gabbana, Gucci, H&M, Hugo Boss, Ralph Lauren, Stella McCartney, Tommy Hilfiger, Valentino, Versace, and Zara. The fashion world can and is already moving on.

Covid-19 exposed this industry as a serious contagion risk, and the reactionary culling of millions is a tragedy that ignores the real problem. The terrible events of the past couple of years have underscored the need and stirred calls worldwide for transformational change in the way humans trade in, consume, impact, and too often abuse nature.

**The farming, trade and consumption of wildlife and wildlife-derived products (for ... fur and other products) have led to biodiversity loss, and emerging diseases, including SARS and COVID-19. ... high pandemic risk consumption patterns (e.g. use of fur from farmed wildlife)<sup>4</sup>**

**There is no future for business as usual ... To successfully address [these challenges] will require tackling the ... drivers of nature loss - ... trade, production and consumption ... and the values and behaviours of society.<sup>5</sup>**

Studies show the fur industry presents high climate and environmental costs, with significant emissions and land use requirements, as well as air and water pollutants emanating from animal waste (nitrogen, phosphorus), incineration (carbon monoxide, hydrochloric acid, sulphur dioxide, and nitrogen oxides), and tanning processes. Industrial animal farms are “extremely energy intensive ... requir[ing] disproportionately large inputs of fossil fuels.”<sup>6</sup> In 2012, the Advertising Standards Authority banned a fur ad (run by the European Fur Breeders Association), concluding that the ad’s claim that fur is ‘eco-friendly’ was misleading.<sup>7</sup>

**To produce 1 kg of fur requires more than 11 animals. ... Compared with textiles, fur has a higher impact on 17 of 18 environmental themes, including climate change, eutrophication and toxic emissions. In many cases fur scores markedly worse than textiles. ... The climate change impact of 1 kg of mink fur is five times higher than that of the highest-scoring textile ... This impact is not only high compared with other textiles. There are not many raw materials scoring this high per kg on climate change; the score of mink fur is similar to that of materials involving high fuel consumption, or solvents for extraction (e.g. precious**

metals). With an emission factor of about 110 kg CO<sub>2</sub> eq. per kg fur, the impact on climate change equals a car drive of over 1,250 km. ... For land occupation, fur scores far higher than the other textiles. ... Two environmental impacts affect (local) air quality ... On both of these, fur scores far higher than the other textiles. ... Even in a conservative approach, the environmental impacts of 1 kg fur ... are a factor 2 to 28 times higher than those of common textiles. This is a very clear and consistent result, with indicator categories all pointing in the same direction.<sup>8</sup>

When people buy fur, they buy cruelty, not luxury or beauty. ADI investigations reveal nightmarish fur industry standard practices, where animals' miserable lives in cramped, filthy cages meet brutal, abrupt ends, by electrocution (to their anus or genitals), suffocation, broken necks, or worse. We include here for your consideration, links to several ADI reports and videos ~ [A Lifetime: living and dying on a fur farm report](#)<sup>9</sup> and its [related video](#),<sup>10</sup> [Never Humane: Tragedy of the fox who almost got away](#);<sup>11</sup> and [Bloody Harvest: the real cost of fur](#).<sup>12</sup> It's time to end this horrific practice.

We hope this informs your review, and we urge you to support SB682 SD1, to join other leaders toward cruelty-free fashion innovation. Many thanks for your time and consideration.

**Animal Defenders International**  
[www.ad-international.org](http://www.ad-international.org)

---

<sup>1</sup> [www.ad-international.org](http://www.ad-international.org)

<sup>2</sup> Fur Farming bans: Austria, Belgium, Croatia, Czech Republic, Denmark, France, Japan, Luxembourg, the Netherlands (moved up from a 2024 effective date due to covid outbreaks on fur farms there), Slovenia, and the UK. Similar measures under consideration: Bosnia & Herzegovina, Bulgaria, Estonia, Ireland, Lithuania, Montenegro, Norway, Poland, Republic of Macedonia, Serbia, Slovakia, Ukraine. Ban on breeding for fur: Hungary. Ban on mink imports: New Zealand. Ban on mink, fox, chinchilla fur skins imports: India. Fur trade/sales ban: California (US), Sao Paolo (Brazil).

<sup>3</sup> As reported by Georgia Murray in *Is this the Biggest Move in Banning Fur to Date?* Refiner29 (January 16, 2018), available at <https://sports.yahoo.com/biggest-move-banning-fur-date-180000485.html>.

<sup>4</sup> IPBES Pandemics Report on Biodiversity and Pandemics, Executive Summary (2020), available at <https://ipbes.net/pandemics>

<sup>5</sup> World Economic Forum's *New Nature Economy Report* series: *The Future of Nature and Business* (2020), available at [http://www3.weforum.org/docs/WEF\\_The\\_Future\\_Of\\_Nature\\_And\\_Business\\_2020.pdf](http://www3.weforum.org/docs/WEF_The_Future_Of_Nature_And_Business_2020.pdf).

<sup>6</sup> Pew Commission on Industrial Farm Animal Production, *Putting Meat on the Table: Industrial Farm Animal Production in America, Executive Summary* (2008), available at [https://www.pewtrusts.org/~media/assets/2008/pcfap\\_exec-summary.pdf](https://www.pewtrusts.org/~media/assets/2008/pcfap_exec-summary.pdf).

<sup>7</sup> As reported by Mark Sweney in *'Eco-friendly' fur ad banned. Fur breeders' campaign ruled misleading by ASA*, The Guardian (March 2012), available at <https://www.theguardian.com/media/2012/mar/21/eco-friendly-fur-ad-banned>.

<sup>8</sup> Bijleveld, Korteland, Sevenster. *The Environmental impact of mink fur production*. Delft. (January 2011), available at [https://www.cedelft.eu/publicatie/the\\_environmental\\_impact\\_of\\_mink\\_fur\\_production/1131](https://www.cedelft.eu/publicatie/the_environmental_impact_of_mink_fur_production/1131).

<sup>9</sup> *A Lifetime: living and dying on a fur farm*, Animal Defenders International Report (2017), available at [https://www.ad-international.org/admin/downloads/adi\\_f4d655d1c535636ff5fab85010358c7d.pdf](https://www.ad-international.org/admin/downloads/adi_f4d655d1c535636ff5fab85010358c7d.pdf).

<sup>10</sup> *Exposed: The tragic short lives of foxes on a fur farm*, Animal Defenders International (2017), available at <https://www.ad-international.org/fur/go.php?id=4440&ssi=19>.

<sup>11</sup> *Never Humane: tragedy of the fox who almost got away*, Animal Defenders International (2017), available at <https://www.ad-international.org/fur/go.php?id=4455&ssi=19>.

<sup>12</sup> *Bloody Harvest: the real cost of fur*, Animal Defenders International (2010), available at <https://www.ad-international.org/publications/go.php?id=1836>.

**SB-682-SD-1**

Submitted on: 3/15/2023 9:17:48 AM

Testimony for JHA on 3/16/2023 2:00:00 PM

Submitted By	Organization	Testifier Position	Testify
Lana Rapoza	Individual	Support	Remotely Via Zoom

Comments:

**To the Respected House Committee on  
Judiciary & Hawaiian Affairs,**

**With all my heart, I support the proposed fur  
ban, [SB 682 SD1](#).**

- As a resident of Hawaii, I urge you to support SB 682 SD1, which would ban the sale of fur in our state. No federal humane slaughter law protects animals on fur factory farms, and killing methods are gruesome, which is why it's critical that we end our state's support of this industry.
- Socially conscious consumers today know that the fur industry electrocutes, gases, poisons, or breaks the necks of millions of animals every year before peeling their skin off—sometimes while they're still alive and struggling. It doesn't matter if it's a full-length fur coat or a jacket lined with a small bit of fur trim—if it contains fur, it supports an industry that tortures and kills animals.
- Many countries and cities are waking up to the cruelty behind the fur trade, including California and multiple communities across the U.S. that have already voted in favor of banning the retail sale of fur.
- Producing animal fur causes up to *10 times* more damage to the environment than producing vegan fur. Not only do fur farms produce millions of pounds of feces every year, the formaldehyde, bleaching

agents, and other toxic, carcinogenic chemicals used to prevent the fur from rotting are also often improperly disposed of and end up polluting local streams and rivers—which in turn kills even more animals.

Please be a trailblazer, be the ones that stand up for all animals; to stop animal cruelty, to stop the companies that do those barbaric acts for profit. Any and all companies from around the world should NOT be allowed to profit from torturing animals! Animals cannot protect themselves. Your support of SB 682 SD1 can make a change for the greater good to protect the animals & the environment.

When a human is very badly hurt and in pain, will cry, moan and scream. Its the same for animals that are cruelly tortured for its fur. Animals when inflicted with pain, do hurt, cry, moan and scream. So aside of it being an animal, from that perspective, what makes them different from humans?

I humbly ask you to do what is right for all animals and for the worlds environment. Please support SB 682 SD1.

Sincerely, Mrs.Lana Rapoza

**SB-682-SD-1**

Submitted on: 3/14/2023 2:01:19 PM

Testimony for JHA on 3/16/2023 2:00:00 PM

<b>Submitted By</b>	<b>Organization</b>	<b>Testifier Position</b>	<b>Testify</b>
Nancy Davlantes	Individual	Support	Written Testimony Only

Comments:

I support this bill. Thank you.

**SB-682-SD-1**

Submitted on: 3/14/2023 11:44:20 PM

Testimony for JHA on 3/16/2023 2:00:00 PM

<b>Submitted By</b>	<b>Organization</b>	<b>Testifier Position</b>	<b>Testify</b>
Will Caron	Individual	Support	Written Testimony Only

Comments:

Animals that are slaughtered for their fur endure tremendous suffering. Animals raised on fur farms typically spend their entire lives in cramped and filthy cages. Fur farmers typically use the cheapest killing methods available, including suffocation, electrocution, gas, and poison.

Furthermore, fur farms are known reservoirs and transmission vectors for dangerous zoonotic disease, including SARS coronaviruses, that threaten public health. COVID-19 infections have been confirmed at fur farms in Europe and the United States, and scientific studies have linked mink, raccoon dogs, and foxes, animals most commonly farmed for fur, to a variety of coronaviruses.

The fur production process is energy intensive and has a significant environmental impact, including air and water pollution. Runoff from the fur production process contains high concentrations of phosphorus and nitrogen, which are among the most common forms of water pollution in the United States.

The demand for fur products does not justify the unnecessary killing and cruel treatment of animals, harm to the environment, and the public health risks created by these practices. Banning the sale of fur products in Hawai'i will decrease the industry demand for these cruel and environmentally harmful products and promote community awareness of animal welfare.

**SB-682-SD-1**

Submitted on: 3/15/2023 4:39:05 AM

Testimony for JHA on 3/16/2023 2:00:00 PM

<b>Submitted By</b>	<b>Organization</b>	<b>Testifier Position</b>	<b>Testify</b>
G zuckerman	Individual	Oppose	Written Testimony Only

Comments:

Hello,

Hawaiians ought to be free to dress as they please.

Banning fur is banning someones freedom to express themsleves as they see fit through fashion.

Regards,

Greg

**SB-682-SD-1**

Submitted on: 3/15/2023 4:43:42 AM

Testimony for JHA on 3/16/2023 2:00:00 PM

<b>Submitted By</b>	<b>Organization</b>	<b>Testifier Position</b>	<b>Testify</b>
j zuckerman	Individual	Oppose	Written Testimony Only

Comments:

Dear Members of JHA comittee,

Please opose SB682.

If the governmnts tells people what they can wear, what is next? What they can eat? How it is permissible for them to express themselves?

Judy Z



**SB-682-SD-1**

Submitted on: 3/15/2023 4:47:12 AM

Testimony for JHA on 3/16/2023 2:00:00 PM

<b>Submitted By</b>	<b>Organization</b>	<b>Testifier Position</b>	<b>Testify</b>
danny zuckerman	Individual	Oppose	Written Testimony Only

Comments:

Hello Members of the Senate of Hawaii,

Please oppose SB682.

Danny Z

**SB-682-SD-1**

Submitted on: 3/15/2023 5:32:11 AM

Testimony for JHA on 3/16/2023 2:00:00 PM

<b>Submitted By</b>	<b>Organization</b>	<b>Testifier Position</b>	<b>Testify</b>
Jacqui skill	Individual	Support	Written Testimony Only

Comments:

- As a resident of Hawaii, I urge you to support SB 682 SD1, which would ban the sale of fur in our state. No federal humane slaughter law protects animals on fur factory farms, and killing methods are gruesome, which is why it's critical that we end our state's support of this industry.
- Socially conscious consumers today know that the fur industry electrocutes, gasses, poisons, or breaks the necks of millions of animals every year before peeling their skin off—sometimes while they're still alive and struggling. It doesn't matter if it's a full-length fur coat or a jacket lined with a small bit of fur trim—if it contains fur, it supports an industry that tortures and kills animals.
- Many countries and cities are waking up to the cruelty behind the fur trade, including California and multiple communities across the U.S. that have already voted in favor of banning the retail sale of fur.
- Producing animal fur causes up to *10 times* more damage to the environment than producing vegan fur. Not only do fur farms produce millions of pounds of feces every year, the formaldehyde, bleaching agents, and other toxic, carcinogenic chemicals used to prevent the fur from rotting are also often improperly disposed of and end up polluting local streams and rivers—which in turn kills even more animals.

**SB-682-SD-1**

Submitted on: 3/15/2023 6:08:22 AM

Testimony for JHA on 3/16/2023 2:00:00 PM

<b>Submitted By</b>	<b>Organization</b>	<b>Testifier Position</b>	<b>Testify</b>
Caroline Azelski	Individual	Support	Written Testimony Only

Comments:

In strong support of SD1. Thank you.

**SB-682-SD-1**

Submitted on: 3/15/2023 6:24:55 AM

Testimony for JHA on 3/16/2023 2:00:00 PM

<b>Submitted By</b>	<b>Organization</b>	<b>Testifier Position</b>	<b>Testify</b>
Harold Dittrich	Individual	Oppose	Written Testimony Only

Comments:

I am writing in opposition to SB628.

Your bill is full of falsehoods about fur products and animal usage. There is much to address in the Bill, the most shocking to me is the fear mongering used around mink and COVID. It is insidious to claim that fur farms “threaten public health” because mink can be susceptible to COVID-19. In fact, with proper bio-security -- and quarantine, when necessary -- Dr. Anthony Fauci and the CDC have stated that they do not consider mink farms to be a public health risk. When pigs develop Swine Flu (H1N1) or chickens develop Avian Flu, we do not ban the sale of pork and poultry – although this is exactly what animal activists have called for. Instead, farmers work closely with public officials to resolve the problems, as mink farmers have done.

Mink farmers have long practiced strict on-farm biosecurity. The protocols in place, are the primary reason that the few US farms infected by COVID have been isolated & manageable. On the proactive front; Zoetis animal health has finished clinical testing on a mink vaccine that is now awaiting approval from the USDA. We expect to have 2 million doses available to the farmers by June.

We as citizens rely on government to craft laws and regulations based on facts and science. We rely on officials to research the issues, using information from reliable and knowledgeable sources. I urge you and this committee to reject the rhetoric, rely on the science, and OPPOSE SB628.

In addition, here are some VERY IMPORTANT FACTS for you to consider in regard to this issue...

-Banning the retail sale of fur in Hawaii potentially violates the dormant commerce clause, that says the US Constitution limits the power of states to regulate commerce outside their borders without congressional authorization.

-Small businesses who sell fur, fur trim or other animal-based products in Hawaii have been under constant attack and harassment by certain members of the Rhode Island legislature, with the yearly introduction of legislation like SB 682. The bullying and targeting must stop

-The Hawaii legislature must develop proposals that both protect and promote natural fibers

-Organizations like PETA and HSUS continue to use deceitful "Shock Advocacy" tactics to bully small business owners. Claims made by both organizations against the fur industry have repeatedly been proven false.

-This attack on the retail sale of fur is a part of a broader agenda. Speaking to an animal rights conference, HSUS's then-vice president for farm animal issues stated that HSUS's goal is to "get rid of the entire [animal agriculture] industry" and that "we don't want any of these animals to be raised and killed."

-Consumer choice is one of the key tenets of capitalism not over/unnecessary regulation

-The Hawaii legislature must protect the rights of all consumers both native and tourist to create the marketplace

-Natural certified fur is more sustainable than fake fur. Fake fur is not renewable, sustainable, or biodegradable.

-Natural certified fur can last generations when cared for properly.

-Natural certified fur is produced ethically and responsibly throughout the entire production process.

-The amount of energy and fossil fuel required for natural fur fabrication is relatively low when compared to large, automated synthetic fur factories.

-The fur trade supports land-based cultures and local indigenous populations contributing to environmental conservation.

-Natural certified fur is held to ethical global standards like Furmark that ensures the highest animal welfare and sustainability standards.

Sincerely concerned citizen,  
Harold Dittrich

**SB-682-SD-1**

Submitted on: 3/15/2023 6:36:46 AM

Testimony for JHA on 3/16/2023 2:00:00 PM

<b>Submitted By</b>	<b>Organization</b>	<b>Testifier Position</b>	<b>Testify</b>
mike rueli	Individual	Support	Written Testimony Only

Comments:

NO dead animal fur in HI

**SB-682-SD-1**

Submitted on: 3/15/2023 6:42:03 AM

Testimony for JHA on 3/16/2023 2:00:00 PM

<b>Submitted By</b>	<b>Organization</b>	<b>Testifier Position</b>	<b>Testify</b>
Elisabeth Sherman	Individual	Support	Written Testimony Only

Comments:

Just to state the obvious, no one in HI needs fur. As a state with a deep connection to nature, we have an opportunity to lead in promoting decency, kindness, & ethical/environmental responsibility by passing SB682 SD1. The fur industry is horrifically cruel & very harmful to our environment. There have been better alternatives for years & no one anywhere needs fur anymore.

Mahalo & best wishes,

Elisabeth

**SB-682-SD-1**

Submitted on: 3/15/2023 7:46:55 AM

Testimony for JHA on 3/16/2023 2:00:00 PM

<b>Submitted By</b>	<b>Organization</b>	<b>Testifier Position</b>	<b>Testify</b>
Sylvia Perreira	Individual	Support	Written Testimony Only

Comments:

We must stop the killings of so many animals Just to make us humans look better!!!



**SB-682-SD-1**

Submitted on: 3/15/2023 8:04:15 AM

Testimony for JHA on 3/16/2023 2:00:00 PM

<b>Submitted By</b>	<b>Organization</b>	<b>Testifier Position</b>	<b>Testify</b>
Jennifer Chiwa	Individual	Support	Written Testimony Only

Comments:

Aloha Chairperson Tarnas, Vice Chairperson Takayama and Members of the Committee on Judiciary and Hawaiian Affairs. I am Jennifer Chiwa, have lived on Oahu my whole life and currently reside in Makiki.

Please support SB 682 SD 1, relating to animal fur products. Supporting this bill is, I think, to support not only animal welfare, but also what some would perceive as the larger issues of public health and the environment.

Thank you for this opportunity to testify and for your consideration in supporting SB 682 SD 1.

Jennifer Chiwa

Makiki

**SB-682-SD-1**

Submitted on: 3/15/2023 8:25:14 AM

Testimony for JHA on 3/16/2023 2:00:00 PM

Submitted By	Organization	Testifier Position	Testify
Mary Lu Kelley	Individual	Support	Written Testimony Only

Comments:

Aloha.

I am a 35 year resident of Hawaii, I urge you to support SB 682 SD1, which would ban the sale of fur in our state. No federal humane slaughter law protects animals on fur factory farms, and killing methods are gruesome, which is why it's critical that we end our state's support of this industry.

There are so many socially conscious consumers today know that the fur industry electrocutes, gasses, poisons, or breaks the necks of millions of animals every year before peeling their skin off—sometimes while they're still alive and struggling. It doesn't matter if it's a full-length fur coat or a jacket lined with a small bit of fur trim—if it contains fur, it supports an industry that tortures and kills animals.

Many countries and cities are waking up to the cruelty behind the fur trade, including California and multiple communities across the U.S. that have already voted in favor of banning the retail sale of fur.

Producing animal fur causes up to *10 times* more damage to the environment than producing vegan fur. Not only do fur farms produce millions of pounds of feces every year, the formaldehyde, bleaching agents, and other toxic, carcinogenic chemicals used to prevent the fur from rotting are also often improperly disposed of and end up polluting local streams and rivers—which in turn kills even more animals.

Please pass SB 682. Thank you.

**SB-682-SD-1**

Submitted on: 3/15/2023 9:16:47 AM

Testimony for JHA on 3/16/2023 2:00:00 PM

<b>Submitted By</b>	<b>Organization</b>	<b>Testifier Position</b>	<b>Testify</b>
eve furchgott	Individual	Support	Written Testimony Only

Comments:

Please support this bill to end sales of fur & fur products in Hawaii. This is the humane thing to do... fashion should not be a cause of suffering for animals and profit.

**SB-682-SD-1**

Submitted on: 3/15/2023 9:24:43 AM

Testimony for JHA on 3/16/2023 2:00:00 PM

<b>Submitted By</b>	<b>Organization</b>	<b>Testifier Position</b>	<b>Testify</b>
Judith A Mick	Individual	Support	Written Testimony Only

Comments:

It's time for the cruelty to stop for other animals and ban the use of fur for humans. Leave the fur where it belongs. Thanks you. Aloha, Judith A. Mick, Kailua

**SB-682-SD-1**

Submitted on: 3/15/2023 10:28:33 AM

Testimony for JHA on 3/16/2023 2:00:00 PM

<b>Submitted By</b>	<b>Organization</b>	<b>Testifier Position</b>	<b>Testify</b>
Benny Miralles	Individual	Support	Written Testimony Only

Comments:

I oppose the fur industry especially the gruesome way they kill animal to get their fur.

**SB-682-SD-1**

Submitted on: 3/15/2023 10:30:29 AM

Testimony for JHA on 3/16/2023 2:00:00 PM

<b>Submitted By</b>	<b>Organization</b>	<b>Testifier Position</b>	<b>Testify</b>
Lory Ono	Individual	Support	Written Testimony Only

Comments:

As a resident of Hawaii, I urge you to support SB 682 SD1, which would ban the sale of fur in our state. No federal humane slaughter law protects animals on fur factory farms, and killing methods are gruesome, which is why it's critical that we end our state's support of this industry.

Producing animal fur causes up to *10 times* more damage to the environment than producing vegan fur. Not only do fur farms produce millions of pounds of feces every year, the formaldehyde, bleaching agents, and other toxic, carcinogenic chemicals used to prevent the fur from rotting are also often improperly disposed of and end up polluting local streams and rivers—which in turn kills even more animals.

Mahalo for your consideration.

Lory Ono

**SB-682-SD-1**

Submitted on: 3/15/2023 11:23:44 AM

Testimony for JHA on 3/16/2023 2:00:00 PM

<b>Submitted By</b>	<b>Organization</b>	<b>Testifier Position</b>	<b>Testify</b>
Taurie Kinoshita	Individual	Support	Written Testimony Only

Comments:

To the Honorable Committee,

I am writing in extremely strong support of SB682 SD1.

The fur industry is cruel and wasteful (producing animal fur causes 10 times as much environmental damage as vegan fur.)

Many countries and cities, including California and multiple communities across the U.S., have already voted in favor of banning the retail sale of fur due to the horrific cruelty and disgusting waste created by torturing animals for fur.

As a resident of Hawaii, I urge you to support SB 682 SD1, which would ban the sale of fur in our state. No federal humane slaughter law protects animals on fur factory farms, and killing methods are gruesome, which is why it's critical that we end our state's support of this industry.

Thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely,

Taurie Kinoshita

**SB-682-SD-1**

Submitted on: 3/15/2023 12:32:45 PM

Testimony for JHA on 3/16/2023 2:00:00 PM

Submitted By	Organization	Testifier Position	Testify
Nita Tomaszewski	Individual	Oppose	Written Testimony Only

Comments:

Dear Sirs;

The killing of harmless animal for fashion is barbaric. Many of these animals experience cruel habitats for breeding and storage before their death. The death can be a electrode inserted in the anus for electrocution. Or the use of lethal gas or high altitude chamber for death. ALL are extremely cruel and very painful.

The damage to the environment is also at danger since some of these fur bearing animals may not be native to the Hawaiian environment. And all know what happens if a new species is released, can cause dangerous impacts to the environment, wiping out native species. There is also the concern that fur bearing animals can carry very dangerous virus. Do you condone rabies for Hawaii?

Thank you for giving me the opportunity to give testimony.

Sincerely,

Nita Tomaszewski Pahoa Hawaii



**SB-682-SD-1**

Submitted on: 3/15/2023 2:00:47 PM

Testimony for JHA on 3/16/2023 2:00:00 PM

<b>Submitted By</b>	<b>Organization</b>	<b>Testifier Position</b>	<b>Testify</b>
Bryan Walston	Individual	Support	Written Testimony Only

Comments:

- As a resident of Hawaii, I urge you to support SB 682 SD1, which would ban the sale of fur in our state. No federal humane slaughter law protects animals on fur factory farms, and killing methods are gruesome, which is why it's critical that we end our state's support of this industry.
- Socially conscious consumers today know that the fur industry electrocutes, gasses, poisons, or breaks the necks of millions of animals every year before peeling their skin off—sometimes while they're still alive and struggling. It doesn't matter if it's a full-length fur coat or a jacket lined with a small bit of fur trim—if it contains fur, it supports an industry that tortures and kills animals.

**SB-682-SD-1**

Submitted on: 3/15/2023 2:32:49 PM

Testimony for JHA on 3/16/2023 2:00:00 PM

<b>Submitted By</b>	<b>Organization</b>	<b>Testifier Position</b>	<b>Testify</b>
Shannon Rudolph	Individual	Support	Written Testimony Only

Comments:

Support

**SB-682-SD-1**

Submitted on: 3/15/2023 3:37:52 PM

Testimony for JHA on 3/16/2023 2:00:00 PM

<b>Submitted By</b>	<b>Organization</b>	<b>Testifier Position</b>	<b>Testify</b>
Carol Carpenter	Individual	Support	Written Testimony Only

Comments:

The fur industry is barbaric. No animal should ever be treated in such a way. The things they do to these poor creatures is

unbelievable. They are kept in filthy conditions and killed in horrendous ways. Please stop fur from being sold in Hawaii.

**SB-682-SD-1**

Submitted on: 3/15/2023 3:41:43 PM

Testimony for JHA on 3/16/2023 2:00:00 PM

<b>Submitted By</b>	<b>Organization</b>	<b>Testifier Position</b>	<b>Testify</b>
Dana Keawe	Individual	Support	Written Testimony Only

Comments:

Support

**SB-682-SD-1**

Submitted on: 3/15/2023 4:43:51 PM

Testimony for JHA on 3/16/2023 2:00:00 PM

<b>Submitted By</b>	<b>Organization</b>	<b>Testifier Position</b>	<b>Testify</b>
Angela Bailey	Individual	Support	Written Testimony Only

Comments:

Please help Hawaii stop cruelty to animals and end the fur trade!

**SB-682-SD-1**

Submitted on: 3/15/2023 7:47:05 PM

Testimony for JHA on 3/16/2023 2:00:00 PM

<b>Submitted By</b>	<b>Organization</b>	<b>Testifier Position</b>	<b>Testify</b>
Peter Mathews	Individual	Support	Written Testimony Only

Comments:

As a Hawaii resident I strongly support the ban of fur sales in Hawaii. Farming and killing animals for fur is cruel and I fully support banning the retail sale of fur in Hawaii.

**SB-682-SD-1**

Submitted on: 3/16/2023 12:10:45 AM

Testimony for JHA on 3/16/2023 2:00:00 PM

<b>Submitted By</b>	<b>Organization</b>	<b>Testifier Position</b>	<b>Testify</b>
Kelly Deese	Individual	Support	Written Testimony Only

Comments:

As a resident of Hawaii, I urge you to support SB 682 SD1, which would ban the sale of fur in our state. No federal humane slaughter law protects animals on fur factory farms, and killing methods are gruesome, which is why it's critical that we end our state's support of this industry.

Socially conscious consumers today know that the fur industry electrocutes, gasses, poisons, or breaks the necks of millions of animals every year before peeling their skin off—sometimes while they're still alive and struggling. It doesn't matter if it's a full-length fur coat or a jacket lined with a small bit of fur trim—if it contains fur, it supports an industry that tortures and kills animals.

Many countries and cities are waking up to the cruelty behind the fur trade, including California and multiple communities across the U.S. that have already voted in favor of banning the retail sale of fur.

Producing animal fur causes up to *10 times* more damage to the environment than producing vegan fur. Not only do fur farms produce millions of pounds of feces every year, the formaldehyde, bleaching agents, and other toxic, carcinogenic chemicals used to prevent the fur from rotting are also often improperly disposed of and end up polluting local streams and rivers—which in turn kills even more animals.

Thank you for your time.

**SB-682-SD-1**

Submitted on: 3/16/2023 8:47:13 AM

Testimony for JHA on 3/16/2023 2:00:00 PM

<b>Submitted By</b>	<b>Organization</b>	<b>Testifier Position</b>	<b>Testify</b>
Beverly Shintaku	Individual	Support	Written Testimony Only

Comments:

- As a resident of Hawaii, I urge you to support SB 682 SD1, which would ban the sale of fur in our state. No federal humane slaughter law protects animals on fur factory farms, and killing methods are gruesome, which is why it's critical that we end our state's support of this industry.
- Socially conscious consumers today know that the fur industry electrocutes, gasses, poisons, or breaks the necks of millions of animals every year before peeling their skin off—sometimes while they're still alive and struggling. It doesn't matter if it's a full-length fur coat or a jacket lined with a small bit of fur trim—if it contains fur, it supports an industry that tortures and kills animals.
- Many countries and cities are waking up to the cruelty behind the fur trade, including California and multiple communities across the U.S. that have already voted in favor of banning the retail sale of fur.
- Producing animal fur causes up to *10 times* more damage to the environment than producing vegan fur. Not only do fur farms produce millions of pounds of feces every year, the formaldehyde, bleaching agents, and other toxic, carcinogenic chemicals used to prevent the fur from rotting are also often improperly disposed of and end up polluting local streams and rivers—which in turn kills even more animals.
- Thank you very much for this opportunity.