

**SB-682-HD-1**

Submitted on: 4/3/2023 2:12:52 PM

Testimony for FIN on 4/5/2023 2:00:00 PM

| <b>Submitted By</b> | <b>Organization</b>   | <b>Testifier Position</b> | <b>Testify</b>            |
|---------------------|-----------------------|---------------------------|---------------------------|
| Cathy Goeggel       | Animal Rights Hawai'i | Support                   | Written Testimony<br>Only |

Comments:

ARH stands in strong support of SB682

Mahalo



**THE HUMANE SOCIETY  
OF THE UNITED STATES**

**Support for SB682, Prohibiting the Sale of Fur Products  
House Committee on Finance  
Susan Rhee, Hawai'i State Director  
The Humane Society of the United States**

Aloha Chair Yamashita 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. This important bill will prohibit the sale of new fur products in Hawai'i, which include manufactured items like trim on gloves or coats, or poms on hats. It includes commonsense exemptions such as for used fur products and taxidermied items. SB 682 also does not impact the sale of raw fur pelts or items made from animal hair that isn't attached to skin, such as paint brushes and fishing lures.

SB 682 will help countless animals by removing our state from the global fur trade with little to no impact on our state's economy. No jobs will be lost in Hawai'i with the passage of SB 682 as there are no fur farms or fur-specific retailers in our state. Few stores continue to sell fur in Hawai'i, and most of the fur products sold at these stores are smaller accessories that can easily be replaced with humane, eco-friendly faux fur alternatives.

In a recent poll of more than 800 registered Hawai'i voters, 82% on average said they support legislation in our state that prohibit the sale of new fur products, with overwhelming support from both Democrats and Republicans alike.<sup>1</sup> SB 682 upholds the values of the majority of Hawai'ians who care about animal welfare and environmental health. Similar to Hawai'i's bans on other wildlife products like ivory and shark fins, SB 682 will ending our state's role in supporting the global fur trade.

Each year, more than 100 million animals are killed solely to be turned into fur coats, keychains, and other novelty items. Fur factory farms are typically 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. Even in the U.S., not a single state requires veterinary care for sick or injured animals on fur factory farms, and there are no legal requirements for humane slaughter of these animals.

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 dying 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.

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. Thank you for your consideration.

Susan Rhee  
Hawaii State Director, HSUS

---

<sup>i</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.

April 4, 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 imposter 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. Testimony given opposing this bill at the hearing in March clearly debunked the misconstrued and false claims favoring such actions. 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.

The financial impact in passing this bill will resonate across the country, destroying an entire legal and productive chain of businesses, professions and the economy. In a time where government is crying for green deals, banning the sale of fur items goes against this mission. I love my job and if The Aloha State bans 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.

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 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 Mike Brown

Organization: Head of Communications and Public Affairs, Natural Fibers Alliance

Bill: SB 682

Chair, Rep. Kyle T. Yamashita

Members of the House Finance Committee

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on SB 682, a bill that would prohibit the sale, offer for sale, display for sale, trade, or distribution of certain animal fur products in Hawaii. The Natural Fibers Alliance is a coalition comprised of producers and associations that support the use of natural sustainable materials in clothing, accessories, and other goods.

We oppose this bill for several reasons:

SB 682 is based on decades of scare tactics and misinformation from activist who use the mink industry and legislation like this to increase fundraising efforts. The truth is clear, mink farmers throughout North America like cattle and pig farmers, view animal health and welfare as a top priority. Farms have strict operating guidelines and certification protocols governing the care of mink. Farmers follow comprehensive animal husbandry practices developed leading veterinarians, and welfare experts, with detailed standards for nutrition, housing, biosecurity, veterinary care, and humane harvesting. Mink farming is subject to state, federal, and local laws, including environmental regulations.

Second, legislation like this could violate the dormant commerce clause. Currently, the US Supreme Court is hearing a case based on a 2018 California ballot initiative that banned the sale of pork in California, unless pregnant pigs were allowed at least 24 square feet (2.2 square meters) of space. The intent of the ballot initiative was to

force out-of-state producers to make costly changes to pen sizes even though California imports more than 99% of the pork it consumes.

Supreme court justices have now asked whether allowing the California law would mean other states could impose their own demands -- such as requiring that workers be paid a certain wage, vaccinated, or be allowed to opt out of a union -- before products could be sold.

Banning the retail sale of fur 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.

Third, banning natural fibers such as fur will harm current efforts to improve environmental sustainability. Natural fibers provide a viable, biodegradable alternative to synthetic materials associated with landfill, microplastics, overconsumption, and pollution. .

Lastly, some activists have been found to repeatedly exaggerate or even fabricate COVID on mink farm claims. After some initial farm infections in the fall of 2020, the industry now boasts a vaccination rate of nearly 100% of certified mink farms. Leaders, to include the Prime minister of Denmark have also since apologized for misleading the public over the issue.

Please don't fall for the misinformation. This bill does not serve the public interest and will undoubtedly lead to the banning of leather dress shoes, ugg boots, down feather coats and other products. All of which have been deliberately left out of these types of proposals to gain support without opposition. I encourage you to ask those who advocate for this type of legislation what is their end goal, and they will tell you, the complete elimination of commercial farming and fishery. This is legislation is not about the fur industry it's about activist using the legislative process to control our lives.

Proposals like this have real intended and unintended consequences that have led to decades of harassment against retailers and manufactures. To include the most recent violent attacks against farmers in Ohio and Michigan. Rather than gaslight extremist behavior, Hawaii must send a message and promote natural animal-based fibers as the state of New York has done with the recent passage and promotion of the New York Textile Act of 2022.

I urge you to vote no.

**SB-682-HD-1**

Submitted on: 4/4/2023 4:24:59 AM

Testimony for FIN on 4/5/2023 2:00:00 PM

| <b>Submitted By</b> | <b>Organization</b>     | <b>Testifier Position</b> | <b>Testify</b>         |
|---------------------|-------------------------|---------------------------|------------------------|
| Chris DeRose        | Last Chance for Animals | Support                   | Written Testimony Only |

Comments:

To Whom It May Concern:

My name is Chris DeRose, President and Founder of Last Chance for Animals (LCA), I am writing to you on behalf of LCA and its supporters. LCA supports SB 682, to ban the sale of fur in Hawaii. LCA is an international non-profit organization based in Los Angeles that advocates for animals through legislation, investigations, education, and media outreach. 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 throughout the years by animal welfare organizations such as LCA. Animals on fur farms spend their entire lives in tiny cages, subjected to horrendous cruelty and neglect - only to be killed for fashion. In 2018, LCA released an undercover investigation into Millbank, a mink fur farm – the practices documented were so cruel they led to 14 charges levied against the farm.

The environmental and public health risks the fur industry poses also cannot be ignored. Fur farming causes environmental damage in surrounding areas, including polluted lakes and watersheds. Fur farms also pose a public health risk; the spread of COVID-19 on mink farms has been well documented in countries throughout the world. To date, there have been several outbreaks of COVID-19 on mink fur farms in the United States.

LCA believes Hawaii is a compassionate state that cares about the welfare of all animals, public health, and the environment. By enacting a fur sale ban, Hawaii will set a historic precedent that animal abuse and other injustices will not be tolerated. Thank you for your time and please do not hesitate to reach out for further information to assist with this matter.

Sincerely,

Chris DeRose

President and Founder

Last Chance for Animals



525 East Cotati Avenue  
Cotati, California 94931

T 707.795.2533  
F 707.795.7280

info@aldf.org  
aldf.org

April 5, 2023

**Memorandum of Support – SB682 SD1 HD1**

*An Act relating to animal fur products.*

Dear Chair Yamashita, Vice Chair Kitagawa, and Members of the House Committee on Finance,

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 HD1, 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 HD1 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 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.

**All our clients are innocent**

Printed on recycled paper



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 HD1, 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)



## Fur Commission USA

---

P.O. Box 513 Preston ID, 83263  
(435) 915-6735  
[www.furcommission.com](http://www.furcommission.com)

Dear Committee Members,

My name is Challis Hobbs, and I am the Executive Director of Fur Commission USA, a national non-profit association representing U.S. Fur farmers. All of the mink farms in operation today in the U.S. are third and fourth-generation family farms. Mink ranchers recognize their responsibility to preserve and protect the land on which they work and provide the highest quality care for their livestock.

I am writing to express my **strong opposition to SB 682** that aims to prohibit the sale, offer for sale, display for sale, trade, or distribution of animal fur products in the State of Hawaii.

I have extensive personal and professional experience in the fur farming industry, having worked with fur farmers on the fur farming certification program, visited almost every fur farm in the U.S., grown up in a farming community, and worked for the largest global fur auction house in the world for four years.

There is no justification for SB 682, and it does not benefit anyone in the state of Hawaii. **The bills supporters suggest that existing laws provide relatively little oversight of the fur trading industries, while choosing to ignore the fact that fur farmers in the U.S. are held to animal welfare standards and regulations just like the swine, beef, and poultry industries, resulting in similar animal welfare situations as those other animal agriculture industries.** The mink farming certification program is peer reviewed and accredited by the Professional Animal Auditor Certification Organization (PAACO), which also peer-reviews and accredits the farming standards and certification programs for other major animal agriculture industries in the U.S., such as swine, beef, and poultry. The mink farming certification protocols were developed with input from scientists, veterinarians, and animal welfare experts, with rigorous standards for nutrition, housing, biosecurity, veterinary care, and humane harvesting to ensure the well-being of their animals. Mink farms are independently inspected by Validus Verification Services for compliance. Mink farming is also subject to state, federal, and local laws, including environmental regulations.

Moreover, mink are euthanized using approved methods from the American Veterinary Medical Association (AVMA), which is required in their certification. All mink in the U.S. are euthanized using cooled filtered carbon monoxide, they are put to sleep. After harvest, the mink pelts are sold on the market and the remaining animal matter is used in various products, such as organic compost, artisanal pet food, crab bait, and medical research. Nothing is wasted.

The bills supporters also have suggested that by banning the retail sale of fur, it will reduce human health risks, implying that farmed mink are a threat to human health. This notion is unfounded as 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



## Fur Commission USA

---

P.O. Box 513 Preston ID, 83263  
(435) 915-6735  
[www.furcommission.com](http://www.furcommission.com)

population and implementation of strict biosecurity protocols. These efforts have been successful in preventing significant outbreaks of the virus on mink farms. The USDA has stated that there is no significant threat to the public from farmed mink, and the U.S. mink farming industry is collaborating with the USDA/APHIS on a mink farm COVID-19 surveillance program. This ongoing program has been in place since the summer of last year, further ensuring the safety of both mink and humans.

Mink farms also contribute positively to the environment by serving 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. Mink fur is often considered a sustainable product because it is durable, biodegradable, and can last for many years. Choosing natural fibers like mink fur is a more sustainable option compared to synthetic fibers.

**It is important to recognize the hypocrisy in supporting the sale of plant-based fibers while condemning the use of animal-based fibers like fur. Both types of clothing production result in the death of animals.** In the U.S., approximately 1.5 million mink are harvested each year for their pelts to be turned into clothing, while the remains are used in pet foods, crab bait, compost, and medical research. In contrast, plant-based materials like cotton require tilling and plowing the ground, which kills millions of animals each year in the U.S. alone.

In conclusion, SB 682 is based on misinformation about animal welfare, the role of mink farming in public health, and the environment. The animal welfare claims suggested by the bill's proponents are not supported by facts and evidence. Moreover, this bill infringes upon the freedom of consumers to make their own educated choices regarding the use of animal products, including fur. **The bill's author and supporters seek to impose their preferences on the general public, effectively taking away the right to choose from Hawaiians, and the island's visitors.** We must be tolerant to individual choice and allow consumers to make their own decisions even if they differ from yours.

I respectfully urge the committee members to oppose SB 682, consider the facts, and be tolerant to other people's differences to create a more inclusive and diverse state.

Sincerely,  
Challis Hobbs Executive Director  
Fur Commission USA

**SB-682-HD-1**

Submitted on: 4/4/2023 8:47:37 AM

Testimony for FIN on 4/5/2023 2:00:00 PM

| <b>Submitted By</b> | <b>Organization</b> | <b>Testifier Position</b> | <b>Testify</b>         |
|---------------------|---------------------|---------------------------|------------------------|
| Jason Baker         | PETA                | Support                   | Written Testimony Only |

Comments:

Hello. My name is Jason Baker, and I'm a vice president at People for the Ethical Treatment of Animals, or PETA. Thank you for the opportunity to speak today. As a Hawaii resident and on behalf of PETA's 21,000 members and supporters in the state, I urge you to support the proposed ban on fur sales.

PETA entity undercover investigations around the world have exposed the horrors in the fur industry, including that animals are skinned alive in China and are electrocuted, have their necks snapped, or are crudely gassed to death on fur farms in the U.S. Animals on fur farms go insane—pacing endlessly and even biting into their own skin—because they're denied everything that gives their lives meaning. And in nature, trappers ensnare animals in steel-jaw traps that tear their flesh and break their bones, before the trappers return to shoot, stomp on, bludgeon, or kill them in some other violent way. Hundreds of major retailers as well as the entire country of Israel, more than 10 U.S. cities, and the state of California have already opposed this cruelty by banning fur sales. Seventy-one percent of Americans oppose killing animals for their fur.

On a personal level, I moved my family to Hawaii not for the weather and beaches but because of the progressive and compassionate nature of Hawaiians and the Hawaiian community. This is a ban I know my neighbors and my community support. Now, I urge you, too, to support this lifesaving legislation to end fur sales. Thank you.

Jason Baker

Diamond Head

**SB-682-HD-1**

Submitted on: 4/4/2023 8:58:12 AM

Testimony for FIN on 4/5/2023 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:

I continue to support the proposed ban on fur related products. As a law enforcement officer for over 38 years including five years as the Chief of Humane Law Enforcement with San Diego Humane I have seen first hand the cruelty man can place on the animals. I was directly involved in a rescue of 400+ chinchillas in such a "fur farm" and so the inhumane conditions they were under, including a device that would kill the chinchillas through electrocution.

I can see no rationale for not passing this legislation. It is widely endorsed by the Hawaii community, faux fur garmetnts are an easy replacement, and there is absolutely no justification for the inhumane treatment that continues in such endeavors. I strongly encourage your consideration to pass this bill. Thank you.

Stephen MacKinnon, Chief Executive Officer of the Maui Humane Society



**HUMANE SOCIETY  
VETERINARY MEDICAL  
ASSOCIATION..**

April 4, 2023

**House Committee on Finance**

Representative Kyle T. Yamashita, Chair and Members  
State Capitol  
415 South Beretania Street  
Honolulu, HI 96813

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

Dear Chair Yamashita 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

**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



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



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 HD1  
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 HD1, 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 HD1, 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>.



April 4, 2023

To: Chair Rep. Kyle Yamashita  
Vice Chair Rep. Lisa Kitagawa  
And Members of the Committee on Finance

Submitted By: Kaua`i Humane Society

RE: SB682 SD1: Relating to animal fur products

**Testimony in support.**

I support the Senate Bill 682 SD1 and the campaign to prohibit the sale of certain fur products because of the crowded and inhumane manner of which animals harvested for their coats, like rabbits and chinchillas, are housed in a captive environment. Due to these crowded conditions of fur farms, they act as reservoirs for deadly diseases and viruses and have the potential to also establish new strains, further threatening animals and humans. The harvesting of the fur is performed inhumanely, through gassing and electrocution. If a pet rabbit or chinchilla was in need of euthanasia these two methods of extermination would in no way be deemed acceptable by the pet owner or the veterinarian performing the procedure. The rabbit that brings joy to the classroom is no different than the rabbit that adorns a keychain.

The harvesting of animals for a coat, hat, or keychain is irrelevant to our society today. Hawai`i banned the sales of new cosmetic products tested on animals demonstrating that Hawai`i will not tolerate unnecessary cruelty to animals, like what is seen in fur farms. I urge you to pass Senate Bill 682 SD1. Thank you for considering our testimony.

Respectfully,  
Nicole Schafer Crane  
Executive Director  
Kaua`i Humane Society  
nicole@kauaihumane.org



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

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

Date: April 4, 2023

To: Chair Rep. Kyle T. Yamashita  
Vice Chair Rep. Lisa Kitagawa  
and Members of the Committee Finance

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

RE: Testimony in support of SB 682, SD1, HD1:  
Relating to Animal Fur Products  
Wednesday, April 5, 2023, 2 p.m., Room 308 & Via Videoconference

---

On behalf of the Hawaiian Humane Society, thank you for considering our support for Senate Bill 682, SD1, HD1, 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-HD-1**

Submitted on: 4/4/2023 11:02:10 AM

Testimony for FIN on 4/5/2023 2:00:00 PM

| <b>Submitted By</b> | <b>Organization</b>      | <b>Testifier Position</b> | <b>Testify</b>    |
|---------------------|--------------------------|---------------------------|-------------------|
| AMANDA FOX          | Animal Rights Initiative | Support                   | Remotely Via Zoom |

Comments:

Aloha 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 and for us to prevent unsafe clothing items from being sold within our state. Breaches of animal welfare are documented on every fur farm - they frequently suffer from cannibalism, self-mutilation, and infected wounds. They go insane from the confinement, pacing endlessly and attacking 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. Hawaiians that have pets are double the national average at 60% - 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 and Bird flu. It attacks their respiratory systems, just like humans, causing atrociously painful chest infections. Mink are reservoirs for coronaviruses, providing an opportunity for the virus to mutate, and repeatedly spill back over into humans, forever. Outbreaks occurred on 427 farms across Europe and America. No zoonotic disease has ever disappeared from the earth when transmission from animals was the case. We need to follow the recommendations of infectious disease experts and end our support for these items just like they've done in Poland, France, Italy and Ireland. Fur is not even a natural product once chromium and formaldehyde are applied, which is shown to cause cancer and hormone imbalances. To continue to manufacture these unnecessary vanity items In light of the consequences would be more than imprudent; it would be depraved. Thank you for your support on this bill.



April 4, 2023

The Honorable Kyle T. Yamashita, Chair  
Finance Committee  
Hawaii House of Representatives

Dear Representative Yamashita and Members of the Finance 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 Finance Committee to support SB 682 SD1 HD1. 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 HD1 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 HD1.

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  
PETA.org

**Affiliates:**

- PETA Asia
- PETA India
- PETA France
- PETA Australia
- PETA Germany
- PETA Netherlands
- PETA Foundation (U.K.)



**TESTIMONY OF TINA YAMAKI, PRESIDENT  
RETAIL MERCHANTS OF HAWAII**

**APRIL 5, 2023**

**Re: SB 682 SD1 HD1 Relating to Animal Fur Products**

Good afternoon, Chair Yamashita and members of the House Committee on Finance. 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 HD1 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.

**Hawaii is already one of the most regulated states in the entire nation. We do not feel that another law is necessary as retailers are already self-regulating.** This is NOT the mainland where fur coats, scarves and other fur apparel and items are necessary to keep warm in the winter months.

**We do not feel this measure is necessary as stores in Hawaii are already phasing out fur items as well 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. **There is NOT a large demand for fur in Hawaii.**

**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 or in other products. Nothing goes to waste. **We also question if we ban fur products today, will cows, chicken and pigs be next on the ban list as they too are raised on farms???**

With Hawaii's average temperature in the 80's, **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, especially if there is a short deadline.** It is unfair that retailers would not be able to sell out their existing inventory. 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 a great loss or trashed if they did not meet the deadline. We have seen since last year that sales are down and awfully slow for many of our retailers who are dependent on foreign customers who are currently NOT traveling to Hawaii. Certain types of merchandise like the existing inventory of fur are not moving fast due to the lack of Asian 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 continue 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 humbly ask that you hold this bill. Mahalo again for this opportunity to testify.

**SB-682-HD-1**

Submitted on: 4/3/2023 2:14:57 PM

Testimony for FIN on 4/5/2023 2:00:00 PM

| <b>Submitted By</b> | <b>Organization</b> | <b>Testifier Position</b> | <b>Testify</b>            |
|---------------------|---------------------|---------------------------|---------------------------|
| Cards Pintor        | Individual          | Support                   | Written Testimony<br>Only |

Comments:

Aloha,

I support this bill.

Mahalo nui,

Cards Pintor

**SB-682-HD-1**

Submitted on: 4/3/2023 5:23:03 PM

Testimony for FIN on 4/5/2023 2:00:00 PM

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

Comments:

Support



**SB-682-HD-1**

Submitted on: 4/3/2023 8:36:41 PM

Testimony for FIN on 4/5/2023 2:00:00 PM

| <b>Submitted By</b> | <b>Organization</b> | <b>Testifier Position</b> | <b>Testify</b>            |
|---------------------|---------------------|---------------------------|---------------------------|
| Gerard Silva        | Individual          | Oppose                    | Written Testimony<br>Only |

Comments:

This should not Be Illegal in Hawaii!!!



**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

April 3, 2023

**Via Email**

Honorable Committee on Finance  
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 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 Finance Committee  
April 3rd, 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  
Natural Fibers Alliance  
(202) 618-1689  
Communications@naturalfibersalliance.com

**SB-682-HD-1**

Submitted on: 4/4/2023 5:49:21 AM

Testimony for FIN on 4/5/2023 2:00:00 PM

| <b>Submitted By</b> | <b>Organization</b> | <b>Testifier Position</b> | <b>Testify</b>            |
|---------------------|---------------------|---------------------------|---------------------------|
| David Raatz         | Individual          | Support                   | Written Testimony<br>Only |

Comments:

Mahalo.

**SB-682-HD-1**

Submitted on: 4/4/2023 6:26:05 AM

Testimony for FIN on 4/5/2023 2:00:00 PM

| <b>Submitted By</b> | <b>Organization</b> | <b>Testifier Position</b> | <b>Testify</b>            |
|---------------------|---------------------|---------------------------|---------------------------|
| Karen Mawae-Spence  | Individual          | Support                   | Written Testimony<br>Only |

Comments:

In this day and age where we can manually produce such items ....to replace animal leather and fur, there is no need to kill animals for this. It is ridiculous and this practice needs to stop. we are not in the 1800's anymore.

**SB-682-HD-1**

Submitted on: 4/4/2023 6:44:00 AM

Testimony for FIN on 4/5/2023 2:00:00 PM

| <b>Submitted By</b> | <b>Organization</b> | <b>Testifier Position</b> | <b>Testify</b>            |
|---------------------|---------------------|---------------------------|---------------------------|
| Shari Grounds       | Individual          | Support                   | Written Testimony<br>Only |

Comments:

I am born and raised in Hawaii, am part Hawaiian and have lived here my whole life.

I urge you to support SB 682 SD1 HD1, 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.

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.

Mahalo for helping animals and ending this horribly cruel and unnecessary practice!

**SB-682-HD-1**

Submitted on: 4/4/2023 6:49:50 AM

Testimony for FIN on 4/5/2023 2:00:00 PM

| <b>Submitted By</b> | <b>Organization</b> | <b>Testifier Position</b> | <b>Testify</b>         |
|---------------------|---------------------|---------------------------|------------------------|
| Amy Sherrer         | Individual          | Support                   | Written Testimony Only |

Comments:

- As a resident of Hawaii, I urge you to support SB 682 SD1 HD1, 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 all you do for animals.

**SB-682-HD-1**

Submitted on: 4/4/2023 6:51:37 AM

Testimony for FIN on 4/5/2023 2:00:00 PM

| <b>Submitted By</b> | <b>Organization</b> | <b>Testifier Position</b> | <b>Testify</b>            |
|---------------------|---------------------|---------------------------|---------------------------|
| Carol Fahy          | Individual          | Support                   | Written Testimony<br>Only |

Comments:

- As a resident of Hawaii, I urge you to support SB 682 SD1 HD1, 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.

**SB-682-HD-1**

Submitted on: 4/4/2023 7:40:44 AM

Testimony for FIN on 4/5/2023 2:00:00 PM

| <b>Submitted By</b> | <b>Organization</b> | <b>Testifier Position</b> | <b>Testify</b>            |
|---------------------|---------------------|---------------------------|---------------------------|
| Lorraine Barrie     | Individual          | Support                   | Written Testimony<br>Only |

Comments:

Please ban the use of fur. It is derived from extreme cruelty & suffering of living creatures.  
Thank you.



**SB-682-HD-1**

Submitted on: 4/4/2023 7:59:43 AM

Testimony for FIN on 4/5/2023 2:00:00 PM

| <b>Submitted By</b> | <b>Organization</b> | <b>Testifier Position</b> | <b>Testify</b>            |
|---------------------|---------------------|---------------------------|---------------------------|
| Erin Sunahara       | Individual          | Support                   | Written Testimony<br>Only |

Comments:

As a Maui resident, the sale of animal fur is not a necessity.

**SB-682-HD-1**

Submitted on: 4/4/2023 8:03:48 AM

Testimony for FIN on 4/5/2023 2:00:00 PM

| <b>Submitted By</b> | <b>Organization</b> | <b>Testifier Position</b> | <b>Testify</b>            |
|---------------------|---------------------|---------------------------|---------------------------|
| Keith Krueger       | Individual          | Support                   | Written Testimony<br>Only |

Comments:

I STRONGLY support SB682. The fur industry is a cruel, environmentally damaging, and totally unnecessary. It is more so in Hawaii, which has a moderate climate.

**SB-682-HD-1**

Submitted on: 4/4/2023 8:15:29 AM

Testimony for FIN on 4/5/2023 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:

Aloha,

As a resident of Hawaii, I urge you to support SB 682 SD1 HD1, 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 inhumane, cruel and 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.

Please pass this very important bill.

Mahalo,

Lory Ono

**SB-682-HD-1**

Submitted on: 4/4/2023 8:16:45 AM

Testimony for FIN on 4/5/2023 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 Yamashita, Vice Chairperson Kitagawa and Members of the Committee on Finance.

I am Jennifer Chiwa. My dad was from Hilo, my mom, from Puunene, and I'm from Aiea, currently residing in Makiki.

Please support SB 682 SB 1 HD 1 relating to animal fur products. In its current draft form, this bill appears to be only about animal welfare. However, in the excellently written justification of the original form, this bill also addresses detriments to public health and the environment. Please support SB 682 SD 1 HD 1 to continue Hawaii's leadership in animal welfare, public health and environmental protection.

Thank you for this opportunity to testify and for your consideration.

Jennifer Chiwa

Makiki

**SB-682-HD-1**

Submitted on: 4/4/2023 9:29:40 AM

Testimony for FIN on 4/5/2023 2:00:00 PM

| <b>Submitted By</b> | <b>Organization</b> | <b>Testifier Position</b> | <b>Testify</b>            |
|---------------------|---------------------|---------------------------|---------------------------|
| Andrew Arneson      | Individual          | Support                   | Written Testimony<br>Only |

Comments:

Aloha Chair Yamashita and Members of the Committee. As a Hawaii resident, I support SB 682 prohibiting the sale of new fur products in our state.

sincerely,

Andrew Arneson

**SB-682-HD-1**

Submitted on: 4/4/2023 9:31:25 AM

Testimony for FIN on 4/5/2023 2:00:00 PM

| <b>Submitted By</b> | <b>Organization</b> | <b>Testifier Position</b> | <b>Testify</b>            |
|---------------------|---------------------|---------------------------|---------------------------|
| Judith Aikawa       | Individual          | Support                   | Written Testimony<br>Only |

Comments:

*Aloha Chair Yamashita and Members of the Committee. As a Hawaii resident, I support SB 682 prohibiting the sale of new fur products in our state. Mahalo, Judith Aikawa, MD*

**SB-682-HD-1**

Submitted on: 4/4/2023 10:16:09 AM

Testimony for FIN on 4/5/2023 2:00:00 PM

| <b>Submitted By</b> | <b>Organization</b> | <b>Testifier Position</b> | <b>Testify</b>            |
|---------------------|---------------------|---------------------------|---------------------------|
| Gerrit B Osborne    | Individual          | Support                   | Written Testimony<br>Only |

Comments:

Killing animals...any animals...to make money by selling their fur is unconscionable, "un-human" and should be outlawed nationally. Even the rat and the mongoose should be free of this threat. Tongue-in-cheek, however, I'll say there are some politicians that should be skinned (at last metaphorically.)

**SB-682-HD-1**

Submitted on: 4/4/2023 10:44:32 AM

Testimony for FIN on 4/5/2023 2:00:00 PM

| <b>Submitted By</b> | <b>Organization</b> | <b>Testifier Position</b> | <b>Testify</b>            |
|---------------------|---------------------|---------------------------|---------------------------|
| Randyl Rugar        | Individual          | Support                   | Written Testimony<br>Only |

Comments:

Please respect the autonomy of all animals unjustly sacrificed for the fur industry.  
I support Bill SB682!!!



**SB-682-HD-1**

Submitted on: 4/4/2023 11:02:38 AM

Testimony for FIN on 4/5/2023 2:00:00 PM

| <b>Submitted By</b> | <b>Organization</b> | <b>Testifier Position</b> | <b>Testify</b>         |
|---------------------|---------------------|---------------------------|------------------------|
| Tina Hudgins        | Individual          | Support                   | Written Testimony Only |

Comments:

Aloha Chair Yamashita and Members of the Committee,

As a Hawaii resident I support bill SB 682 to prohibit the sale of new fur products in Hawaii.

Hawaii can be the example of a kinder future.

Mahalo,

Tina Hudgins

**SB-682-HD-1**

Submitted on: 4/4/2023 11:21:09 AM

Testimony for FIN on 4/5/2023 2:00:00 PM

| <b>Submitted By</b>      | <b>Organization</b> | <b>Testifier Position</b> | <b>Testify</b>            |
|--------------------------|---------------------|---------------------------|---------------------------|
| kellycollinsjk@gmail.com | Individual          | Support                   | Written Testimony<br>Only |

Comments:

Aloha Chair Yamashita and Members of the Committee -

As a Hawaii resident, I support SB 682 prohibiting the sale of new fur products in our state.

It is our kuleana to do the RIGHT thing, which is to help eliminate the horrible suffering animals experience when they are harvested for their fur.

Mahalo,

Kelly Collins

**SB-682-HD-1**

Submitted on: 4/4/2023 11:35:51 AM

Testimony for FIN on 4/5/2023 2:00:00 PM

| <b>Submitted By</b>    | <b>Organization</b> | <b>Testifier Position</b> | <b>Testify</b>            |
|------------------------|---------------------|---------------------------|---------------------------|
| Marie-Louise Lundqvist | Individual          | Support                   | Written Testimony<br>Only |

Comments:

*Aloha Chair Yamashita and Members of the Committee.*

*As a Hawaii resident, I support SB 682 prohibiting the sale of new fur products in our state.*

*Mahalo!*

**SB-682-HD-1**

Submitted on: 4/4/2023 11:43:30 AM

Testimony for FIN on 4/5/2023 2:00:00 PM

| <b>Submitted By</b> | <b>Organization</b> | <b>Testifier Position</b> | <b>Testify</b>         |
|---------------------|---------------------|---------------------------|------------------------|
| Juliet Pearson      | Individual          | Support                   | Written Testimony Only |

Comments:

Millions of animals suffer and die a horrific death on fur farms.

Forced to live in small wire cages, animals farmed for their fur are denied their most natural behaviors, with the chronic deprivation and extreme confinement causing both psychological and physical damage. Despite industry claims that methods of killing are quick, the evidence is clear that these animals are terrified as they face a cruel and inhumane death.

When people buy fur, they buy cruelty, not luxury or beauty.

The fashion world can and is already moving on, with numerous designers and brands saying no to fur industry cruelty. From Armani to Zara, a huge number of designers and brands have all said no to fur industry cruelty, as have at least 18 countries. Most recently, Hudson's Bay Company, which owns Saks Fifth Avenue, went fur-free and Lexington, Massachusetts became the sixth municipality in the state to ban the sale of new fur products.

With your help, Hawaii may become the second US state, after California, to pass a statewide ban on fur products.

**SB-682-HD-1**

Submitted on: 4/4/2023 12:24:53 PM

Testimony for FIN on 4/5/2023 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 strong support of SB 682.

As a resident of Hawaii, I urge you to support this bill 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.

Its time to end this barbaric practice and pass SB 682 SD1 HD1.

Thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely,

Taurie Kinoshita

**SB-682-HD-1**

Submitted on: 4/4/2023 12:26:34 PM

Testimony for FIN on 4/5/2023 2:00:00 PM

| <b>Submitted By</b> | <b>Organization</b> | <b>Testifier Position</b> | <b>Testify</b>            |
|---------------------|---------------------|---------------------------|---------------------------|
| Lynn Bowen          | Individual          | Support                   | Written Testimony<br>Only |

Comments:

*Aloha Chair Yamashita and Members of the Committee. As a Hawaii resident, I support SB 682 prohibiting the sale of new fur products in our state.*

*Mahalo, Lynn Bowen Kalaheo HI 96741*

**SB-682-HD-1**

Submitted on: 4/4/2023 12:53:01 PM

Testimony for FIN on 4/5/2023 2:00:00 PM

| <b>Submitted By</b> | <b>Organization</b> | <b>Testifier Position</b> | <b>Testify</b>         |
|---------------------|---------------------|---------------------------|------------------------|
| Sybil Scholz        | Individual          | Support                   | Written Testimony Only |

Comments:

I support the fur ban!

- As a resident of Hawaii, I urge you to support SB 682 SD1 HD1, 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-HD-1**

Submitted on: 4/4/2023 2:01:22 PM

Testimony for FIN on 4/5/2023 2:00:00 PM

| <b>Submitted By</b> | <b>Organization</b> | <b>Testifier Position</b> | <b>Testify</b>         |
|---------------------|---------------------|---------------------------|------------------------|
| Kathy Shimata       | Individual          | Support                   | Written Testimony Only |

Comments:

*Aloha Chair Yamashita and Members of the Committee.*

*As a Hawaii resident, I support SB 682 prohibiting the sale of new fur products in our state.*

In this day & age there is absolutely no reason for us to continue the barbaric practice of killing animals to wear their skins. Polling shows that 82% of residents support this legislation to ban the sale of new fur products.

Please pass SB682.

*Mahalo,*

*Kathy Shimata*

*Honolulu 96822*



**SB-682-HD-1**

Submitted on: 4/4/2023 2:22:01 PM

Testimony for FIN on 4/5/2023 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 Wahiawa, Hawaii, I urge you to support SB 682 SD1 HD1, 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 already 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 your consideration.

**SB-682-HD-1**

Submitted on: 4/4/2023 2:42:06 PM

Testimony for FIN on 4/5/2023 2:00:00 PM

| Submitted By    | Organization | Testifier Position | Testify                |
|-----------------|--------------|--------------------|------------------------|
| Laurel Whillock | Individual   | Oppose             | Written Testimony Only |

Comments:

*Aloha Chair Yamashita and Members of the Committee.*

*As a Hawaii resident, I support SB 682 prohibiting the sale of new fur products in our state.*

- Hawaii must pass SB 682 and no longer support the cruel fur industry.
- Hawai'i cares deeply about animal welfare and polling shows that an overwhelming majority of residents, 82%, support legislation to ban the sale of new fur products.
- SB 682 creates commonsense policy that helps Hawai'i continue to lead the nation on animal welfare and environmental protection.
- Factory fur farming is inherently cruel to animals and pollutes the environment with toxic chemicals.
- Like Hawai'i's ivory and shark fin bans, SB 682's ban on new fur products won't harm retailers as few stores still sell fur in the state.
- Every year, more than 100 million animals are raised and killed just to be turned into fur products like coats and hats. On fur factory farms, undomesticated animals spend their entire lives in cramped cages and deprived of their natural behaviors, only to be crudely gassed or electrocuted at the end. They suffer serious welfare problems, such as self-mutilation, infected wounds, and illness.

Thank you for taking action!

*Mahalo,*

*Laurel Whillock*

**SB-682-HD-1**

Submitted on: 4/4/2023 2:59:07 PM

Testimony for FIN on 4/5/2023 2:00:00 PM

| <b>Submitted By</b> | <b>Organization</b> | <b>Testifier Position</b> | <b>Testify</b>         |
|---------------------|---------------------|---------------------------|------------------------|
| Alice Saul          | Individual          | Support                   | Written Testimony Only |

Comments:

Aloha chair Yamashita and Members of the Committee. As a Hawaii resident, I support SB682 prohibiting the sale of new fur products in our state.

Annually over one hundred-million animals are raised under unnatural conditions, and killed for use as fur in clothing. How inhumane is that?

The commonsense policy in this bill will further Hawaii's lead in the national effort on animal welfare and environmental protection.

It's time to totally end our tolerance for inhumane cruelty. I am certain no retailers will be harmed as a result of this action.

Thank you.

**SB-682-HD-1**

Submitted on: 4/4/2023 3:01:10 PM

Testimony for FIN on 4/5/2023 2:00:00 PM

| <b>Submitted By</b>      | <b>Organization</b> | <b>Testifier Position</b> | <b>Testify</b>         |
|--------------------------|---------------------|---------------------------|------------------------|
| Anastasia Keller-Collins | Individual          | Support                   | Written Testimony Only |

Comments:

- Hawai'i must pass SB 682 and no longer support the cruel fur industry.
- Hawai'i cares deeply about animal welfare and polling shows that an overwhelming majority of residents, 82%, support legislation to ban the sale of new fur products.
- SB 682 creates commonsense policy that helps Hawai'i continue to lead the nation on animal welfare and environmental protection.
- Factory fur farming is inherently cruel to animals and pollutes the environment with toxic chemicals.
- Like Hawai'i's ivory and shark fin bans, SB 682's ban on new fur products won't harm retailers as few stores still sell fur in the state.
- Every year, more than 100 million animals are raised and killed just to be turned into fur products like coats and hats. On fur factory farms, undomesticated animals spend their entire lives in cramped cages and deprived of their natural behaviors, only to be crudely gassed or electrocuted at the end. They suffer serious welfare problems, such as self-mutilation, infected wounds, and illness.

**SB-682-HD-1**

Submitted on: 4/4/2023 4:07:28 PM

Testimony for FIN on 4/5/2023 2:00:00 PM

| <b>Submitted By</b> | <b>Organization</b> | <b>Testifier Position</b> | <b>Testify</b>         |
|---------------------|---------------------|---------------------------|------------------------|
| Ashley Wilcox       | Individual          | Support                   | Written Testimony Only |

Comments:

Hawai'i cares deeply about animal welfare and polling shows that an overwhelming majority of residents, 82%, support legislation to ban the sale of new fur products.

**SB-682-HD-1**

Submitted on: 4/4/2023 11:05:00 PM

Testimony for FIN on 4/5/2023 2:00:00 PM

| <b>Submitted By</b> | <b>Organization</b> | <b>Testifier Position</b> | <b>Testify</b>         |
|---------------------|---------------------|---------------------------|------------------------|
| Gerry Lee           | Individual          | Support                   | Written Testimony Only |

Comments:

*Aloha Chair Yamashita and Members of the Committee. As a Hawaii resident, I support SB 682 prohibiting the sale of new fur products in our state. Mahalo, Gerry Lee*

Hawai'i should pass SB 682 to no longer support the cruel fur industry. I care deeply about animal welfare and an overwhelming majority of residents, 82%, support legislation to ban the sale of new fur products.

SB 682 should be passed and enacted because:

Factory fur farming is inherently cruel to animals and pollutes the environment with toxic chemicals.

Every year, more than 100 million animals are raised and killed just to be turned into fur products like coats and hats. On fur factory farms, animals spend their entire lives in cramped cages and deprived of their natural behaviors, only to be cruelly gassed or electrocuted at the end. They suffer serious health problems, such as self-mutilation, infected wounds, and illness.

Please stop the cruelty! Thank you!

**SB-682-HD-1**

Submitted on: 4/5/2023 8:16:17 AM

Testimony for FIN on 4/5/2023 2:00:00 PM

| <b>Submitted By</b> | <b>Organization</b> | <b>Testifier Position</b> | <b>Testify</b>         |
|---------------------|---------------------|---------------------------|------------------------|
| Wendy Bernier       | Individual          | Support                   | Written Testimony Only |

Comments:

Hello,

I support a ban on fur products in Hawaii. We are a kinder population. This is not necessary.

Thank you.

**SB-682-HD-1**

Submitted on: 4/5/2023 1:06:17 PM

Testimony for FIN on 4/5/2023 2:00:00 PM

| <b>Submitted By</b> | <b>Organization</b> | <b>Testifier Position</b> | <b>Testify</b>         |
|---------------------|---------------------|---------------------------|------------------------|
| Mark K.Wilson III   | Individual          | Support                   | Written Testimony Only |

Comments:

Raising animals to take their fur is simply cruel. Hawaii should have no part in selling animal fur products.