

YES on AB 44

Fur Products Prohibition Act

Author: Assemblymember Laura Friedman

AB 44 would make it unlawful to sell or manufacture a new fur product in the state. If passed, California will be the first state in the country to ban the cruel and unnecessary fur trade within its borders.



"Monster Foxes" are bred on fur factory farms in Finland; ©Oikeutta Elaimille



Fur factory farms are responsible for the suffering and death of millions of animals; ©Marc Ching

The future is fur-free. Consumers' growing concern for animal welfare is leading fashion brands, cities, and countries to move away from animal fur once and for all. Recent polling shows that 71% of Californians support a ban on the sale of fur products in the state. In 2018, Chanel, Coach, Burberry, Versace, Donna Karan, Diane Von Furstenberg, and *InStyle* magazine joined Gucci, Michael Kors, and Armani by announcing fur-free policies. Los Angeles and San Francisco joined Berkeley, West Hollywood, and São Paulo by banning fur sales. Internationally, Norway and Belgium joined the Netherlands, United Kingdom, and Austria in banning fur production. India banned fur imports in 2017.

Animal cruelty is standard in the fur industry. Every year, more than 100 million animals are raised and killed for their fur. On fur factory farms, undomesticated animals spend their entire lives in cramped cages, deprived of the ability to engage in natural behaviors – only to be crudely gassed or anally-electrocuted at the end. The stress from living in a tiny cage causes serious welfare problems, such as self-mutilation and infected wounds. Animal protection organizations have documented animals being skinned alive by the fur industry. In the wild, animals are caught in crippling leg-hold traps for days without food or water. These archaic traps are indiscriminate, often maiming and killing non-target animals, including threatened species and pets.

Fur is an environmental nightmare. On fur factory farms, waste runoff from animals pollutes the soil and waterways. The tanning and dying process uses toxic chemicals, like chromium and formaldehyde, to prevent the skin from decaying. Not surprisingly, truth in advertising committees across Europe have ruled that advertising fur as environmentally friendly is "false and misleading." In 2018, the French advertising authority said, "numerous reliable reports show that the production of fur is extremely cruel and polluting, and that the final product contains toxic substances."

Humane alternatives exist. After going fur-free in 2016, Giorgio Armani said, "technological progress made over the years allows us to have valid alternatives at our disposal that render the use of cruel practices unnecessary as regards animals." Michael Kors went fur-free the following year saying, "due to technological advances in fabrications, we now have the ability to create a luxe aesthetic using non-animal fur." This sentiment has spread across the fashion industry, as major fashion brands have switched to innovative materials that have the look and feel of animal fur but without the cruelty. Also, fur bans are helping drive the demand for innovation leading to a more sustainable and cruelty-free future.



Animal Hope & Wellness
FOUNDATION

For questions or additional information, please contact Ashley Doyle, HSUS Public Policy Specialist at adoyle@humanesociety.org

Top, right photo: © Jo-Anne McArthur