

# For Fur's Sake: Can the UK Ban Imports of Fur from Other Countries?

Rachel Dunn, Senior Lecturer at Northumbria University

## Abstract

This article examines the current legal position of fur trade in the UK and the issues faced by consumers and the Government. Whilst some view Brexit as a detrimental position for the UK, including the author, there are some potential benefits for animal welfare. Free Movement of Goods within the EU makes it harder for the UK to ban imports of fur. Further, consumers are facing issues of not knowing whether the “faux fur” they are buying is real or not, with many high street retailers facing accusations over transparency of products. This article will consider what the UK can do to stop imports of fur products, both as a Member State of the EU and not. The animal welfare issues of fur farming will be discussed and why it is important that the UK does not financially support such trade, whether knowingly or not. It is proposed that the UK do ban imports of fur products.

## Keywords

Fur trade, Brexit, animal welfare

## Introduction

Fur farming is a serious consideration for animal welfare and millions of animals are killed for their pelts each year for the vanity of fashion. Animals on fur farms are subjected to extremely inhumane conditions and slaughtering. Often, they are kept in metal cages, over fed and killed using a variety of inhumane methods. Those who wish to take a stand against this

practice and buy fake fur may be actually buying real fur, however, and investigations over the last few years have found that big high-street brands have, mostly without realising, been selling products which contain real fur and advertising it as fake fur.<sup>1</sup>

We have seen countries ban fur farms across the globe. Most recently, Norway, one of the biggest producers of fur, has pledged to introduce a ban which will see the diminishment of fur farms by 2025. The actual ban of imports and sale of fur products seems to be a harder task, with countries anticipating legal action over such trade restrictions. There has been a rise, however, of countries, and even cities, banning the sale of fur products and it is time the UK followed suit.

This article will explore the UK's current position on the fur trade and the issues consumers have faced when buying what they believe to be faux fur when it is proven to be real fur. It will explore what options we have to ban imports as a member of the EU and the Single Market and, if we can't, how we may be able to impose labelling requirements which will help consumers know what is in the textiles which they are buying. Conclusions will be drawn as to how the UK should proceed to control imports of fur products, to stop supporting this cruel practice.

## Animal Welfare Issues on Fur Farms

It is estimated that more than 130 million animals each year suffer for the fur industry, with minks being the

<sup>1</sup> Humane Society International, 'TK MAXX, Boohoo, Not On The High Street Among Online Retail Giants Caught Selling Real Fur Advertised As 'Faux'' (20<sup>th</sup> December 2017) Accessed via

<[http://www.hsi.org/world/united\\_kingdom/news/releases/2017/12/online-real-as-faux-122017.html](http://www.hsi.org/world/united_kingdom/news/releases/2017/12/online-real-as-faux-122017.html)> Last cited 28.10.18

most commonly killed at 97.7 million.<sup>2</sup> The animals are kept in metal wired cages for their entire life, unable to display usual behaviours akin to their species. For example, in the wild mink, a semi-aquatic creature, live in territories which stretch across lakes or river banks and build anywhere between 5-24 dens usually less than 10m away from the water, to store food and rest. On fur farms, however, they are unable to exhibit this behaviour, usually kept in cages sized 1/3 m<sup>2</sup> unable to explore and swim. Research has shown that minks in captivity do not adapt to their new surroundings, even when bred in captivity, and can suffer high levels of stress, specifically from the lack of a water resource for swimming.<sup>3</sup> The mink is a solitary animal, but are often caged with other minks on fur farms, causing further distress and suffering.

As a result of heightened stress levels and the restriction of movement and normal behaviour patterns, animals will resort to acts such as fur chewing and biting. Due to the wire cages animals can suffer from bent feet and/or sores on their bodies. In order for farmers to gain more fur, they will overfeed animals to obesity, and some claim that they are genetically modified to become so large, which causes health issues and restrains movement of the animal.<sup>4</sup> The European Commission's Scientific Committee on Animal Health and Animal Welfare (SCAHAW) highlights that 'deaths on farms can be caused by disease, injury or physiological system failure, which shows that welfare has been poor.'<sup>5</sup>

For those animals not bred in captivity, their capture can be extremely distressing and cruel. Some wild animals are caught in traps, including leg hold traps and drowning traps, often left for days without water, food or shelter. If animals manage to escape, it is not without seriously injuring themselves. If they do not escape, they will be beaten or stomped to death once the trapper returns.<sup>6</sup>

Animals on fur farms are killed in a variety of ways depending on the animal and the farm. Minks are commonly killed using CO<sub>2</sub> gas. Practice varies between killing up to 50 minks in one box, which can cause suffocation before the gassing, or individual gas tubes, but SCAHAW acknowledges no reliable data on the merits of the different techniques.<sup>7</sup> Mink will obviously be distressed during this time and there can be a delay between the mink entering the gas chamber, falling unconscious and dying. Other methods include electrocution and the breaking of their necks, although in EU countries and Norway neck breaking is now illegal.<sup>8</sup> Foxes are commonly killed by electrocution, using two electrodes, one inserted in the mouth and one in the rectum. If used properly, it is meant to induce unconsciousness immediately.<sup>9</sup>

The welfare of animals on fur farms raises serious concerns, particularly when the purpose is for fashion and vanity. Humane Society International UK (HSI) argues that any animal welfare scheme is inadequate,

<sup>2</sup> Humane Society International, *Political Briefing Paper One: The Case for a Ban on the UK Fur Trade 2018*, 4. Accessed via <https://www.furfreebritain.uk/resources/HSI-Political-Briefing-One-The-case-for-a-ban-on-the-UK-fur-trade.pdf> Last cited 13.09.18

<sup>3</sup> Mason GJ, *et al*, 'Frustrations of fur-farmed mink,' 2001 410:6824 *Nature* 35-36

<sup>4</sup> J. Mononen *et al*, 'The development of on-farm welfare assessment protocols for foxes and mink: the WelFure project' (2012) 21 *Animal Welfare* 363

<sup>5</sup> European Commission's Scientific Committee on Animal Health and Animal Welfare, *The Welfare of Animals Kept for Fur Production*, December 2001, 8. Accessed via [https://ec.europa.eu/food/sites/food/files/safety/docs/sci-com\\_scah\\_out67\\_en.pdf](https://ec.europa.eu/food/sites/food/files/safety/docs/sci-com_scah_out67_en.pdf) Last cited 13.09.18

<sup>6</sup> Humane Society International, *The Fur Trade*. Accessed via [http://www.hsi.org/world/united\\_kingdom/work/fur/facts/fur-trade-facts.html](http://www.hsi.org/world/united_kingdom/work/fur/facts/fur-trade-facts.html) Last cited 13.09.18

<sup>7</sup> Humane Society International, *Political Briefing Paper One: The Case for a Ban on the UK Fur Trade 2018*, 67. Accessed via <https://www.furfreebritain.uk/resources/HSI-Political-Briefing-One-The-case-for-a-ban-on-the-UK-fur-trade.pdf> Last cited 13.09.18

<sup>8</sup> Council Regulation (EC) No 1099/2009 – NOAH and Animalia, *Case Saga Furs: Nordic Fur Trade – marketed as responsible business*, (2015) 22. Accessed via [https://www.furfreealliance.com/wp-content/uploads/2015/10/Pels\\_final\\_print\\_mail.pdf](https://www.furfreealliance.com/wp-content/uploads/2015/10/Pels_final_print_mail.pdf) Last cited 28.10.18

<sup>9</sup> Heather Prickett and Stephen Harris, *The Case Against Fur Factory Farming: A Scientific Review of Animal Welfare Standards and 'WelFur'*, A Report for Respect for Animals (2015) 28



stating that 'high-welfare fur farming is basically an oxymoron... they do not offer any meaningful welfare provisions for animals on these farms.'<sup>10</sup> By allowing the sale of fur goods in the UK, we continue to support such businesses and their inhumane practices, regardless of welfare claims.

#### What is the UK's Position on Fur?

In 2000 the Fur Farming (Prohibition) Act was introduced, making the keeping of animals 'solely or primarily for slaughter for the value of their fur,'<sup>11</sup> illegal. The ban came into force in January 2003 and the UK was the first country in the world to ban fur farming. At the time the only animal used in fur farming in the UK was mink, which required a licence. Similar bans

were implemented in Scotland<sup>12</sup> and Northern Ireland.<sup>13</sup> Whilst the enterprise of fur farming has been banned, the sale of goods which contain fur are currently not and the value of fur imported to the UK was approximately £55.6 million in 2016.<sup>14</sup>

Recent times have seen Parliament debating the issue, in light of a GovPoll in February 2018 which showed that 69% of the public would support a ban of fur trade and an e-petition receiving over 100,000 signatures.<sup>15</sup> The debate was positive, with a conclusion that it was time for the Government to support the ban of the sale of animal fur in the UK. In May 2018, 50 veterinarians wrote to Michael Gove expressing their concerns of animal welfare at fur farms outside of the UK, asking for a ban on all imports of fur, arguing 'that their

---

<sup>10</sup> Claire Bass: HSI, Oral evidence submitted to Environment, Food and Rural Affairs Committee: Fur Trade in the UK HC 823 (7<sup>th</sup> March 2018), Q42. Accessed via <http://data.parliament.uk/writtenevidence/committeeevidence.svc/evidencedocument/environment-food-and-rural-affairs-committee/fur-trade-in-the-uk/oral/80118.html> Last cited 5.10.18

<sup>11</sup> S1(1) Fur Farming (Prohibition) Act 2000

<sup>12</sup> Fur Farming (Prohibition) (Scotland) Act 2002

<sup>13</sup> Fur Farming (Prohibition) (Northern Ireland) Order 2002

<sup>14</sup> Humane Society International, *Political Briefing Paper One: The Case for a Ban on the UK Fur Trade 2018*, 4. Accessed via <https://www.furfreebritain.uk/resources/HSI-Political-Briefing-One-The-case-for-a-ban-on-the-UK-fur-trade.pdf> Last cited 13.09.18

<sup>15</sup> Petitions: UK Government and Parliament, *Ban the sale of animal fur in the UK* (2018) <https://petition.parliament.uk/petitions/200888> Last cited 27.06.19

purchase makes us party to the cruelty.’<sup>16</sup> It was also stated in the June 2018 Parliamentary debate that, ‘We do not want fur farming on our own doorstep but are currently not strong enough to end our complicity in what can only be described as animal suffering.’<sup>17</sup>

It is clear that the majority of the UK oppose the fur trade industry, but consumers are facing a bigger challenge than known imports. In February 2018 DEFRA launched an inquiry and published a report into cases of real fur being sold as fake fur, as a result of a joint investigation by HSI and Sky News in 2017. At the start of their investigation they found retailers House of Fraser and Misguided were selling real fur as fake fur, finding fur from rabbit, racoon and mink in some of their products. Later investigations found that other retailers such as TK Maxx, Amazon, BooHoo and Kurt Geiger were also selling real fur, even when they were running no-fur policies.<sup>18</sup>

In most cases, these retailers were not intentionally selling real fur and DEFRA’s committee investigation highlighted the issues with labelling of textile products in the EU under the Textile Labelling Regulation of 2011.<sup>19</sup> HSI highlighted in their evidence to DEFRA that labelling of animal products in textiles is inadequate and unclear as to what a garment contains. The 2011 Regulation requires that textiles containing fur carry the wording “contains non-textile parts of animal origin,”<sup>20</sup> which applies to various products, including leather and bone, but does not identify specific animal parts, such as fur. Further, products which comprise of less than 80% of weight of textile fibres fall outside of the Regulation and do not require labelling. This means that textiles which contain more than 20% fur, including shoes, handbags and accessories, can fall outside its scope and consumers may not know that what they are buying contains fur. More absurdly, this also means that items such as full-length fur coats fall

outside of the Regulation, because it is not considered a textile item.

The Regulation’s minimal requirements mean that consumers are not fully aware of what they are buying and is not fit for purpose. Many animal welfare charities have called for changes to the current labelling scheme. In their written evidence, Four Paws UK stated that the requirements for labelling should include:

- ‘the species from which the fur derives (both the common and scientific name)
- the country of origin of the fur (where the animal was bred, hunted and killed)
- how the animal was reared and killed (whether the animal was caught by trapping or reared in a cage with a wire floor.’<sup>21</sup>

This will clearly help consumers know what kind of product they are buying and the conditions in which the animal was reared and killed. It is not dissimilar to the Truth in Fur Labelling Act 2010 in the US. The Minister for DEFRA, however, has made clear that there will be no plans to change labelling requirements and challenge the Regulation whilst the UK is still a Member State of the EU.<sup>22</sup> Once we leave the EU this issue may be more easily resolved, without the influence of the 2011 Regulation, but it may not be for some time that legislation is provided to combat this issue.

#### Current EU Legislation

One of the largest producers of factory farmed fur is the EU.<sup>23</sup> They have provided some legislation on the matter previously, with Regulation (EC) No 1523/2007 banning the ‘placing on the market and the import to, or export from, the Community of cat and dog fur, and products containing such fur.’ The ideal behind this ban

<sup>16</sup> Letter accessed via <http://www.hsi.org/assets/pdfs/letter-verts-experts-fur.pdf> Last cited 13.09.18

<sup>17</sup> Stated by Daniel Zeichner, HC Deb 4<sup>th</sup> June 2018, vol 642, col 1WH

<sup>18</sup> House of Commons: Environment, Food and Rural Affairs Committee, *Fur trade in the UK*, (22nd July 2018) Seventh Report of Session 2017-19, 6

<sup>19</sup> Regulation 1007/2011

<sup>20</sup> Article 12

<sup>21</sup> Four Paws UK, Written evidence submitted to Environment, Food and Rural Affairs Committee (FUR0041), para 4.

<sup>22</sup> House of Commons: Environment, Food and Rural Affairs Committee, *Fur trade in the UK*, (22nd July 2018) Seventh Report of Session 2017-19, 11

<sup>23</sup> Heather Prickett and Stephen Harris, *The Case Against Fur Factory Farming: A Scientific Review of Animal Welfare Standards and ‘Welfare’*, A Report for Respect for Animals (2015) 11

was that cats and dogs are considered to be pets and is not acceptable to make items with their fur. A similar Regulation has been introduced banning trade in seal products in the EU,<sup>24</sup> both of production and imports. This is a step towards a ban in the EU, but with many other animals, particularly mink, being bred for their pelt, it does little to eradicate the issue. Further, the EU has prohibited the use of leghold traps in the Community and any imported pelts and goods of animals which originate in countries which use trapping methods.<sup>25</sup> This does not, however, prohibit the imports of furs caught by trapping from countries which meet internationally agreed humane trapping standards.

...at the moment, it will be difficult to impose a ban on the sale of fur in the UK, especially since the majority of fur sold here is imported from the EU and EFTA area.

Although the EU allows fur farming to continue, it does provide some legislation which relates to welfare standards on farms, including fur farms. Directive 98/58/EC requires Member States to make provisions that owners or keepers of animals kept for farming purposes ensure that animals are 'not caused any unnecessary pain, suffering or injury.'<sup>26</sup> The conditions in which they are kept should have regard to their species and domestication,<sup>27</sup> with specific provisions to their freedom of movement, accommodation, feed and water and breeding procedures,<sup>28</sup> but this is general to all animals kept for farming, not just for fur, and there is no specific EU legislation that relates solely to fur farming.

Lastly, the EU legislates for the killing of animals,<sup>29</sup> but, again, Regulation 1099/2009 is not specific to animals

farmed for their fur and includes the production of food, wool and other products. It states that the killing of animals for fur should be carried out by and under the direct supervision of a person holding a certificate of competence.<sup>30</sup> Article 3 provides that animals should 'be spared any avoidable pain, distress or suffering during their killing and related operation.' This Regulation provides specific requirements for the variety of methods described above, with the aim of provisions in Article 3. Specific Guidance for the electrocution of foxes and the carbon dioxide euthanasia of mink,<sup>31</sup> has been provided by the European fur sector. It is appreciated that the sector is trying to maintain some consistency of the killing of these animals to develop best practice for their welfare, but providing guidance does not validate the scale of killing that happens annually, nor the unnecessary of farming these animals at all. The paramount interest of fur farms will always be for their profits; animal welfare, no matter how widely claimed to be of importance, will be secondary to that.

Can we Ban Fur Imports and Sales Whilst a Member State?

The main issue for the UK is that whilst we are still a Member State of the EU it is not simple to ban imports and the trade of fur, due to Free Movement of Goods. Article 34 of the Treaty of the Functioning of the European Union prohibits quantitative restrictions on imports between Member States and measures having equivalent effect and Article 35 similarly relates to exports. This means that, at the moment, it will be difficult to impose a ban on the sale of fur in the UK, especially since the majority of fur sold here is imported from the EU and EFTA area. Further, measures having equivalent effect go beyond outright bans, and prohibits any rules which will hinder, directly or indirectly, actually or potentially, trade.<sup>32</sup> This includes origin marking requirements,<sup>33</sup> as they may impose burdens on importers (who may have difficulty

<sup>24</sup> Regulation (EC) No 1007/2009

<sup>25</sup> Council Regulation (EEC) No 3254/91

<sup>26</sup> Article 3

<sup>27</sup> Article 4

<sup>28</sup> Directive 98/58/EC Annex

<sup>29</sup> Council Regulation (EC) No 1099/2009

<sup>30</sup> Article 7

<sup>31</sup> For more information and links, please visit: <https://www.fureurope.eu/fur-policies/legislation/animal-welfare/>

<sup>32</sup> Dassonville (case8/74) [1974] ECR 837

<sup>33</sup> Commission v UK (Origin Marking) (Case 207/83) [1985] ECR 1201

complying with it), content restrictions<sup>34</sup> and authorisation/certification requirements.<sup>35</sup> The latter includes inspections to ensure that goods satisfy national standards and are authorised for sale prior to them being offered to consumers.

On the face of it, it seems that the UK will struggle to impose an outright ban on fur imports and also to inspect items which claim to be fake fur. Further, changing labelling to state the origin of the product, as was suggested by Four Paws UK amongst other labelling requirements, will cause issues for Article 34. The Government have acknowledged, however, that this does not preclude prohibitions under Article 36, under which we could argue prohibition/restrictions on the ground of the protection of public morality, so long as it does not constitute a means of arbitrary discrimination or disguised restriction on trade. As discussed, there is significant favour in the UK of banning imports of fur and it seems that an argument on the basis of public morality is justified. This argument has been used in a World Trade Organisation (WTO) case, which will be discussed in more detail below. There is no EU case precedent for the application of public morality in the trade of cruel animal products, but it seems that the UK will have a strong argument. As the UK does not have a domestic production of fur, a ban cannot be viewed as disguised discrimination or protection of trade for commercial reasons. We will have to argue that the need to protect public morality is strong and sustained, and as there have been many petitions signed and polls taken recently, this should not be too difficult to demonstrate.

If the UK were to make the step toward banning sales of fur products, successfully arguing this exemption, it could lead to other Member States being able to follow suit and implement similar bans in their own country. It may be easier for us to make this step post-Brexit, without facing challenges from other Members States whose trade may suffer as a result, but implementing the ban prior to leaving could have a positive effect for animal welfare across the community and be a

‘welcome gift to our friends in Europe.’<sup>36</sup> It is also a consideration for the UK if we do remain in the Single Market after we exit the EU, whereby we may still be subjected to Free Movement of Goods.

As the UK does not have a domestic production of fur, a ban cannot be viewed as disguised discrimination or protection of trade for commercial reasons.

If we were to be unsuccessful with a holistic ban on the import and sale of fur goods, there is another option the Government, and other EU countries, can consider, to address the issue of the selling of fur products claimed to be fake fur. As stated above, Article 34 also applies to the labelling and inspection of imports within the EU, which means the UK may face issues when imposing the requirements for labels suggested by Four Paws UK or if they want to inspect goods to determine if they contain real fur before allowing them to be offered to consumers. Under the principles of *Cassis de Dijon* the UK could argue a mandatory requirement with the defence of consumer protection. Often, this defence is rejected due to arguments that national legislation goes beyond what was ‘necessary’ to protect consumers and it may be difficult to argue in favour of a fur sale ban. This was the issue with *Estee Lauder v Lancaster*, in which the ECJ rejected claims of consumer protection and stated that ‘it is necessary to take into account the presumed expectations of an average consumer who is reasonably well informed and reasonably observant and circumspect,’<sup>37</sup> when deciding if a particular description of the goods is misleading. Due to the current issues, however, with consumers buying real fur they thought was fake, the UK may be able to argue that better labelling and inspections are necessary to protect the consumer. Further, during evidence taken by DEFRA, Claire Bass, Executive Director for HSI in the UK, highlighted that retailers and consumers found it difficult to tell the

<sup>34</sup> *Cassis de Dijon* (Case 120/78) [1979] ECR 649

<sup>35</sup> *Dynamic Medien v Avides Media* (Case C – 244/06) [2008] ECR I-505

<sup>36</sup> Stated by Daniel Zeichner, HC Deb 4<sup>th</sup> June 2018, vol 642, col 7WH

<sup>37</sup> *Estee Lauder Cosmetics v Lancaster* (Case C-220/98) [2000] ECR I-117, para 27

different between real fur and fake fur. For example, close to 50% of people use cheap price as an indicator of fake fur, thinking that because an item is cheap it must be fake; similarly, some believe that because an item has been dyed an unnatural colour, such as pink, it must be fake fur.<sup>38</sup> It is unreasonable to argue that consumers should be well informed when deciding on a real or fake fur product, when the indications they use are unreliable.

There is no previous EU case law specifically relating to animal products in textiles which we can use to argue a mandatory requirement, but there are some similar cases which have arisen in the past. In *Commission v United Kingdom*,<sup>39</sup> it was decided the UK failed to fulfil its Article 34 (then Article 30 EEC) duties by requiring an indication of origin on goods sold, including textile goods; the argument of providing consumers with adequate information to make decisions on what they are buying was rejected. This case also pointed to a survey conducted in England, that consumers judge the quality of a product due to the country in which it is made. This argument was rejected, stating that this may prompt consumers to favour domestic goods rather than imports. Again, this argument does not stand for fur trade, as there is no domestic farming industry which can be favoured by consumers and thus is not disguised discrimination. Whilst origin marking has failed for the UK previously, the point here is not for consumers to distinguish between domestic and international goods, but to know the welfare standards of the fur they are buying, partly due to the origin of the product. There does seem to be a strong argument, but successful mandatory requirements based on consumer protection are not common.

It was highlighted in the fur trade Parliamentary debate that a WTO case shows that a ban may be possible. This

case involved action brought by Canada and Norway against the EU, when in 2010 they banned the trade of seal products in the EU, arguing it was necessary to protect public morals.<sup>40</sup> Seals are killed for their skins and fur to be used in clothing and sold for other uses. The WTO have similar rules to the EU on restricting trade, and Canada and Norway claimed the ban was more than necessary to satisfy promoting public morals.<sup>41</sup> This ban, however, was allowed by the WTO as a proportionate measure to protect public morals,<sup>42</sup> with an amendment in 2015 to allow for seal products obtained from hunting by Inuit or other indigenous communities. The UK Government has since a move to bring this legislation into domestic law, preparing for our exit from the EU, with the Seal Products (Amendments) (EU Exit) Regulations 2018, banning imports and trade of seal products within the EU. If this has been argued successfully for seals, then it may, and surely should, extend to all animals killed for their fur, with the support of polls to show the necessity to protect public morals.<sup>43</sup>

## Conclusion

It does not seem as though the EU will legislate themselves for the prohibition of fur farming and selling fur products and even though they claim that animal welfare is an important objective for their policy, some have argued that continuing to allow fur farming and not provide specific legislation for it is a paradox.<sup>44</sup> When the UK leaves the EU it may be that we can impose a ban on the import and sale of fur products, depending on our trade deal. If so, then the UK will be taking a stand against this industry and advancing our animal welfare values even further. The Government have recently confirmed a ban on ivory sales, to help protect elephants who are hunted for

<sup>38</sup> Claire Bass: HSI, Oral evidence submitted to Environment, Food and Rural Affairs Committee: Fur Trade in the UK HC 823 (7<sup>th</sup> March 2018), Q42. Accessed via <http://data.parliament.uk/writtenevidence/committeeevidence.svc/evidencedocument/environment-food-and-rural-affairs-committee/fur-trade-in-the-uk/oral/80118.html> Last cited 5.10.18

<sup>39</sup> *Commission v United Kingdom* (Case C - 207/83) [1985] ECR 1201

<sup>40</sup> EC – Seal Products, WT/DS400 & 401/AB/R (adopted 18 June 2014)

<sup>41</sup> World Trade Organisation, General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade (GATT), Article XX (a)

<sup>42</sup> Stated by Daniel Zeichner, HC Deb 4<sup>th</sup> June 2018, vol 642, col 6WH – 7WH

<sup>43</sup> Iyan I.H. Ofor and Jan Walter, 'The Applicability of GATT Article XX(a) to Animal Welfare' (2017) 1:1 *The UK Journal of Animal Welfare* 10

<sup>44</sup> Sabine Brels, "'Anti-fur' Policy and the European Union Paradox: Towards a Ban on Fur Farming for Community Law Consistency' (2012/2013) *Autumn and Winter Journal of Animal Welfare Law* 18

their tusks,<sup>45</sup> and must seriously consider introducing a Bill to ban the sale of fur in the UK under similar measures.

There is already a worldwide movement to eradicate fur farming sales.<sup>46</sup> Countries outside of the EU have effectively prohibited the sale of fur or fur farming. For example, New Zealand bans the import of mink, which has effectively banned the farming of mink, and India banned imports of mink, fox and chinchilla fur in 2017. West Hollywood banned the sale of fur in 2011, being the first city in the world to do so, and San Francisco followed suit in 2018.<sup>47</sup> Countries which have traditionally been leading in fur farming are even moving away from the industry. Norway, one of the biggest European countries with strong fur farming industries, has decided to prohibit the farming and close all farms by 2025,<sup>48</sup> and will become the first Nordic country to do so. Further, many fashion labels have gone fur-free, such as Gucci, Hugo Boss and Ralph Lauren. We may be able to follow this movement and become the first European country to ban the sale of fur.

---

<sup>45</sup> Government confirms UK ban on ivory sales, 3<sup>rd</sup> April 2018 Accessed via <<https://www.gov.uk/government/news/government-confirms-uk-ban-on-ivory-sales>> Last cited 20.10.18

<sup>46</sup> Fur Free Alliance, Fur Bans. Accessed via <https://www.furfreealliance.com/fur-bans/> Last cited 27.09.18

<sup>47</sup> *Ibid*

<sup>48</sup> *Ibid*