

A NOTE REGARDING REGULATION BOOKLETS

Georgia Department of Natural Resources

Ideal regulation booklets should be short, simple, appealing and small enough to fit into a shirt pocket. They should also adequately set forth the wildlife regulations and applicable state laws, govern the taking of all hunted species and identify the protected ones. If there are special regulations for special areas or special species, these must also be included. The text should be complete to prevent confusion but concise to prevent boredom. They must be general enough to allow flexibility of biological imperatives but specific enough to stand up in court. Also certain special situations such as endangered species, field trials, taxidermists, local exceptions ought to be included. It would also be nice if directions to areas and....say, just how large is your shirt pocket.

MEETING ON THE HUMANE TRAP ISSUE

Southeast Wildlife Conference

**White Sulphur Springs, West Virginia
November 17-20, 1974**

WELCOMING STATEMENT

*James M. Ruckel
Assistant Chief in Charge of Game Management
Division of Wildlife Resources
State of West Virginia*

Good evening, ladies and gentlemen: It is nearly 9:00 p.m. and we're sorry that we are so late, but we were unavoidably detained in that elegant dining room.

Last year an anti-steel trap bill was introduced in the West Virginia Legislature. Duane Pursley served as our Wildlife Resources Division spokesman to the joint Senate and House Committee which was deciding the fate of that legislation.

While preparing his presentation, we found that we were somewhat ignorant of the status of humane trap research and the anti-trap movement. Consequently, Duane and I traveled to North Bay, Ontario, where we met with a number of people who have been involved in the humane trapping issue. We received an abundance of valuable information on this subject. Realizing the problems of disseminating this information, we felt that we should bring the experts to this panel meeting and let them enlighten you first hand.

The first speaker is Mr. Art Lalonde of the well-known and highly respected Ontario Trappers Association. This organization is the focal point of the wild fur industry in Canada, and its fur sales service has given invaluable assistance to our Division of Wildlife Resources.

FIRST SPEAKER

*Art Lalonde
Secretary-Treasurer
Ontario Trappers Association*

Thank you, Jim! Honorable sirs, ladies and gentlemen: I am pleased to be here tonight to speak to you in regard to trapping, as I know it in Canada. As Jim mentioned, I am an elected officer of the Ontario Trappers Association and a member of the Canadian Federation of Trappers. I serve in the official capacity of secretary-treasurer.

First, I bring you good wishes from Mr. Lloyd Cook, president of both the Ontario Trappers and the Canadian Federation of Trappers. It is with great regret that Lloyd, due to other commitments, could not be here to speak to you and to bring his broad knowledge of trapping in Canada.

To begin I would like to say a few words in regard to our association, the OTA, and give you a brief outline of its history. Some thirty years ago, a small group of 17 trappers with a great deal of foresight could see the need for trappers in the northern region of Ontario to unite and achieve certain goals. Basically these goals were (1) better prices for their fur; (2) a stronger voice in trapping programs; and (3) some governmental input which would lead all trappers to a better way of life. Their mission was greatly assisted by the Department of Lands and Forests in forming and eventually organizing a fur marketing board, and also in dividing up the province into trapping zones. This enabled the trapper to have a registered line that he could call his own, and he would be the sole trapper on that line. This produced many desirable results, both for the trapper, the department, and the animals sought.

First, the department was able to arrange a broader conservation program, better seasons, and more control of the number of animals trapped and recorded in each area. To the trapper, it provided a means of expressing their ideas on the subjects of seasons, quantity of animals of each species to be harvested, and transplanting programs. The animals were provided with population controls so that no species will come close to the endangered list, or so abundant that Mother Nature would have to see to their reduction through the dreaded diseases of rabies, tularemia, etc. With the close cooperation of the Ontario Trappers Association and the Department of Lands and Forests, now known as the Ministry of Natural Resources, the Ontario Trappers Association flourished under such dedicated men as Ralph Bice and Lloyd Cook to only mention a few, and men in the Lands and Forests like Jack Grew.

From those 17 men who formed the original nucleus to its present membership of over 8,000 it became apparent that the OTA, with its many successes, was being lauded by most of the other provinces. Help was sought by provinces, and the OTA immediately responded by sending delegates to help with the organization of trapping groups in each province. At the same time it became quite apparent that Canada required an organization to look out for all of the provinces, so in the year 1970 the Canadian Federation of Trappers was born and Mr. Lloyd Cook, our president, was chosen as its president.

The second subject I would like to touch on is humane trapping groups. The relationship between the Canadian Association for Humane Trapping and the Ontario Trappers Association has existed for nearly seven years; and although at one period of time, the feelings between the two groups became strained and tense, this relationship has been much better in recent years. The Canadian Association for Humane Trapping was first invited to attend a trappers convention in 1967 because we felt that trappers had nothing to hide. Our feelings have not changed over the years. We feel today, as we did then, that an experienced trapper is the best friend a conservationist ever had. The humane trapping groups did not necessarily agree with our views at that time, but it is evident that as time has passed and they have become more knowledgeable in our ways, they are agreeing with our views more than they ever had before. Many of our trappers were against the CAHT, but I would like to thank these dedicated people for making us aware of the need for some of us to improve our ways. They taught us that if we were to survive we must unite into a strong association, speaking with one loud voice rather than hundreds of small cries in the wilderness. More than this, our exposure to these people, and consequently their exposure to us, brought about some startling facts. The first was that they were humans also and they were dedicated to a belief, although it was not 100% correct. They were open-minded and exhibited a willingness to learn our side of the story. They were quick to grasp certain of our problems, willing to help us develop ways of solving them. But most important they came, they saw, they were willing to compromise. Without these lines of communication, we would still be at loggerheads. The OTA, and other trapping groups, have also met the not-so-dedicated

humane groups, those who would get on the band wagon for personal gain. I need not mention any names but most of us in this room are familiar with some of those that I am speaking of. These people are unscrupulous and do not have the fur bearing animals in mind whatsoever, but prey on the feelings of the uninformed layman by stirring up controversy and untruths for their personal benefit. Let us hope that we can weed out those people who are true friends of animals and let those others go on their way.

The next topic I have chosen is trap testing. For many years trappers have brought forth various reports regarding traps that were used in harvesting wild animals. In many cases these reports contradicted one another and therefore became extremely difficult to evaluate. It was decided, therefore, that an extensive trap research program be undertaken under the jurisdiction of the Ministry of Natural Resources with the leadership of a biologist attended by a qualified trapper, who is basically the only person that can properly set these various traps due to his knowledge of the animal habits and trapping.

From these various tests came the unavoidable conclusion that the so-called "killer" traps were not as effective in all cases, as many people would like us to believe. Certain problems became apparent from these tests. The killer traps did not fit all sets for certain species and many animals alluded and resisted the trigger. It further became apparent that if these killer traps were to be used, certain modifications would have to be made in order to make them effective. It was also apparent that of those killer traps tested, 53 in number, only 2 traps proved to be effective. They were the Conibear and the Cap-trap. A few words in regard to the Cap-trap. It is a trap which was invented by a trapper and is undergoing testing by the Federal Provincial Humane Trapping Committee, and it will probably not reach the market for another 7 to 9 months. Modifications were made to the existing Conibear and it was found that these modifications increased the killing power by as much as 30%. These modifications will be made on all new Conibears being sold and can also be made on the existing traps, with the use of a jig. Details in regard to the jig can be obtained from us or from CAHT members. Through all the trap testing, the use of the leghold trap in conjunction with the slide lock and the drowning set prove to be one of the most effective and humane traps of all.

May I take the liberty at this time to say a few words in regard to trapper education. It is my honest belief that more humane work can be done by teaching and educating the new and unknowledgeable trapper, as well as many of our experienced trappers, the best way of humanely taking each of these species. It has been found that 95% of all our problems arising from inhumaneness in taking furbearing animals were caused by the inexperienced trapper. The Ontario Trappers Association has for the last 12 years, in conjunction with the Ministry of Natural Resources, offered to the trappers in each area a course in trapping and the teachers have always been of a high caliber and experienced.

At the present time the Ministry of Natural Resources of Ontario has put forward some \$20,000 to assist in the educating of not only our trappers but our conservation personnel as well. The education of trappers has proven to be beneficial in the past. Not only do the trappers produce more furs but furs of higher quality. These furs are better handled, and therefore, they command higher prices. The OTA publishes a magazine which is sent to each of our members and contributes greatly to their education. I have copies of the latest issue with me tonight so feel free to pick one up on your way out. Hopefully, the OTA's next education project will be the production of a film showing the best and most humane methods of taking each of our furbearing species. This film will be shown to all trappers from coast to coast. A manual which will explain the trap sets in our film will be given to each trapper so that he will be able to follow the program easily.

I would like at this time, to thank Duane for his invitation to this meeting. I have enjoyed myself immensely, and have again, as on every occasion when I have met with people of your caliber, learned a great deal. If we can be of any assistance, please let us know. Thank you very much.

Thank you very much, Art. In recent years many sportsmen and wildlife officials have become antagonistic toward organizations and individuals who exposed humaneness. Many of these individuals and groups exhibit their credentials as conservationists by proclaiming all that they oppose. It is very rewarding and certainly refreshing to meet two individuals who are humanists and who represent a humane organization that is for something, an organization that is helping in a very positive manner to secure the goals of humaneness in trapping. One of these is Mrs. Dan Manthorpe, Executive Secretary of the Canadian Association for Humane Trapping and the other is Mr. Neal Jotham, Vice President of that same organization. Neal and Dan, you're on stage.

SECOND SPEAKER

*Neal Jotham, Vice President
Canadian Association for Humane Trapping*

Thank you very much, Jim! Ladies and gentlemen: I don't know that I'm speaking for all animal welfare groups throughout the world, but it is a very great honor that you have asked us to come down here and discuss with you some of the work that we've been involved in pertaining to the various issues surrounding trapping.

I would like, at least Dan and I as a team, would like to explain who we are, what we believe, and what we try to do. Perhaps later on there will be questions, etc. but at any rate, let me proceed. Actually the movement concerning leghold trapping, I think, started in the United States about 1930 with a group called the Anti-Steel Trap League. Maybe some of you know it, I don't know. At any rate, it had certain success, I suppose, in a very limited way and it generated certain activity up into Canada and in the early 40's there was an organization formed that was known as the Association for Protection of furbearing animals. And they, by and large, were against trapping. But in 1953 there were a number of people who became concerned and found that this simply was getting nowhere. That in fact trapping went on, that in fact for whatever reasons that trapping was important, and in Canada, perhaps unlike the United States, trapping had played an even more important role in the livelihood of many people. And as a result the organization decided that they would change their name and apply for a Federal Charter. They then became known as the Canadian Association for Humane Trapping, and that's a very important point. Because after that we suddenly stood for something which was positive. Doors were opened to government and trapping fraternities which allowed us to establish certain positive programs. We are a Federally Chartered, charitable, non-profit organization. We are in fact a corporation and the one basic aim of the Canadian Association for Humane Trapping is to foster the lessening and eventual elimination of the suffering imposed upon wild animals by the device known as the steel leg-hold trap or which may be imposed by any other device for the taking of wild animals. Now as I said we are a corporation, therefore, it makes us a business except that we are a charitable organization and non-profit. But if we look at it from a business point of view which we did, we said what is our problem, how do we solve it, what are the avenues that we can explore to solve this problem? Well, early in the late 50's we found that there were traps from England that were supposedly humane. We imported these traps, gave them away, sold them at cost, whatever. Some traps from the United States that were reported to be humane, we imported those, gave them to trappers and wildlife officers for testing, simply because we were told by various sources that they were humane or more humane. We made presentations to government, pleaded our case, but it wasn't enough. We were still getting nowhere as far as we were concerned. In 1967, I think Art made reference to it, we found ourselves with a different board of directors, a younger group, perhaps a little more concerned with the total ecology. We again sat down and looked at our problems, and asked ourselves what are the real issues and how can we solve them from a business point of view? We established what we believed to be very positive programs which would hopefully lead to solutions to the problem.

After testing had been done by various trappers throughout Canada, we established a Conibear trap exchange program. We believed it to be a more humane device than was presently being used for certain species. We immediately wrote to the various wildlife officers and governments throughout Canada and asked them to participate in this program. Essentially what it was is that we said for every leg-hold trap (one per trapper) we will exchange (free of charge) a Conibear trap, a 330, 220, or 110. And we asked the wildlife officers involved to participate in this exchange and as a result over the years we contributed some \$40,000 to this particular program. It had, we felt, a two-fold effect. It suggested to the trapper at the time, and I'm talking about 1963, that there is an organization that is doing something positive. They're not just screaming out in the blue. We felt what we were doing was telling the trapper that here is a humane trap and we were saying to him, "here is another way." It is, in a way, creating a humane concept. We also established a trapper-inventor assistance program, and by the way, we have contributed quite a number of dollars to Frank Conibear in his efforts to perfect his trap. We have helped a number of other trappers in Canada, who have had devices, which may or may not, or which seemed, at the time, to be promising from a humane point of view. I think probably the most important program that we have established was the research program. Now, it is all very well that animal welfare groups can write letters to government forever and ever, shout and holler, say please do something about it. We found that government reply basically was well if you can find a humane trap, we will use it, but unfortunately, we don't have such a device or devices, so we can't really do anything about it. Well, in the absence of any research, and I say systematic research into the development of humane devices, we felt that we had better do something about that. So, in 1968 we formed the Humane Trap Development Committee which was an amalgamation of the organization known as Canadian Federation of Humane Societies, a sister group which I referred to earlier, the Association for Protection of Furbearing Animals, who operate only in western Canada, ourselves, and the Canadian Association for Humane Trapping. The idea was to bring whatever scientific assistance we could muster to the solving or designing of traps which could take animals efficiently and humanely. We set the program up. Well, what we did we said we have a four-part situation and we would like to refer to them as four little boxes.

First of all, we said we must understand the trap as a mechanism, we must understand the animal as a mechanism, we must understand the inter-relationship between the trap and the trapper, and the inter-relationship between the animal and the trap. So we were very fortunate in being able to set up the engineering aspect of trap research and development at the University of McMaster in Hamilton, Ontario, and the biological and zoological aspects of trapping at the University of Guelph, Ontario. We required funds to do this. We asked government to contribute, and we asked individuals to contribute, anyone who had any interest at all in this issue, we asked them to contribute to this particular program. Over a few years, we gathered \$60,000. About \$40,000 was contributed by animal welfare groups and individuals. We had \$10,000 contributed by the Hudson Bay Company. We had \$1,500 contributed by the Fur Conservation Institute of America, and we had about \$5,000 contributed by the various Canadian governments.

As a result of that particular program, we were able to make a presentation to the Woodstream Corporation, which added to their knowledge about certain aspects of traps that they were producing. We were very fortunate to get their cooperation in our endeavors, and we feel certain that they are ready to cooperate in producing traps which are acceptable to trappers and to animal welfare groups as well.

The Humane Trap Development Committee, at this particular point, is in a sense winding up its work, simply because in Canada there has been formed the Federal Provincial Committee on Humane Trapping which you will hear about. One thing I would like to say is in all of our programs, in all of our efforts in Canada, as long as I've been involved with the organization, that's been some 7-8 years now, we have always promoted the importance of strong trapper associations. It is through groups such as you've heard, The Ontario Trappers Association, from Art Lalonde and Lloyd Cook,

that new trapping techniques can be discussed and promoted, and devices which perhaps some of us thought were inhumane when properly used, can be humane. And I think that, as I say, through our knowledge, because of people like Art and Lloyd, and the trappers associations throughout Canada, that we know of the importance of a strong trapping fraternity and we have always, hopefully, we have always managed to promote this attitude. Again, as I wind up, I could go on about our humane trap program, that is the research program, results of the studies we have done, are already being made available to the new government committee and we hope that much of the work that we have already done is going to be very beneficial to the new committee. Now I have talked to you about some of our background, our history, who we are, how we are financed, I don't know if I touched on that. We are simply financed on memberships, donations, requests, and we have had a number of other programs. And now if I may, I would like to ask Dan Manthorpe, my colleague to talk to you about other aspects of our work. Thank you.

THIRD SPEAKER

*Ms. Dan Manthorpe, Secretary-Treasurer
Canadian Association for Humane Trapping*

It is a fairly well-known fact that governments need to be well-prodded before embarking upon new activities. It is a tragic irony that unless some show of power is made, in terms of either top level string-pulling or strong public reaction, government ears do not listen with great enthusiasm to requests or demands for change. So it was with trapping, there are many aspects of trapping which most of us find at least unpleasant, but these aspects are of prime concern to a few people working for better treatment of animals. CAHT one such group as you know, for years wrote briefs to governments, arranged private meetings, wrote letters, set up committees, etc., and all of these proved frustratingly powerless.

Finally then, and reluctantly, CAHT in 1972 decided that some kind of a publicity campaign was necessary in order to get governments to give monetary support to the development of humane trapping techniques. Because we literally didn't have enough. The Humane Trap Development Committee was running on a shoestring, on volunteer consultants, etc. It was not enough. I say, reluctantly, because the outcome of such a campaign in terms of government action was predictable. That is, the establishment of an exploratory committee, and it was an exhausting, unpleasant, time-consuming and an utterly unnecessary thing to engage in. Could have been unnecessary had real channels of communication been open between government and humane groups at that time. During the CAHT Campaign we at all times tried to keep our publicity responsible. For example, at no time did we speak on radio or TV without strong suggestions that trappers and government be allowed equal time. We knew we would have problems and we did. Problems with other groups who could actually be called anti-trapping and who wanted to work toward humane trapping but who never intended to stop at that. One could never quite understand the rationale of such groups. The money injected into the fur industry (and by finding alternative methods of trapping we're doing just that) could only in the long run tend to strengthen it. And once trapping can be proven to be humane, any objections to it can only come from a very small minority of the total population.

The CAHT has always realized that its activities would act as a spur to the formation of strong trappers groups and to a critical appraisal of the whole trapping issue. Activities, like this meeting here tonight, are helping to upgrade standards in terms of humaneness, which is our particular concern. As soon as we heard whisper of planned formation of some kind of government committee, we formally stopped major publicity activities. In fact, the committee's main objective so coincided with our own that we felt the most constructive thing to do in order to help was to actively discourage publicity on the issue. Bear in mind that we aren't the only humane group in Canada. Some didn't and some still don't agree with us here. However, government activities

function only as long as government funding is secure, and if the present commitment fails at any point in the future it just may be that we will be in the grim position of having to go through with a similar campaign again. Although if government funding for upgrading trapping did cease, the increasingly strong trappers groups may be able to put on the pressure and leave us out of it. We sincerely hope that this would be the case. So what are we doing now that the Federal Provincial Committee for Humane Trapping is in action? Well, however much we may want to go out of business, we still feel that it is purely vital for us to maintain a watchdog role, that there should be spokesmen for the animals within the whole picture. We can't quit until we are satisfied that their welfare has been served. Thus, CAHT is now operating in basically two areas.

Firstly, we are extending our own education and range of learning and encouraging our membership to do likewise. We are arranging a series of seminars in Toronto, so that one section of the city based part of our membership (and we do have some vociferous rural support) has the opportunity to make fact as well as emotion the basis for any conclusions regarding what is essentially a part of someone else's way of life. Incidentally, Mr. Lloyd Cook, President of the OTA, will be taking the first seminar during the season on December 12. If this scheme arouses enough interest within our membership we may well extend it to other parts of Canada. And our board of directors now includes a wildlife biologist, a veterinarian (one of the foremost experts in animal euthanasia in the country) a couple of lawyers and a statistics expert, all of whom can contribute in many valuable ways. The other broad arm of our work is that we are available as far as possible to help anyone who is willing to work toward humane trapping including the Federal Provincial Committee for Humane Trapping, trappers groups, and Canadian Governments generally. The work of the Federal Provincial Committee should be over in at least 5 years, and during that time there is an incredible amount of basic ground work to be done. Trappers groups in all provinces or possibly on a national scale have to become really strong in order to be able to help cope with dissemination of ideas and techniques expected from the Committee. Some Canadian Provincial Governments have to instigate what may well amount to whole new systems of licensing, recording, and administration. Trappers have to be encouraged to use different techniques and when you consider the vast distances both geographically and in terms of philosophical outlook which make up the Canadian trapping scene, one catches an awesome glimpse of the tremendous undertaking. As we are trying to be of assistance here and just two examples will probably illustrate the kinds of things we are trying to do without any lengthy explanation.

Firstly, in early December, two directors, Neal Jotham and our wildlife biologist will be flying to Manitoba at the invitation of the Manitoba Government. They will be learning by visiting native-run trap lines, etc. and helping too by bringing some of the HTD experience to the Manitoba test work. CAHT is flying out to conduct immediate autopsies on the animals used in the live-testing and to assist in setting up these tests.

The second example, we have produced an instruction sheet on how to modify existing Conibear traps which won't be pertinent to many states of the U.S. (but remember we are a Canadian group) something a trapper can do easily and which will create a more efficient and safe tool for him and a more humane death for the animal. I don't know how our friends at Woodstream view this, but I am sure that progressive thinking on traps will lead them to give their whole-hearted approval. The conclusions on the modifications herein were largely a result of mechanical and field testing work done by the Ontario Trappers Association and the Ontario Ministry of Natural Resources (as has been said before) and was substantiated by mechanical work already done by HTDC. We knew that OTA didn't really have the manpower available to undertake the whole thing although we got a tremendous amount of support and help from Mr. Cook. We knew some Ministry Personnel who were keen to have this information made available to trappers. But government budgeting systems being what they are, it wasn't immediately possible. So the obvious thing was for us to do it and make it available to everybody. And also getting, as Art mentioned, the jigs made up which we

could send out on loan to government and trappers associations where they could be passed around on request. The two projects which I have just outlined served to illustrate too perhaps the most important thing I have to say this evening.

In the past in Canada, except in periods of uneasy truce which were productive in their own way, the whole trapping scene tended to be viewed in conflicting terms of ideology which meant of course that any inter-personal or inter-group communications tended to be on the nastiest level. I think you know something of what I'm talking about. In such a situation it is frighteningly easy for all of us to forget that basically we are dealing with other people — people who have children like oneself — who have to eat like oneself — and all the rest. People aren't ideologies, they're just people. When CAHT, our government, the OTA, and the other associations really started to talk to each other, and that took quite a lot of initial power and hard work too, and really listened to each other, we found this out, and it came as rather a shock to a lot of us, I suspect.

I could say lots of nice things about the people represented by Art and John, and about the two gentlemen themselves, but it is pretty evident that we think quite highly of their particular contributions. We wouldn't be human if we didn't disagree in some areas, but in the same way, we wouldn't be human if we couldn't agree in some areas, too. In this case we all happen to want the humanest of trapping. Of course, we know OTA wants better fur handling, etc., governments want more revenue, more economic stability, so we all agree that we want humane treatment for the animals, too. And also there is the basic and important fact that the more you learn, the more you understand about other people's problems. And while you are learning not only about the problems, but also why the person approaches them as he or she does, it is impossible not to become more tolerant of their own particular position. And so in Canada at this moment we do have three main groups who are committed to making this general upsurge of interest in trapping techniques produce results. Not on an official paper basis only, but because within government, humane societies, and trappers groups, we have individuals committed on a personal level, and I really think that this, in the long run, is where it all counts.

Thank you very much, Dan and Neal. As Neal mentioned in 1973 the Federal Provincial and territorial wildlife managers in Canada established a Federal Provincial Committee on Humane Trapping. The gentleman who was appointed as chairman of this committee was and is the director of the Commercial Fish and Fur Branch of the Ontario Ministry of Natural Resources. After you have had the opportunity to view his distinguished countenance, hear his eloquent presentation, you will understand why our next speaker was chosen for these offices. I am very proud to present Mr. John Brubacher.

FOURTH SPEAKER

*Mr. John Brubacher, Chairman
Federal-Provincial Committee on Humane Trapping*

Ladies and gentlemen, if only I could live up to what the chairman just now said. The night is moving along and there has been much said by the earlier speakers, Art representing the Trappers in Ontario, our last two able speakers representing the CAHT, and my position is one of speaking for government.

I am relatively a newcomer having spent some 20 years in fishery and only recently moved into the wildlife area. However, there was some reorganization, as governments reorganize occasionally, in the Province of Ontario over the last 3-4 years. The head of our program had a new executive director, now a deputy minister, who began to say to me "perhaps we should get to know what these people are talking about." And I agreed with him. We had a number of meetings. When we first began, we were pretty well polar in position. And sometimes we didn't quite, but we were nearly spitting at each other. We didn't really understand, or didn't want to understand what they were saying perhaps. And, of course, we felt that they didn't understand our objectives. But a sort

of new approach to things occurred in which we began to look to see where our objectives actually coincided and to stop looking at the areas in which there was some disagreement. And as already suggested by the last speaker, I think it was when we began to look to see where we had mutual concerns, we began to understand each other a little better, we found that the areas in which we differed were so relatively small and the areas in which we relatively agreed were so large that we have come to work very well together. We don't always agree yet but we certainly agree enough that we can work together. As a result, interestingly enough, I am not going to speak about what the Province of Ontario has done. Other speakers have alluded to it.

The Province had an important trapping industry for a number of years, well ever since the French and British first came to Canada — the British by way of Hudson Bay and the French by way of St. Lawrence River Valley.

But I don't intend to talk about the management of the furbearers in Ontario nor the trapping programs, I intend to skip right down to a year ago last spring when I attended, with my deputy minister, a series of meetings in Winnipeg. We were supposed to be discussing fisheries management and mercury pollution. During lunch hour we began to talk about humane trapping, and the deputy ministers from the western provinces and Ontario began to say to each other, if we all work together, maybe we could really do something effective. The subject was therefore put on the agenda of the Federal Provincial Wildlife Conference which has met annually for 38 years. It is the government of Canada, the people concerned with wildlife there, as well as each of the ten provinces and the two territories. The subject of humane trapping appeared on the agenda a year ago last July. Following a resolution, there was a special ad hoc committee meeting from that conference in Winnipeg a year ago last September, that was September 1973, and that committee appointed five members who were given the name of the Canadian Federal Provincial Committee for Humane Trapping. One of our members is from the Yellowknife, Northwest Territories, another from Edmonton, Alberta, one from Toronto, Ontario, one from the Government of Canada in Ottawa, and one from the Government of Quebec in Quebec City. We five had a little get-together, and because I am not as good a speaker as the chairman mentioned, I became chairman of the committee. These are some of the duties that we were assigned. We were directed within broad guidelines to establish long and short term objectives, prepare budgets, hire a coordinator, and by the way, sell that budget to each of the 14 jurisdictions (10 provinces, two territories, and two departments of Federal Government) and not only to sell it to them and have them agree to it, but agree to support our program. Then we were to proceed with the work of establishing engineering and biological criteria for traps and humane traps and undertake them for adequate field testing and then eventually, make recommendations to provinces. (I'm jumping a little bit ahead, we assumed and our assumption has proven correct — that none of the provinces disagreed with us that the objective of the fur industry in each of the provinces, the objectives of government with respect to the fur industry, was essentially to provide for continuing optimum, economical and social benefits to the utilization of the furbearer resources.) Continuing means of course that you think of the future as well as the present. And optimum, not maximum. Now the long term goal of our committee, within those goals or objectives of each of the provinces, was to within a maximum of five years, if possible, to be able to recommend to provinces traps and trapping techniques for all of the furbearers which will, insofar as the state of science of the art will allow, provide the greatest humaneness in holding or killing furbearers. And to maintain throughout the program communication with governments, interested persons or groups, and with the news media. We also have an objective of being able to communicate with people generally, with respect to the position of trapping, as a way of life, and as a means of livelihood, for in excess of 50,000 Canadians.

So, since its inauguration a year ago, our committee has embarked on this task. We have a five-year program which is subscribed to by the provinces. Our budget this year ran about \$90,000 and should run to \$110,000 next year, and continue at a rel-

atively high level, averaging out to about \$110,000 per year for five years. It doesn't necessarily need to end at the end of five years. We might be a little naive if we expected that we could achieve perfection at the end of five years, but at least for the time being, we are dealing with a five-year program and at the end of three years we will probably have a hard look at it. We have a coordinator who is selected because he is a businessman and we think rather astute. He is learning, I hope rapidly, many things about trapping, trappers, and furbearers. We are about, I think, to enter into a contract with persons skilled in the sciences of biology and veterinary science for testing traps, to see how they meet certain standards of humaneness and the field testing, of course, will come thereafter. We have made arrangements for the manufacture of prototypes. We have also made arrangements for a service to assist, well not to assist so much as to guide, inventors who may have ideas worth looking at. We don't expect to come up with anything perfect, but in my estimation, there may well be a few devices which will show for certain species some improvements over what presently exists.

I think that is about all I have to say. I will be glad to answer any questions that I can.

John, you were impressive as always. As I mentioned in the prefacing remarks, the speakers tonight represent many facets of this controversial subject, and I'm certain that many of you are familiar with the Woodstream Corp., but for those of you who aren't, these are the people who manufacture Victor and Conibear traps among other things. They are obviously the number one trap manufacturing group in North America. I am delighted to present the president of their trapping division, Mr. John Robertson.

FIFTH SPEAKER

*Mr. John H. Robertson, President
Trapping Division, Woodstream Corporation*

Thank you, Jim! Good evening, ladies and gentlemen! Speaking for the Woodstream Corporation, we appreciate the opportunity to be with you at these meetings. Trapping is our business. We want to see trapping preserved, as the most practical means of harvesting an important natural resource. Traps are our business and we want to be part of any effort to improve the product.

Our company's roots go back to the 1830's and Sewell Newhouse. In the early days, things were called for what they were. That was before America became name conscious and began dreaming up euphemisms for everything. If you sold products, you were a salesman—not a "marketing representative." If you collected garbage, you were a garbageman—not a "sanitary engineer." We made traps, so our name was the Animal Trap Company of America. Through acquisitions, mergers, and what ultimately became the Animal Trap Company, we are heir to virtually all of the names one associates with trapping — Newhouse, Oneida, Victor, and names like Norwich, Triumph, Gibbs, Pratt, Briddell and Elgin. All of those are now part of our company. Furthermore, we are not simply an American Company. We have had a plant for decades at Niagara Falls and Ontario and this month dedicated an entirely new plant there. It was only in the recent past that we added other lines of sporting goods, and changed our name to Woodstream. Even today, over the front door of our general office building, you can see the old name, "The Animal Trap Company of America."

We're still very much in the business of manufacturing and selling traps. I believe we're the largest producer in the world. As a result, we are deeply interested in the business and its continued health and vitality.

The threat to wildlife management has not lessened. There are those who would ban hunting and trapping altogether. There are those who would do away with game management. Mr. Cleveland Amory in his latest book, "Man Kind?", which, if nothing else, at least gave my adrenal glands a workout, advocates a sort of wildlife *Laissez Faire* — a policy of no hunting, no trapping, no game management — let wildlife manage itself! There is legislation pending or renewable to ban either trapping in total

or the leg-hold trap alone, in 12 of our states. There are also two major bills at the Federal level, which will be reintroduced in January. The purpose of this meeting is not to discuss the threat itself, but to discuss a positive action program and the part Woodstream can play in it.

We at Woodstream have followed with great interest the efforts of the Canadian Association for Humane Trapping and the formation of the Federal Provincial Committee for Development of the Humane Trap. One of the purposes of this meeting is to possibly stimulate interest in the formation of a similar committee for the United States.

And, we heartily support formation of a committee which can pull together individual efforts already underway at local levels, eliminate duplication of efforts, and be the single source to which we all can turn for meaningful information and concerted action. As you probably know, virtually every improvement or new approach to trapping over the years has come from trappers themselves. If the Committee wished, we at Woodstream would be happy to sponsor a program which would yield the ideas and concepts that trappers, who are members of both national and local trapping associations, may have to offer. It could very well be that the improved trap, or trapping concept is out there now in the mind of some trapper who only needs a source, like the proposed Committee, to research and develop it. As I said, Woodstream is ready to assist in such a program, perhaps by providing some monetary incentive or scholarship program, which would encourage trappers to come forward — and I hasten to repeat — come forward to the Committee, not to Woodstream.

We at Woodstream would also like to be able to bring new ideas to such a Committee for testing. As I understand it, the Canadian definition of a humane trap is one "that either kills instantly, or renders the animal unconscious until the trapper can dispatch it or until it dies." For a country like Canada, the development of a trap meeting those criteria, may be a laudable objective. But, before the same objective becomes that of the United States Committee, it seems to me we should also give consideration to the differences in our two countries and in the different ways trapping is approached. In land mass, Canada and the United States are about the same; over 3½ million square miles. But in terms of population, the United States is almost ten times more densely populated than Canada.

This difference is one that warrants consideration in developing the objectives for a more humane trap in this country. The Canadian trapper works long lines and primitive areas. Mr. Lloyd Cook, President of the Ontario Trappers Association, pointed out in an address that many trap lines cover an area of 300 square miles. In many cases, the trapper doesn't see another human being from the start to the finish of the trapping season.

In the United States on the other hand, with the exception of a few primitive areas, the trapper is running his lines in semi-populated areas. This means that the risk, for example, of domestic pets being caught is far greater in this country than in Canada, which brings us to the question of a "more humane" trap. In Canada, where it may be practical to visit the line infrequently, for example, the objectives of instant kill or rendering unconscious may make sense. But, in this country, where traps are visited by responsible trappers — and I truly think that means most trappers — once a day — and where the danger to domestic pets is high — instant kill may be unnecessary — and, in fact, undesirable. I would rather have my new beagle limp home on a sore foreleg, than never come home at all! To digress for a moment, I learned only today, from talking to our Canadian friends, that they are rethinking this definition of a humane trap.

I think another point that deserves consideration is the subject of trapper education. It is useless to work toward development of a humane trap if we are not going to develop a humane and responsible attitude toward trapping. In a survey we conducted in September, we asked the various state game commissions about educational programs. We were surprised to find how little exists, as well as how Herculean the task can be. We, at Woodstream, would like to work with a Committee on Humane Trap-

ping Education and contribute toward its development. Considering the many regional variations, however, development of trapping educational material for all states is more than a company of our size can take on alone.

At this point, I hope you will permit me to speak aside. I find it somewhat incongruous that we are meeting here this evening with a concern of the development of a "more humane" trap, when a meeting has just been concluded in Rome by the United Nations. That meeting dealt with the world food crisis and revealed that the world food supply is being wasted through a world-wide plague of vermin and rodents. The meeting pointed out, for example, six rats consume the quantity of grain in a year that can sustain one man. Closer to home, we know that our drought-plagued corn and grain belts are suffering not only from a lack of rain but a superabundance of vermin and varmints. We are producing less grain and corn and much of it is consumed by rats, mice, raccoons, and other crop-eating animals. In the face of a world-wide famine, it seems to me that we should be concerning ourselves with a control of animals, which cause damage during the food-growing period — not to mention damage to our timber supply, which is equally threatened, and our waterways, equally important to our food production.

Perhaps, as one further "aside," people like Cleveland Amory should be spending more time helping to inflame the nation against animals that destroy crops and livestock, rather than writing inflammatory half truths and making non-constructive criticisms of people who have devoted their education and careers to wildlife, its conservation and management. Additionally, it seems to me, we should be concerned with providing trappers with an incentive of one form or another — despite the going pelt price — to rid our grain and livestock-producing areas of predators and an already short food supply situation.

At Woodstream we make all kinds of traps. We make leg-holds. We make Conibears. We make live-animal cage traps called the Tender Trap. We make snares. None is perfect. All are constantly being improved.

Over the years, we have made a number of improvements to the leg-hold trap, and we will continue to do so. We've added offset jaws. At the suggestion of the Canadians we added a slide lock on the chain for water set. We've added a swivel to prevent the trap from acting as a fulcrum around which the animal can twist its leg. We have reduced the impact at the time of close. We have reduced the holding forces. We have eliminated teeth. And, we have tried the padding of jaws. We have tried to pad the jaws of leg-hold traps with every material that you can think of. But from what the trappers tell us, padding is totally ineffective.

The Conibear, which we make, has been lauded as the most "humane trap" available. But a Conibear is only "instant kill" when it catches the animal in exactly the right place. It can possibly be made a more efficient instant kill trap by increasing the striking force of the trap jaws and controlling the positioning of the animal. However, the danger to domestic pets, to species which are caught by accident, and to the trapper himself must be important factors in this consideration.

As a study conducted by the Ontario Department of Lands and Forests in 1970 pointed out, the humane attributes of the leg-hold traps we are using today are documented.

In that study, of 1,417 leg-hold water sets inspected, less than one-half of one percent (9 cases) showed evidence of a struggle. We of Woodstream, like every game conservationist here, would like that percentage to be 0 and we are working toward that end.

Let me take a moment to tell you what we are doing to continue refining and improving our products. We have retained one of the most prestigious international research firms to develop an entirely new trap and/or create significant improvements in the present leg-hold steel trap. At the same time, we have requested that any changed or modifications be within range of the present retail price limits of the present traps, and the same weight and size requirements. After all, we have the ultimate in humane traps now, with the live animal Tender Trap. It catches the animal alive and unharmed,

so it is totally humane. The animal can be inspected before opening the trap, so the Tender Trap is totally selective. However, it weighs many times more than a leg-hold trap, it is many times larger, many times more expensive, and it is ineffective with some types of animals. Somehow I can't visualize a trapper driving a half-ton truck loaded with box traps through the marshes of Louisiana to set his trap line even if he could afford to.

I come to you this evening with a request and an offer. The request is that we in the conservation industry not become stampeded by the threats of our opponents, some of whom have much to criticize and little that is constructive to offer. I request that we consider our objectives for a more humane trap on the basis of economic and practical reality.

As a company, I believe we at Woodstream have as much expertise in producing traps and in their marketing as anyone in North America. We are committed to trapping as a wildlife management tool and a predator control technique, and as a means of harvesting a renewable natural resource. We are also committed to the outdoorsman, especially the trapper, and we are committed to developing improved methods of humane trapping. So my offer is our help in whatever way the Committee wishes.

We have much to offer in technology. We have become heir to this in 140 years of trap manufacturing. We have much to offer in data on metallurgy, the physics of trap operation, and the economics of various production techniques, as well as marketing and distribution. We cannot, however, as a trap manufacturer, conduct research with live animals which our Canadian friends will, I am sure, tell you is absolutely necessary. Such tests must be conducted independently under scientifically controlled, laboratory conditions and, to avoid criticism, under the most humane controls possible. Such testing, it seems to us, must come under the auspices of the proposed committee. We at Woodstream, on the other hand, are willing to open our doors to the Committee and to provide our technological expertise, as well as our facilities for the development of models, studies of materials, production of traps for tests, etc. And as I said earlier, if the Committee is open to suggestions from trappers themselves, we offer our resources to provide some kind of incentive or scholarship program that might bring forward a new trapping concept or improvement.

The problem is the preservation of the right to harvest our furbearers, and the preservation of wildlife management and predator control techniques, and above all, the conservation of wildlife. We at Woodstream are committed to conserving these things and we offer you our help in doing so.

Ladies and gentlemen, that finishes my formal comments, but I have one or two "straight from the shoulder" things I would like to say. First of all, I think it is appropriate for me to recognize the contributions that our friends from Canada have made to the Woodstream Corporation in improving some of the traps we manufacture. The Canadians are way ahead of the United States in trapper education, in the whole thought process dealing with humane trapping, and I think we have a lot to learn from them.

The second comment I would like to make is this. My company is kind of a middle man between the humane societies on the one hand and the trapper on the other. We are businessmen. We would like to respond to all of these pressures. We feel we must be party to melting the desires of these various groups. For example, consider the question "what is a humane trap?" Before you can sit down and engineer a trap more humane than those we now have, you have to know where it is you are trying to go. We look to professionals like yourselves to tell us. If you don't like what we manufacture, tell us how you would like it improved. We are doing original thinking on our own part, but we need your help.

To the trapper I would like to say this. I know that you fellows will use humane traps if they are produced. I know that you feel the leg-hold trap is probably the most humane trap available. I know that you must have traps that are economical, potysnlr, trlislrlr, and durable. And these things really present quite a challenge to us in the manufacturing business.

Now, one specific comment to the Canadian Association for Humane Trapping - Neal and Dan who addressed you tonight. These people have made a real contribution on this whole subject and they are refreshing, but I am sorry to say, I don't believe they are typical of the various humane societies found in the United States. I think that they are the first group that ever came to the Woodstream Corporation with something constructive to offer, not simply criticism of what we were doing but a point or two about how we could improve what we were manufacturing. They have also served as a spark to make us consider many things that probably we would not have considered otherwise.

In closing I would like to say that we have one other challenge in the United States — and again the Canadians are ahead of us on this one. That is the education of the public as to what wildlife management is all about, what trapping is all about, etc. The anti-trapping forces are very well-organized, well-financed, articulate, and on the other side of the question, I think we are less well-organized. In fact, I'm not so sure that we aren't disorganized, but we have a job to do in presenting to the American people the other side of this question. You fellows here can make a great contribution. You are the professionals, you are the people who have credibility, who can speak up and say this is true and that is not true. As a starter in this education program, Woodstream is making an effort. We have put together a paper with the help of Dr. Frank Hayes and a few others in this room which presents the trapping and wildlife management side of the story. I have some copies of this draft, and I would like to ask any of you that are really interested in the subject to see me after the meeting and get a copy of this and then let us have your criticism. If you disagree with anything that has been said, let us know, tell us why, tell us what is really the case if we are misinformed, because we want a document that really tells the story accurately. There's much misinformation on this whole subject that needs to be corrected. Thank you for your time. Thank you Duane, Jim, for inviting us. We're very happy to work with you if you decide to form any kind of committee for the development of the humane trap. Good night!

Thank you very much, John. Our next speaker is certainly a distinguished veteran in the world fur industry. He was elected president of Fur Conservation Institute of America in 1972. His work in the anti-trap issue is probably not yet well-known to most of you and I am sure you will obtain a new and refreshing view of this issue from the man who is also President of the Fur Information and Fashion Council, Inc. Mr. Irving Hecht.

SIXTH SPEAKER

*Mr. Irving Hecht, President
Fur Information and Fashion Council, Inc.*

Good evening, ladies and gentlemen: It is my pleasure indeed to be at this beautiful Greenbrier Hotel, but it is indeed a greater pleasure to renew acquaintances with many people I've met before like Mr. and Mrs. Walcott, Mr. Hunter, and a lot of other people in this room, Mr. Langscomb whom I've met, and, besides the trapper, we have chinchilla rancher in the room, Mr. and Mrs. Cornett, and I'm delighted to see all of you.

I'm going to discard my formal address since I'd rather speak to you impromptu, spontaneously, and straight from the shoulder. I was introduced to you as the President of the Fur Conservation Institute of America. That's a fine sounding name, but we do a fine job. We have taken positive action, and we're going to continue to take positive action. In 1971 or prior to 1971, the fur industry whom I represent, and I'm talking of New York City, I mean manufacturers, skin dealers, and skin dressers were in the doldrums. We were beset on all sides. They belittled us and demeaned us—demeaning the oldest handicraft industry in the United States. And we were demeaned, and I mean that in all sincerity. And we sat there with complacency, with somnambulism and said, "Well, this will go away." Well, it didn't go away. And we sat and we sat. And we saw our sales drop from over one-half billion dollars retail sales to a low of 190 million dollars retail sales. And we still sat.

So in 1971 we became incensed. We became incensed because of an ad that was put in the New York papers. And the trappers in this room, I'll ask your indulgence, this may be redundant to you, but I know other people perhaps have not heard this. We became incensed about this ad and the entire industry (fur industry, I'm talking about, the manufacture of trap, the skin dealers, and so on—it is a small industry). We only have approximately 400 fur manufacturing firms with a very small complement people. And they agreed, ladies and gentlemen, to impose upon themselves a tax of one-third of one percent of their volume, and I'm happy to tell you now that this tax since 1971 has produced over \$2 million, voluntary contributions by these people, in this small New York area. This \$2 million (every cent of it) was spent for advertising and public relations. Our public relations has one theme—to get across the proper message of fur conservation and proper animal management.

I attended a meeting this afternoon and I was very much surprised to hear Dr. Hayes who is sitting in this room who never heard of a Cleveland Amory or an Alice Harrington. Let me give you one comment and I say you trappers will forgive me because you've heard me say this before. Alice Harrington is suing me for \$1 million. Yes, because she claimed I defamed her. And at an examination before trial, I asked Mrs. Harrington, "How did your organization start?" And she said, "Well, we subsidized veterinarians to spay cats and dogs." And I said, "Why do you spay cats and dogs?" She said, "My God, man, don't you realize that if we don't spay them, they will proliferate? They will grow into the millions, and millions, and millions. Disease will spread and this will be a horror." And I said, "I agree with you, Mrs. Harrington. Now, can you spay the wildlife? Do you suggest that same program for the wildlife? Do you suggest trapping of animals to prevent proliferation of disease?" She had no answer for me. She had no answer for me because that was not her cup of tea. Her cup of tea was soliciting funds from well-meaning people to sponsor whatever cause she wants to sponsor. And if it isn't the trapping of animals and if it isn't the killing of all wildlife, then she gets on another theme. And just recently, no, not recently, a year ago I believe, Mrs. Harrington embarked upon a program of "save the whale." Now we know that the whale was endangered. And we wanted to save the whale, but Mrs. Harrington didn't bring out that prior to this program, and she—an ardent conservationist—that prior to this program, millions upon millions of canned cat and dog food was made of whale meat. And by a syllogistic reasoning could we say to Mrs. Harrington that "If you want to save the wildlife, don't kill the animals"; couldn't we then say, "If you want to save the whale, kill the cats and dogs." It is syllogistic reasoning and we don't agree with it but this is some of the people whom we are faced with. These anti-fur groups, and when I say anti-fur because we are in the business of selling this product "fur," that you people who trap work so diligently and so hard to bring to our New York market, so that we can produce them into garments and sell them—and we think you are entitled to a fair return for your labors, and we do know statistically that when skin prices are high, we found our Volume of business good. And conversely when we reached our lowest ebb in the New York market, we found that skin prices were horribly low. But the anti-fur people and the anti-trap people are not laying down on the job, ladies and gentlemen. They are most vociferous and let me quote from one article that I picked up recently from the Animal Protective Institute of America. They are located in Sacramento, California and our program is beginning to hurt them. And I will go into our program in a minute. They said and I quote "I know this though that the Animal and Environmental Preservation Protectionists Forces in this country are opposed by extremely powerful interests." Now if you speculate as I have, I am sure you will agree that the Animal Protection Industry or Institute must be doubly on guard, doubly energetic, doubly effective, in this potentially dangerous year of 1974. We feel that in the year ahead we will require to operate a budget at least double of 1974. We also think of the Fur Conservationists of America that we have to double our budget and be doubly aware. We have found that we have made some positive results in our program.

A gentleman by the name of Roger Carris—he is the self-proclaimed most famous naturalist in the country (I believe that's how he announces himself) got on a radio

show and he equated the fur people—and he means all fur people—with the Mafia and dope peddlers. Now we heard this. We didn't sit back. We were no longer complacent. We immediately asked for equal time on the radio. And after a bit of doing, we received equal time. And a tape was made. And this tape went out throughout the country and we answered Roger Carris.

When our friend, Cleve Amory, brought a leg-hold trap and tried to impress the audience of its horrors, and then a film was shown by Mary Tyler Moore who seems to be his chief sponsor because she has tremendous exposure, and she demeaned and belittled the fur people, and said "don't wear furs, wear these synthetic, beautiful things." We immediately got to work. And our immediacy took six months before we finally convinced the station, the radio station, that unless we get equal time, we will bring suit before the Federal Communications Commission. And they sat up and listened, ladies and gentlemen. And they sat up for one reason only. Not because one isolated group was speaking out, but because the American Fur Industry was speaking out and they sat up and took notice because we were speaking for the American Fur Industry. We obtained equal time on the Mike Douglas Program 10, 1974 on Natural Network.

We put on a program that lasted about 20 minutes and I am happy to say that one of the gentlemen, Mr. Scompton, who is sitting here and myself met up in Maine. Mr. Bill McCauskey, who is a professional fur trapper, a very erudite college bred individual, he appeared on that program and he told how it is and why it is and why we trap. And our good friend, Dr. Ward Stone, who is here tonight, made a magnificent presentation, and we got across something that we think educated the listening public—that the taking of wildlife is something that just has to be done. Now where do we get our expertise from? Not because it is self-serving but I listened to a man like Dr. Ward Stone who represents New York State. He is the Head of the Pathology Department there. And Dr. Ward Stone has told me and he has told, I would say, millions of people on the radio and on the television that unless we trap, these animals will proliferate, they will die of disease, that the domain in which we have encroached upon cannot support them, and we must trap. And I repeat he says, "we must trap." And I do hope that many of the conservationists sitting here this evening will take a forthright stand as Dr. Stone has taken despite the tremendous pressures put upon him by various people in New York State. He comes out and says, we must trap and that's our position.

Let me give you one other example of the thrust and the force of anti-fur groups. One that appeared on television by "Timme"—a maker of synthetic fur fibers. They like to call them "fake" furs, but to me there is no such terminology as a "fake" fur. These are synthetic fibers which simulate and imitate furs. The ad went as follows: (This is on TV, color, beautifully done.) "He (the tiger) is wearing a real tiger coat. I am wearing a fake fur by Timme. Although it is virtually impossible to tell the difference, a Timme fur coat costs less money. Perhaps even more important, it didn't cost a tiger his life. The beauty of a Timme fake is that you can wear a beautiful coat and he the tiger can keep his." This is followed by the voice of an unseen male naming Timme as a maker of fake fur fabrics.

Now this ad, ladies and gentlemen, received Esquire Magazine's award, and the award is the Corporate Social Responsibility Award, and the publisher, Mr. Furber, of Esquire Magazine and I quote him now, "Despite the squeeze on profits brought about by the current inflationary economy, American business continues to heed the call for corporate responsiveness to help the problems of society. In fact, evidence abounds that many companies are broadening their efforts to solve complex environmental and social problems." Now doesn't that sound fine?

Ladies and gentlemen, let me tell you what we did. We brought suit against "Timme." And Judge Brent of the District Court in his decision stated as follows and I quote Judge Brent "Words are inadequate to describe the mordant effects of these ads on the viewer. In the leopard ad, a woman of fashion makes an insensitive reference to the face that leopards are threatened with extinction and requests her escort (not shown on camera) to buy her one before it is too late. Her self-indulgent attitude, and

frivolous demeanor contrast directly and unfavorably with the words and tone of her ecologist announcer. Persons who would wear natural tiger or leopard coats and by extension, all who would wear natural furs, are portrayed as anti-social, anti-environment, or otherwise in bad light.

The two-fold innuendo exists (1) by selecting "imitation" fur over natural fur, a customer will save money and save the life of a furbearing animal. That is the first innuendo and the second is that the American Fur Industry is responsible for killing an endangered tiger and leopard and by extension are criminals." This is the company who received the reward or award for social corporate responsibility. That is the thrust, that is the power, that is what is put over on the American public. They didn't know that Judge Brent called his ad "mordant." They didn't know that Timme was merely using a product to enhance and grandiose their own product at the expense of an industry and did so by innuendo.

Now, ladies and gentlemen, you have asked, "What have we done?" These are some of the things we have done. We have done a great deal more. We have established a Speakers Bureau. The Speakers Bureau goes out throughout the country and speaks about fur conservation and proper animal management these are positive things that we do. We put on fashion shows to show the American women the beauty of our products and the products that you bring to our markets. We have done a great deal and we will try to continue to do a great deal more so long as our good New York industry continues to find voluntarily their one-third of one percent so that we may continue our successful efforts in the area of conservation. The new attack by the non-professional so-called conservationist has now entered the field of trapping. People like Cleveland Amory and others are trying to convince the American public that animals not be trapped at all. And we didn't give a darn how things were trapped, or why they were trapped as long as the skins came into our New York Market. But we've changed and we learned and I think we've changed for the better. And we firmly believe now that what happens to any one segment of our industry affects all segments of our industry and the quicker we all learn the better off we will all be.

Now, I think Mr. Robertson said 12 states, but my recollection is there are 22 states, who have either passed, have brought up in committee, or are pending bills against the steel leg-hold trap. All have not passed but you can be assured that they will be brought up again, again, and again until some thrust and impact is going to be made upon our well-meaning legislators who unfortunately are un-educated in the field of animal management and proper conservation. They have to be taught, and who's going to teach them, except for our conservationists, who are professionals and not merely self-proclaimed. And it is up to you people sitting in this very room to get this message across. That this is not a sympathetic thing that you are doing because by limiting or banning the leg-hold trap at the present time, you are doing a disservice to proper animal management. I've heard comments today about the humane trap and I don't like that work personally. To the best of my opinion, I think a better trap could be developed, and if it would be developed, I'm sure that we would all participate in its employment and use. But the terminology itself to me implies that what we are doing is not humane. That we are doing something cruel. What is our alternative? Do automobile manufacturers stop producing automobiles because noxious emissions came about? No, they improved it. And we now have what we hope will be a satisfactory emission control program. And maybe five years from now we will have a better one, where we didn't eliminate the manufacturing of automobiles. Neither should we eliminate, unless we have something better, the steel leg-hold trap and I wish somebody would come up with some better instrument for taking of the animals.

There's a very ambivalent position that exists in the country. I read in a magazine from Canada, and I've been corrected, but I'll give the figures that I read, that 850,000 Canadians signed a petition to ban the leg-hold trap. I was later corrected and they told me there was only 85,000 people signed that petition, but not one of the 85,000 people offered a better suggestion or solution. They just said "ban it." And what is strange

about that? When I say ambivalent, because in the State of Maryland they are now asking people to come in and trap muskrats. The State of Maryland, and I have the notation someplace here, there are X number where they invite people to come in to trap the muskrats, because they believe this would control the damage that the muskrats are doing to their dikes. So on one hand you say, in Canada, you have people who say let's ban the leg-hold trap, 85,000 signed such petition, and we have the State of Maryland who says come on trappers, bids are open, come and trap our muskrats because they are doing damage to our dikes. Ambivalent.

Also, we are suing the State of Maryland. We sue anybody, you know. Costs a lot of money, but we do it. We are suing the State of Maryland because we think they usurped the best conservation program our United States Government ever put on. In 1912, "Seals," a wonderful program, and that was before conservation or the word conservation was dreamed about, talked about, or banded about the state of Maryland has put a ban on the importation or the selling of Alaska seals. Now this is a United States Program and you people do know that it is a most effective program that brought the Alaska seal herd from a low of I would say about 25,000 up to a figure now of 1,200,000 that remains standard. And yet we have this ambivalent position, on one hand—trap the animals. On the other hand, ban the seals from coming in and Canadians, not Canadians, certain people telling us we don't want any trapping to come out of here.

What is our alternative? We have an alternative that we certainly would not want to exercise. But if these 22 states or 50 states ban the leg-hold trap we in the New York Fur Market will despair. But I do hope that it won't lead to the fact that we will now have to import our wild furs. I earnestly hope that we don't have to do that. Or let me take another step and say that 40 years ago when certain ranchers started to breed mink and they were looked upon as "what are you doing?" You are spending money for naught! And the most beautiful fur you could buy were the Labrador Canadian mink, the wild mink. They were magnificent, and it was the desire of every woman of own a wild mink. But right now on the New York Market, I don't think I have seen a Labrador mink. But I have seen many, many beautiful ranch mink animals. Now if you can ranch mink, is there anybody in this room to tell me that you can't ranch raccoon? or badger? or any of the desired furs? nutria? So it is something for us to think about. And it is something for you people to think about. And I do say with all sincerity, that it is our job.

We have taken on this job, we have done it positively. We've done it to date by spending over \$2 million which was obtained from our poor industry. And when I say poor, and I mean it. They are small shops. They work very hard. They are ingenious and they produce. And it is a tough way to make a living, but they have raised over \$2 million because they think this is important. And they became conservationists, self-serving, call it self-serving conservationists because if they don't preserve the very product they use, meaning fur skins, they are out of business. So we are the best conservationists in the world, and we expect to stay that way. So I thank you ladies and gentlemen for listening and I do hope and I know that we are all committed and the only way we will succeed is by staying committed and acting in unison with inter-dependency.

May I comment that we do have a film of the Mike Douglas show in which Dr. Ward Stone appears and the trapper and you are certainly welcome to see it. Thank you very much, ladies and gentlemen.

Concluding Remarks

In view of the hour, I think we'll just knock this thing off in a few minutes. I very much appreciate the panelists who have given their presentations to you. We attempted here to show you what has been done in Canada, what's being done in the United States, part of the overall problem, and what we in West Virginia propose doing.

We are going through our Director and attempt to introduce a resolution to the Directors of the Southeastern Association to the effect that they will form a committee for humane trapping. We would also like to see if we could get a letter directed to the International Association of Game, Fish and Conservation Commissioners to request

their president to refer to the International Research Committee or other appropriate committee the charge of looking into the needs in the United States to combat these anti-trapping efforts.

I would like to recognize several people here that have traveled quite a distance. Mr. Gerald Walkup, Mr. Ed Howell, they are the president and vice-president respectively of the National Trappers Association, Mr. Don Hunter, conservation director. Would you gentlemen care to stand? And Mr. Tom Landers of The Furtakers of America.

Thank you, gentlemen, very much for coming. If any of you have any questions, I am sure that some of these panelists will be available. If they haven't fallen asleep, you can corner them here somewhere in the room and solve your problems there. Good night and thank you!