

human beings and putting money in somebody's pocket. Who is to say that somebody could not produce a red lynx or a Canada lynx whose fur can be taken without killing the animal? This amendment would not hurt what Senator Rupp is trying to do. It would simply add another category of persons who could keep these animals. If animals can be kept by the producers of cosmetics and tortured unnecessarily to, as they say, test products, what would be wrong with allowing somebody or somebodies to try to produce animals whose fur could be taken without taking the life of the animal? It is reasonable, it is compassionate, it is humane, and it is something that I believe ought to be given consideration. That is why I offered the amendment. Down through history, animals have occupied different roles. Philosophers have talked about animals and what they are. Theologians have talked about them. There have been hermits, for religious purposes, who have forsaken human society and gone into the wild. And if you believe the stories that are told, they developed a relationship to these animals based not on hostility but cooperation. They came to terms with nature and learned to live in harmony with all of the things out there. There were individuals supposedly fed by ravens. I don't know whether those things are true or not, but they don't seem any less believable than some of the things you read in various other works of religious mythology. There was a situation where Thomas Aquinas indicated that animals exist only for the perfection of human beings and, such being the case, human beings could deal with them any way they chose. The main purpose of a human being is to prepare for the afterlife, human beings being immortal. Since the animals have no afterlife and are not immortal, they have no rights of any kind and human beings can do with them as they please, however, they should show some compassion toward them. Yet, for those who read the Bible, and they read about this vision that the man had in Revelations, there are animals in heaven occupying positions of honor. So, if they are not immortal, what are they doing in heaven? And there are a lot of individuals who are not going to make it there. So, if making it to heaven and not making it to heaven determines what rights you have, the animals certainly should be given a leg up, so to speak, but they are not. I hope that you will look at this amendment. I hope you will adopt it. And whether you adopt it or not, I hope you will give serious thought to the implications of some of the things that are done by people in this society and justified. Animals can be run to death, literally. And, if it's right to raise them to take their fur, to skin them, as Senator Rupp very bluntly put it, it should be right to do anything that you want to with them. So I