

COPY.

22nd May 2008

Deputy R. C. Duhamel,
5 Douro Terrace,
Le Mont Pinel,
ST. SAVIOUR, JE2 7RS,

Deputy R. Duhamel,

Further to my letter of 16th May, I now have pleasure in enclosing a series of notes, correspondence and reports (Nos. 1 – 28). Many are, as you will see copies of correspondence from the R.J.A. The remainder are a miscellaneous bunch of notes and reports (though they include a copy of Mr. Bichard's report), but I enclose them in case they may be of interest to you.

The subject, as you rightly surmise, is a complicated one, and my letters and notes were written with a view to ensuring that a decision to permit semen imports should not be taken without full consideration of what might be the downside of, probably, an irreversible step. They were intended to provoke an open and (hopefully) reasoned debate amongst all those interested, but do not appear to have been circularised generally. Most, though not all (e.g. Henry Walker) of the Council are, as I understand, in favour of importation.

As the owner of one cow, it is not for me to force a conclusion on farmers whose livelihood depend on cattle. The views of Mrs. Le Cras (with 85 milking animals) are perhaps best expressed in her letter of 18th April 2008 to the J.E.P. Mr. N. Le Q. Blampied, a former States' Vet, who has seen the contents of this letter and has received the enclosures is, as you know, opposed to the importation of semen.

In addition, and as a further gloss on the correspondence and the notes the following points may be of interest.

1. Mrs. Le Cras was told that it was only the granddaughters of the animals she sold to Brazil that did well; it might be, conversely, that animals brought back from outside might take some generations to fulfil their potential. As for the effect of soil and conditions, the article from "The Field" about red deer may be of interest. Much the same change seems to have happened to some lions cut off in Botswana, but I appear to have mislaid the article.

2. Thoroughbred stallions are limited to forty coverings a year, and have to perform in person as it were, as A1 foals are excluded from the Stud Book. This obviously has an effect on inbreeding. Tesio thinks it was for the

“spark”, though, of course, it is a pretty fair guarantee that Dad is who it is said he is. In the U.S.A., apparently, they film the deed, no doubt to guarantee authenticity. Incidentally there is a copy of Tesio’s book at the R.J.A.

3. You will see the copy of the “syllabus” for the series of Zoo lectures given in 1992, which I hope will give a fair view of the subjects covered and may serve to explain why I hoped that the RJA would have had early recourse to the Zoo (or Durrell as it now is). I imagine that the papers may be recoverable. Thoroughbreds did not start from 300/600 animals but from 4 stallions and about 100 mares.

4. It seems that the R.J.A. has now gone to the Zoo, and it seems that Mr. Stephan Funk from Durrell is now extremely interested, and it may well be worth your while to contact him.

5. If one prepotent sire is widely used in the Island it may be worth remembering Galton’s work on reversion to the mean, and Dr. Allan’s work shewing the close breeding of Jerseys’ in South Africa (this report will be available from the R. J. A.

6. I do not recall having received any answer as to what EEC regulations conceive to be pure bred (the 7/8th point) and how they may affect the issue; nor, for that matter, on the derogation issue.

7. It seems that disease, as with humans, can pass through semen, so it may be worth asking what precautions are contemplated; for example Leucosia (i.e. leukaemia) (seen in California) is, I understand, a virus.

Last, as so often, it does seem to me that perhaps both sides may be arguing from different premises, neither of them perhaps with the fullest consideration of all the issues in mind.

In general, the arguments seem, to me, to fall into two really quite separate categories.

The first is the breeding argument. Basically, as I see it, those in favour see our position as being similar to that when the Vikings effectively ran out of men when the tide turned about one thousand years ago.

On the other side seem to be the geneticists, who are, I suppose the only people who really know, who say, as I understand it, that there is sufficient diversity to keep things going. One problem seems to be that the animals, world wide, appear to be adapting to the countries they are in, so in any event breeders there do, (or may) not need to return here. I do not know how much cross country breeding there may be, but though I may be proved wrong I doubt if many New Zealand breeders look to Denmark or vice versa; and if we become too heavily dependent on one country it seems to me that we may in fact limit our export market in the future. Put another way, why buy a U.S. Jersey from Jersey when you can go to the U.S.A.

The other aspect may perhaps be described as Political and is really separate, as I see it, from the first. This covers such points as:-

1. The derogation position, where no information seems to be publicly available;
2. The questions surrounding the importation of milk and the effect this would have
3. Questions regarding what semen may be brought in – is it to be solely Jersey, (as considered by the Jersey Herd Book) which may conflict with E.E.C. regulations, or, more likely, any breed – Shorthorn, Aberdeen Angus, Hereford etc.; In any case can one be sure that a “Jersey” from outside has no outside genetic input. This must surely have an important bearing on the discussion.
4. Questions relating to possible import of disease with semen (wherever from)
5. The attitude of the States regarding subsidies to farms, once the herd is no longer unique.
6. Any further side (and unanticipated) effects resulting from E.E.C. Regulations.

I hope this gives a fair background to start compiling your report. I will leave you, if I may, to trawl through the recent correspondence in the J.E.P.

With kind regards,

Yours sincerely,

"P. R. LE CRAS"

P. R. Le Cras

c.c. Deputy P.V.D. Ryan (and enclosures) c/o Mrs. Samantha Power

Papers and letters to go to Deputy Duhamel

1. Random thoughts from a non-expert (pre 2nd September 2005 – probably 6th January 2004.
2. Mr. Mallinson's letter of 30th November 1991, and enclosure
3. Copy of Tom Foose's Report
4. Letter of 20th August 2003 to Mr. James Godfrey.
5. Letter of letter of 3rd September 2003 to Mr. Godfrey.
6. Letter of 6th January 2004 to Mr. Derek Frigot.
7. Letter of 14th July 2005 to Mr. Frigot.
8. Letter of 26th July 2005 from Mr. Frigot.
9. Letter of 12th August to Mr. Frigot.
10. Letter of 2nd September 2005 to Mr. Andrew Le Gallais (no new points)
11. Letter of 18th December 2006 to Mr. Le Gallais.
12. Letter of 3rd January 2007 to Mr. Frigot.
13. Letter of 6th February 2007 to Mr. Frigot.
14. Letter of 7th February 2007 from Mr. Frigot.
15. Letter of 16th February 2007 to Mr. Frigot.
16. Copy of Times article 3rd September 2007
17. Letter of 12th April 2007 to Mr. Frigot.
18. Report from "The Field" March 2007 Red Deer.
19. Copy of Report 2004 from L. Chikhi (and A. Treanor)
20. Draft E.C. Legislation report
21. Mr. M. Bichard's Report.
22. Copy of the booklet re breeding of endangered species 1992.
23. Extract from Société Jersiaise Report (date unknown).
24. Economist 4th June 2005 on Ashkenazi Jews.
25. R. Perchard's letter to The J.E.P. 27th September 2003
26. Economic Development Committee Meeting 2nd June 2005 (v. poor copy)
27. Further report from J.Allan to Mr. Blampied received 7th March 2007
28. Copy of Mrs. Le Cras' letter of 18th April 2008 to The J.E.P.