

Copy 1  
**WILD BIRDS AND WILD ANIMALS**

---

---

1565-3

**HEARING**  
BEFORE THE  
**COMMITTEE ON FINANCE**  
**UNITED STATES SENATE**

**EIGHTY-EIGHTH CONGRESS**

**FIRST SESSION**

**ON**

**H.R. 1839**

**AN ACT TO AMEND THE TARIFF ACT OF 1930 TO PROVIDE  
FOR THE FREE IMPORTATION OF WILD ANIMALS AND  
WILD BIRDS WHICH ARE INTENDED FOR EXHIBITION IN  
THE UNITED STATES**

\_\_\_\_\_  
**JULY 23, 1963**  
\_\_\_\_\_

Printed for the use of the Committee on Finance



**U.S. GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE**  
**WASHINGTON : 1963**

## COMMITTEE ON FINANCE

**HARRY FLOOD BYRD, Virginia, *Chairman***

**RUSSELL B. LONG, Louisiana**

**GEORGE A. SMATHERS, Florida**

**CLINTON P. ANDERSON, New Mexico**

**PAUL H. DOUGLAS, Illinois**

**ALBERT GORE, Tennessee**

**HERMAN E. TALMADGE, Georgia**

**EUGENE J. McCARTHY, Minnesota**

**VANCE HARTKE, Indiana**

**J. W. FULBRIGHT, Arkansas**

**ABRAHAM RIBICOFF, Connecticut**

**JOHN J. WILLIAMS, Delaware**

**FRANK CARLSON, Kansas**

**WALLACE F. BENNETT, Utah**

**CARL T. CURTIS, Nebraska**

**THRUSTON B. MORTON, Kentucky**

**EVERETT MCKINLEY DIRKSEN, Illinois**

**ELIZABETH B. SPRINGER, *Chief Clerk***

# CONTENTS

---

	Page
Text of H.R. 1839.....	1
Department reports:	
Bureau of the Budget.....	1
U.S. Tariff Commission.....	2
Interior.....	2
State.....	3
Commerce.....	3
Agriculture.....	4
Treasury.....	4

## WITNESSES AND EXHIBITS

Buell, Noble E., chief of Division of Wildlife, Bureau of Sport Fisheries and Wildlife, Department of the Interior; accompanied by Everett L. Sutton, assistant chief, sections of regulations and enforcement, branch of management, Bureau of Sport Fisheries and Wildlife, Department of the Interior.....	7
Callison, Charles H., assistant to the president of the National Audubon Society, New York, N.Y.....	23
Audubon group opens attack on women's leopard skin coats, article in the Wall Street Journal, July 10, 1963.....	26
Letter to chairman enclosing press release from the Fauna Preservation Society, London, England.....	30
Douglas, George, director, Audubon Park Zoo, New Orleans, La.....	12
Frazier, Julian, director, Denver Zoo, Denver, Colo.....	14
Goebel, Louis, Thousand Oaks, Calif.....	9
Gutermuth, C. R., vice president, Wildlife Management Institute.....	37
Hall, E. Raymond, director, State Biological Survey of Kansas.....	35
Harris, Mary H., executive secretary, Defenders of Wildlife, Inc., Washington, D.C.....	35
Jenkins, Mrs. Trudie, Tarpon Springs Zoo, Tarpon Springs, Fla.....	17
Rider, V. D., Jr., Rider Animal Co., Warrenton, Va.....	20
Stevens, Christine, president, Animal Welfare Institute, New York.....	31
Teague, Hon. Charles M., a Representative in Congress from the State of California.....	8
Trefflich, Henry, New York, N.Y.....	23
Twynne, Mrs. Paul M., president, Virginia Federation of Humane Societies.....	33

## COMMUNICATIONS

Alexandria Animal Welfare League Shelter, Alexandria, Va.....	6
Animal Welfare League of Arlington, Va., Inc., Arlington, Va.....	6
Cape Henry Bird Club, Norfolk, Va.....	6
Carson, Rachel, Booth Bay Harbor, Maine.....	41
Izaak Walton League of America, the.....	40
Kline Chevrolet Sales Corp., Norfolk, Va.....	40
Mailander, Mrs. Frank R., Winchester, Va.....	40
National Catholic Society for Animal Welfare, Washington, D.C.....	41
National Wildlife Federation, Washington, D.C.....	39
Norfolk Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals, Norfolk, Va.....	5
Peterson, Arleen G., Norfolk, Va.....	7
Society for Animal Protective Legislation, New York, N.Y.....	7
Walker, Ernest P., Washington, D.C.....	39

## ADDITIONAL INFORMATION

Letter of Ben Dorfman, Chairman of the U.S. Tariff Commission, to chairman, re value in 1962 of imported articles.....	16
Letter of Philip Nichols, Jr., Commissioner of Customs, Department of the Treasury, to chairman, re customs clearance procedures.....	22



# WILD BIRDS AND WILD ANIMALS

TUESDAY, JULY 23, 1963

U.S. SENATE,  
COMMITTEE ON FINANCE,  
Washington, D.C.

The committee met, pursuant to notice, at 10:15 a.m., in room 2221, New Senate Office Building, Senator Harry F. Byrd (chairman) presiding.

Present: Senators Byrd, Williams, Carlson, Bennett, and Dirksen. Also present: Elizabeth B. Springer, chief clerk.

The CHAIRMAN. The hearing today is on the bill H.R. 1839. Under existing law wild birds and wild animals may be imported free of duty if intended for exhibition in zoological collections for scientific or educational purposes, and not for sale or profit. The bill under consideration would amend existing law to permit free importation of wild birds and wild animals imported specially for exhibition, whether to be used by the importer or for sale for such purposes.

I place in the record a copy of the bill H.R. 1839 and departmental reports thereon received from the Bureau of the Budget, U.S. Tariff Commission, Departments of the Interior, State, Commerce, Agriculture, and Treasury.

(The bill and departmental reports follow:)

[H.R. 1839, 88th Cong., 1st sess.]

AN ACT To amend the Tariff Act of 1930 to provide for the free importation of wild animals and wild birds which are intended for exhibition in the United States

*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,* That paragraph 1607(b) of the Tariff Act of 1930 (19 U.S.C. 1201, par. 1607(b)) is amended to read as follows:

"(b) Wild animals and wild birds imported specially for exhibition, whether intended to be used by the importer or for sale for such purpose."

SEC. 2. The amendment made by the first section of this Act shall take effect on the tenth day following the date of the enactment of this Act.

Passed the House of Representatives February 26, 1963.

Attest:

RALPH R. ROBERTS, *Clerk.*

EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT,  
BUREAU OF THE BUDGET,  
Washington, D.C., June 19, 1963.

Hon. HARRY F. BYRD,  
*Chairman, Committee on Finance,*  
*U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.*

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: This will acknowledge your letter of March 1, 1963, requesting the views of the Bureau of the Budget on H.R. 1839, to amend the Tariff Act of 1930 to provide for the free importation of wild animals and wild birds which are intended for exhibition in the United States.

In its report to your committee, the Department of the Treasury points out that the language of the bill does not provide for free entry of wild animals and birds imported for donation to exhibits. Free entry for donation to educational

or scientific zoological collections is now possible under the existing paragraph of the Tariff Act which this bill would amend. We suggest that the bill be amended to assure that the privilege of free entry of wild animals and birds for donation to exhibits is retained.

The Bureau of the Budget would have no objection to enactment of the bill amended as suggested above.

Sincerely yours,

PHILLIP S. HUGHES,  
Assistant Director for Legislative Reference.

U.S. TARIFF COMMISSION,  
OFFICE OF THE CHAIRMAN,  
Washington, D.C., April 16, 1963.

HON. HARRY F. BYRD,  
Chairman, Committee on Finance, U.S. Senate.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: This is in response to your request of March 1, 1963, for a report on H.R. 1839, 88th Congress, to amend the Tariff Act of 1930 to provide for the free importation of wild animals and wild birds which are intended for exhibition in the United States.

H.R. 1839, as passed by the House of Representatives on February 26, 1963, provides for the amendment of paragraph 1607(b) of the Tariff Act of 1930 so as to accord duty-free treatment to "Wild animals and wild birds imported specially for exhibition, whether intended to be used by the importer or for sale for such purpose." Currently the subparagraph provides only for "Wild animals and birds intended for exhibition in zoological collections for educational or scientific purposes, and not for sale or profit".

Animals and poultry brought into the United States for the purpose of exhibition and the usual equipment therefor may also be entered temporarily under bond (for periods up to 3 years) without the payment of duty, under the provisions of section 308(10) of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended. Such items must be exported or destroyed under customs supervision within the allotted time.

During 1962 wild animals and birds having an aggregate value of \$255,755 were admitted duty free under paragraph 1607(b). It is estimated that during the same period wild animals and birds having an aggregate value of approximately \$50,000 were entered under the dutiable provisions of paragraph 711 or 715 of the Tariff Act of 1930 which would have qualified for free entry under the proposed amendment had it been in effect. Wild animals now dutiable under paragraph 715 which would most likely be imported under the proposed duty-free provisions would include monkeys, elephants, leopards, lions, and snakes. Wild birds now dutiable under paragraph 711 which would most likely be imported under the proposed new free-list provision would consist principally of plumage birds such as ostriches, parrots, flamingos, etc. The rate of duty presently applicable under paragraph 715 to animals of the kind involved is 7½ percent ad valorem. The duty on birds of the kind involved under paragraph 711 is 19 cents each on those valued not over \$5 each and 9 percent ad valorem on those valued at \$5 or more each. These rates will be further reduced to 17 cents each and 8 percent ad valorem, respectively, effective July 1, 1963. Like tariff treatment is provided for in the revised Tariff Schedules of the United States, the adoption of which is provided for in the Tariff Classification Act of 1962 (Public Law 87-456).

Sincerely yours,

BEN DORFMAN, Chairman.

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR,  
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY,  
Washington, D.C., June 18, 1963.

HON. HARRY F. BYRD,  
Chairman, Committee on Finance,  
U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR BYRD: Your committee has requested a report on H.R. 1839, a bill, to amend the Tariff Act of 1930 to provide for the free importation of wild animals and wild birds which are intended for exhibition in the United States.

The bill would amend paragraph 1607(b) of the Tariff Act of 1930 to provide for the free importation of wild animals and wild birds imported specially for exhibition, whether intended to be used by the importer or sale for such purpose.

The Department of the Interior is agreeable to the enactment of the bill.

The Department believes that in the light of the noncompetitive character of the imports in question, all animal and bird exhibitors should be able to purchase directly or from dealers those live specimens which they believe enhance the quality of their exhibitions without having to pay import duties directly or indirectly on such specimens.

The Department takes this position on the informal assurances of the Bureau of Customs that the enactment of this bill would not result in relaxation, by officials at ports of entry, in their surveillance of the traffic in wild animals.

The act of September 2, 1960, Public Law 86-702 (title 18, U.S. Code, 1958 ed., supp. II, sec. 42(a) and 42(b)) strengthened provisions in the Criminal Code relating to the importation of injurious mammals, birds, reptiles, amphibians and fish. The Bureau of Sport Fisheries and Wildlife is presently preparing regulations to implement section 1 of that act which will prohibit the entry of certain undesirable species. The Department is of the opinion that attention to wild animal traffic and to the entry of undesirable species should not be decreased in any respect.

The Bureau of the Budget has advised that there is no objection to the presentation of this report from the standpoint of the administration's program.

Sincerely yours,

STEWART L. UDALL,  
*Secretary of the Interior.*

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,  
*July 2, 1963.*

Hon. HARRY F. BYRD,  
*Chairman, Committee on Finance,*  
*U.S. Senate.*

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: I refer to your letter of March 1, 1963, requesting the Department's comments on H.R. 1839, a bill, to amend the Tariff Act of 1930 to provide for the free importation of wild animals and wild birds which are intended for exhibition in the United States.

The Department of State has examined the proposed legislation from the standpoint of foreign economic policy and has no objection to its enactment.

The Bureau of the Budget advises that, from the standpoint of the administration's program, there is no objection to the presentation of this report for the consideration of the committee.

Sincerely yours,

FREDERICK G. DUTTON,  
*Assistant Secretary*  
(For the Secretary of State).

GENERAL COUNSEL OF THE DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE,  
*Washington, D.C., June 28, 1963.*

Hon. HARRY F. BYRD,  
*Chairman, Committee on Finance,*  
*U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.*

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: This is in further reply to your request for the views of this Department with respect to H.R. 1839, an act to amend the Tariff Act of 1930 to provide for the free importation of wild animals and wild birds which are intended for exhibition in the United States.

Paragraph 1607(b) of the Tariff Act of 1930 presently provides for the free importation of "Wild animals and birds intended for exhibition in zoological collections for scientific or educational purposes, and not for sale or profit."

The proposed act would amend paragraph 1607(b) to read "Wild animals and wild birds imported specially for exhibition, whether intended to be used by the importer or for sale for such purpose."

In effect, the proposed legislation would enlarge the duty-free category to include all wild animals and wild birds intended for exhibition.

This Department does not oppose enactment of this legislation.

We have been advised by the Bureau of the Budget that there would be no objection to the submission of this report from the standpoint of the administration's program.

Sincerely,

BURT W. ROPER,  
(For Robert E. Giles).

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,  
June 21, 1963.

HON. HARRY F. BYRD,  
Chairman, Committee on Finance,  
U.S. Senate.

DEAR SENATOR BYRD: This is in response to your request for the Department's comments upon H.R. 1839, a bill to amend the Tariff Act of 1930 to provide for the free importation of wild animals and wild birds which are intended for exhibition in the United States.

The Department does not object to the enactment of this bill.

The bill would not pose any problem to the Department of Agriculture because it does not affect the animal quarantine laws administered by this Department but is intended to permit duty free entry of wild animals and wild birds for exhibition.

On the matter of duty free entry, the Department defers to those agencies more directly concerned. In general, however, the Department favors duty free importation of wild animals and birds for exhibition as a means of enriching the cultural content of American life.

The Bureau of the Budget advises that there is no objection to the presentation of this report from the standpoint of the administration's program.

Sincerely yours,

ORVILLE I. FREEMAN, *Secretary.*

---

THE GENERAL COUNSEL OF THE TREASURY,  
Washington, June 19, 1963.

HON. HARRY F. BYRD,  
Chairman, Committee on Finance,  
U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: Reference is made to your request for the views of this Department on H.R. 1839, a bill to amend the Tariff Act of 1930 to provide for the free importation of wild animals and wild birds which are intended for exhibition in the United States.

The proposed legislation would provide for the free entry of wild animals and wild birds imported specially for exhibition, whether intended to be used by the importer of for sale for such purpose. Paragraph 1607(b) of the Tariff Act now permits free entry of wild animals and birds intended to be exhibited in zoological collections for educational or scientific purposes, and not for sale or profit. The proposed legislation would permit the sale of the animals and birds after importation for exhibition and would remove the restrictions on the type of exhibitions. It would not, however, permit the free entry of such animals and birds imported for donation.

The Treasury Department would have no objection to the proposed legislation.

The Department has been advised by the Bureau of the Budget that there is no objection from the standpoint of the administration's program to the submission of this report to your committee.

Sincerely yours,

G. D'ANDELOT BELIN,  
*General Counsel.*

The CHAIRMAN. Also the Chair wishes to place in the record a number of statements submitted for the record in lieu of appearing in opposition to the pending bill, by representatives of the following organizations: The Norfolk Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals; Alexandria Animal Welfare League Shelter; Cape Henry Bird Club of Norfolk, Va.; Animal Welfare League of Arlington, Va.; Society for Animal Protective Legislation of New York; and one from Mrs. C. W. Peterson, of Norfolk, Va.



(The statements referred to follow:)

THE NORFOLK SOCIETY FOR THE  
PREVENTION OF CRUELTY TO ANIMALS,  
Norfolk, Va., July 17, 1963.

Mrs. ELIZABETH B. SPRINGER,  
Chief Clerk, Senate Committee on Finance,  
New Senate Office Building, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MRS. SPRINGER: This is to protest the passing of House bill H.R. 1839 which would admit, duty free, wild animals from other countries.

The U.S. Government should have learned its lesson on entry of animals from abroad from the devastating effects and the nuisance elements from the imported English sparrow, starling, and nutria or coypu, to name a few. The English sparrow and starling are depriving our native hole-nesting birds of their homesites, thus decreasing the numbers of valuable bluebirds and members of the woodpecker family. The fur-bearing nutria has become a nuisance and a menace throughout the southeastern part of our country.

Our wildlife conservation programs which are for the benefit of all of our citizens, stand to be the big losers. While the very small percentage of selfish commercial enterprises will be the only ones to gain.

Please enter this protest to House bill H.R. 1839 in the record as I will not be able to be present at the hearing, Tuesday, July 23.

Sincerely yours,

(S) Mary Frances Morrisette,  
Mrs. C. DODSON MORRISETTE,  
First Vice President.

THE NORFOLK SOCIETY FOR THE  
PREVENTION OF CRUELTY TO ANIMALS,  
Norfolk, Va., July 18, 1963.

Mrs. ELIZABETH B. SPRINGER,  
Chief Clerk, Senate Committee on Finance,  
New Senate Office Building, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MRS. SPRINGER: The Norfolk Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals is opposed to House bill H.R. 1839 and we request that this protest be entered in the record.

If H.R. 1839 is made into law there will be increased importation of animals which will provide an avenue for undesirable species to multiply in this country to the detriment of our wildlife.

Very truly yours,

(S) Charlotte S. McGaughy  
Mrs. JOHN B. MCGAUGHY, Secretary.

THE NORFOLK SOCIETY FOR THE  
PREVENTION OF CRUELTY TO ANIMALS,  
Norfolk, Va., July 18, 1963.

Re H.R. 1839.

Mrs. ELIZABETH B. SPRINGER,  
Chief Clerk, Senate Committee on Finance,  
New Senate Office Building, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MRS. SPRINGER: The Norfolk Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals asks that you enter in the record our opposition to the above bill.

The bill, if passed, would increase the importation of animals into this country with attendant neglect and cruelty and would increase the number of those dreary roadside exhibitions of animals improperly fed and cared for and often tormented by children and adults who should know better.

It might also cause undesirable species to escape and multiply in this country as the starling and English sparrow have.

Yours sincerely,

ALFRED L. NICHOLSON.

ALEXANDRIA ANIMAL WELFARE LEAGUE SHELTER,  
Alexandria, Va., July 21, 1963.

Mrs. ELIZABETH B. SPRINGER,  
Chief Clerk, Committee on Finance,  
U.S. Senate, New Senate Office Building, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MRS. SPRINGER: The Animal Welfare League of Alexandria, Inc., wishes to express for the record its view of H.R. 1839, a bill that, we understand, would permit the duty-free entry of wild birds and animals imported for exhibition, whether intended to be used by the importer or to be resold for such purposes.

We are unable to attend the Senate Committee on Finance hearings on the bill, but we wish to state that we fully support the position of the Virginia Federation of Humane Societies in opposition to this legislation.

H.R. 1839, we believe, would encourage widespread exploitation of imported wild birds and animals for commercial purposes by persons unprepared and unable to care for them humanely. It is difficult—impossible, in the cases of some species—to keep the wildlife of our own country in captivity. It requires even more expert curators, such as those in the zoological institutions, to maintain wild birds and animals far removed from their native habitats. The proper institutions, which may now import animals and birds free of duty, would not be aided by this legislation.

We urge the committee to recommend against passage of H.R. 1839.

Very truly yours,

(Mrs.) JEAN REICHMANN, *President.*

CAPE HENRY BIRD CLUB,  
Norfolk, Va., July 19, 1963.

Mrs. ELIZABETH B. SPRINGER,  
Chief Clerk, Senate Committee on Finance,  
New Senate Office Building, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MRS. SPRINGER: The Cape Henry Bird Club of Norfolk wishes to protest H.R. 1839 which would admit wild animals from abroad duty free.

Every department of our Government should be jealously guarding our shores from importation of foreign wildlife. Escapees can breed and multiply to the detriment of our native species. This bill endangers our conservation. Commercial profits and exploitation of defenseless creatures would result from the passage of this bill.

As we are unable to be present at the hearing on Tuesday, July 23, 1963, please enter this protest in the record.

Yours sincerely,

Mrs. C. DODSON MORRISSETTE, *President.*

ANIMAL WELFARE LEAGUE OF ARLINGTON, VA., INC.,  
Arlington, Va., July 17, 1963.

Senator HARRY F. BYRD,  
Chairman, Senate Committee on Finance,  
New Senate Office Building, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR BYRD: This letter is written in protest of H.R. 1839, a bill which would allow duty-free entry of wild birds and wild animals, imported especially for exhibition, whether intended to be used for the importer or for sale, and such other purposes.

Zoos are already exempt from this duty, and therefore, this bill would benefit people who wish to sell commercially. We do not understand why the Government should allow them to import free of duty. We think it can lead to exploitation of animals in countries where hunted, and it can endanger our native species.

We are opposed to the bill on humane grounds. These birds and animals will be brought in, improperly caged and improperly cared for.

We strongly urge that this bill not be approved.

Sincerely yours,

KATHRYN RATCLIFFE,  
Mrs. V. Allan Ratcliffe,  
*Corresponding Secretary.*

SOCIETY FOR ANIMAL PROTECTIVE LEGISLATION,  
New York, N.Y.

On behalf of the Society for Animal Protective Legislation, I urge emphatically that the Senate Finance Committee report unfavorably on H.R. 1839, which would remove the tariff on wild animals imported by commercial exhibitors.

My experience leads me to the firm conviction that wild animals, removed from their native habitat, suffer greatly in transport and from improper care and handling. All too often, they are in the victims of hidden or manifest brutality.

We need more, rather than less, regulation to protect these animals. I do not think importation should be facilitated.

Respectfully submitted.

MADELEINE BEMELMANS,  
President.

NORFOLK, VA., July 17, 1963.

DEAR MRS. SPRINGER: This is to protest the passing of House Bill H.R. 1839 which would admit, duty free, wild animals from other countries. Please enter this protest in the record, as I shall not be able to be present at the hearing.

The indiscriminating admittance of foreign birds and animals in the past has resulted not only in cruelty and neglect of them, in many instances, but also in the introduction to this country of several undesirables such as the starling, English sparrow, and Nutria to name a few.

Very truly yours.

ARLEEN G. PETERSON.

The CHAIRMAN. The first witness is Mr. Noble E. Buell, Chief of Division of Wildlife, Bureau of Sport Fisheries and Wildlife, Department of Interior, who is accompanied by Mr. Everett L. Sutton, Assistant Chief.

Mr. Buell, will you come forward?

Take a seat sir.

**STATEMENT OF NOBLE E. BUELL, CHIEF OF DIVISION OF WILDLIFE, BUREAU OF SPORT FISHERIES AND WILDLIFE, DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR, ACCOMPANIED BY EVERETT L. SUTTON, ASSISTANT CHIEF, SECTION OF REGULATIONS AND ENFORCEMENT, BRANCH OF MANAGEMENT, BUREAU OF SPORT FISHERIES AND WILDLIFE, DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR**

Mr. BUELL. Good morning, sir, it is a pleasure to be here at your committee hearing.

I have with me Mr. Sutton, I am Noble Buell, Chief of the Division of Wildlife, Bureau of Sport Fisheries and Wildlife, and with your permission I would like to read a short statement.

The CHAIRMAN. Proceed, sir.

Mr. BUELL. Your committee has the legislative report of the Department of the Interior on H.R. 1839 dated June 18, 1963, which would, under Title II: Free List, Tariff Act of 1930, delete the wording in paragraph 1607(b)—

wild animals and birds intended for exhibition in zoological collections for scientific or educational purposes and not for sale or profit—

and substitute—

wild animals and birds imported specially for exhibition, whether intended to be used by the importer or for sale for such purposes.

We are agreeable to the enactment of this bill in the light of the noncompetitive character of these imports. We are aware of the great public interest in viewing wild animals and wild birds, both native and exotic. We believe free importation could enhance the quality of exhibitions to the benefit of the viewing public.

It is our understanding that the kinds of animals most likely to be imported under the provision of 1607(b) of the Tariff Act of 1930 would be monkeys, elephants, leopards, lions, and snakes, and wild birds whose plumage is unusual.

The act of September 2, 1960, Public Law 86-702 strengthened provisions of the Criminal Code (18 U.S.C. 42(a) and 42(b)) relating to the importation of injurious mammals, birds, reptiles, amphibians, and fish.

We are most concerned that there be no relaxation in the enforcement of regulations on importation of wild animals and that attention to wild animal traffic and to the entry of undesirable species not be decreased in any respect.

We have the informal assurance of the Bureau of Customs that enactment of this bill would not result in relaxation of the surveillance of traffic in wild animals by officials at ports of entry. We therefore conclude that the prohibitions on the importation of wild animals injurious to human beings, the interests of agriculture, horticulture, forestry, and to wildlife and wildlife resources of the United States will continue in full force and effect.

Thank you, sir.

I shall be glad to answer any questions.

The CHAIRMAN. Thank you very much, Mr. Buell. I don't believe there are any questions.

Now, we are honored today to have present Congressman Charles M. Teague, of California. The Congressman has requested that the other witnesses, V. D. Rider, Rider Animal Co. of Warrenton, Va.; Mrs. Trudie Jenkins, Tarpon Springs, Fla.; George Douglas of New Orleans, La.; Louis Goebel, of Thousand Oaks, Calif., and Julian Frazier, director of the Denver zoo, sit at the table as a panel.

Mr. TEAGUE. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

May I make a brief opening statement and then call upon Mr. Goebel to introduce the other importers.

**STATEMENT OF HON. CHARLES M. TEAGUE, A REPRESENTATIVE  
IN CONGRESS FROM THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA**

Mr. TEAGUE. My name is Charles Teague, representing the 13th Congressional District of California.

Senator Kuchel, as you gentlemen know, I am sure, is very much interested in this bill, but he is detained in California for reasons known to all of us, I believe.

But he did ask me to express to you his interest in this bill. I am sorry he cannot be here this morning. That was Senator Kuchel I was referring to, Senators.

Now, the House twice has passed this bill. I realize, of course, that that doesn't in itself guarantee that it has merit. But it would seem to us it did. It came out of the Ways and Means Committee twice by unanimous vote, was passed on the consent calendar twice in the House by unanimous consent.

Now, the theory we all held over there was this: The purpose of duties is to protect domestic industry.

Now, so far as I know, there is no domestic industry engaged in raising elephants, boa constrictors and tigers and lions and giraffes and wild birds, exotic types which are not native to this country. This duty accounts for a comparatively small amount of money. It has been a very difficult thing to administer.

My friends in the importing business from all over the country, who will follow me to the table, will explain to you gentlemen why they feel this is unfair and unjust and should be changed.

I would like, before that, to state I realize there is some opposition to this bill. The reasons for the opposition are not clear to me. They are not clear to my friends in the importing business. I understand, from Mrs. Springer, you have a rule against rebuttal in this committee, but I would hope that you gentlemen, if you feel that after my witnesses are through, that you feel the Audubon Society or other witnesses have raised questions which need answering, I would hope you would consider asking these businessmen who are here in the room to answer those questions.

Now, they asked me whether they thought they should have an attorney here and I said—

I don't know what the committee rules are, but you people know far more about this particular problem and all there is to know about wild animals and you can do a better case for yourselves than an attorney could.

In introducing Mr. Goebel, let me state to you gentlemen he is a constituent of mine. He told me he had been in cages with wild lions and tigers many times and never was very nervous about that, but he was scared to death this morning. I told him you were very kindly gentlemen, and I am sure all you wanted to do was to get to the facts, and he had no reason to be as nervous as he is.

Mr. Goebel will introduce the other importers here with me.

Senator DIRKSEN. Mr. Goebel, do we look like a lot of raging lions and tigers?

#### STATEMENT OF LOUIS GOEBEL, THOUSAND OAKS, CALIF.

Mr. GOEBEL. Thank you, but I have had experience with the others and I haven't had experience with this kind.

May I please introduce Mr. Julian Frazier from the Denver, Colo., zoo, the director.

Mr. George Douglas from the Audubon Park Zoo, New Orleans, La., Mrs. Trudie Jerkins from Tarpon Springs Zoo, in Tarpon Springs, Fla., and Mr. Rider from Warrenton, Va.

Senator BENNETT. Mr. Goebel, may I ask how many of these people represent municipal zoos?

Mr. FRAZIER. I do.

Senator BENNETT. There are two; one from Denver and one from New Orleans. The others are private.

Mr. GOEBEL. We are importers; yes, sir.

Senator BENNETT. You are importers. Then the Tarpon Springs Zoo is not a municipal zoo; it is a private operation.

Do you exhibit animals?

Mrs. JERKINS. Yes, we do.

Senator BENNETT. And you, Mr. Rider, are an importer; do you exhibit any animals?

Mr. RIDER. Not now, sir. I used to over at New Market, Va.

Mr. GOEBEL. We also have an importer here, one of the large importers, Mr. Henry Trefflich from New York.

The CHAIRMAN. You may proceed, sir.

Mr. GOEBEL. It is our hope that we could get relief from this duty on wild animals mostly for the delays and things that happen to us at the time of their arrival, and getting these animals in our possession. There are many cases I could state which would take up a lot of time, and these are all true, such as bringing in stock, and we can't get a release out of their cages until they have been checked with the customs department, and this could be on a Sunday or holiday or anything else, and the animals suffer and many times we lose them.

We actually lose them at the port; seemingly, for some reason, an animal stands a trip wonderfully. The biggest loss and the rate of mortality occur within a few days after arrival.

We pay a duty on these animals, and we have no recourse on this, which is very unfair, to my way of looking at it.

I had a recent case of a little elephant coming in that was down in the crate, and the boys brought it home with another elephant, and we were told that it was down. We got it home, it was weak, had to break the crate open to get it out, and in doing so the doctor did everything possible, but it died within just a few hours.

And I asked for the duty to be refunded on this, and I was turned down because it was alive when it came in regardless and the duty had to be paid on it. These are some of the things that happen.

Now, I am a man who has been in this business with animals all my life and I love animals. We have saved many animals. Just recently I was up in San Francisco at the big tannery there and if it were proper for a man to cry, I could have cried. Here is a whole load, not dozens but hundreds of zebra hides, leopard hides. These animals were slaughtered for their hides. If you have a feeling for these animals, this hurts you. I asked the man, "How come?" He says, "They can bring them in here duty-free if they are grown and not tanned," and so on and so forth.

These things all have a bearing on our feeling.

I could go on telling you many stories, sir, but I would rather one of my colleagues would follow through for me.

Senator DIRKSEN. Mr. Goebel, what is the duty on an elephant?

Mr. GOEBEL. The duty is 7½ percent. The duty value is not a matter of issue. If you don't mind my saying so, I have had several years after these animals arrive, been assessed additional duty. The animals are sold or they have died or whatever happens, and again comes additional duty, and you ask why? Well, somebody else bought some for a higher price and the highest price is the price that should be used.

In a matter of years, prices do change, and the buyer, all buyers don't buy for the same price, and it is really a complicated operation in that respect.

Senator DIRKSEN. On an average, what does a mature elephant cost?

Mr. GOEBEL. A mature elephant?

Senator DIRKSEN. Yes.

Mr. GOEBEL. To answer your question, we very seldom bring mature elephants in.

Senator DIRKSEN. All right, any kind of elephant.

Mr. GOEBEL. They cost at the place of origin, we have bought them as cheap as \$250 to \$750, and I paid a thousand dollars when I had to have some of them. Some of these dealers over there play the market, and they charge according to how badly you need the animal.

But if you go over there, you find they have a penful of these animals and you can buy them at a different price like any buyer will buy.

Senator DIRKSEN. Well, the duty on a \$500 elephant would be—

Mr. GOEBEL. Would be 7½ percent; yes, sir.

Senator DIRKSEN. What do you pay for a giraffe?

Mr. GOEBEL. A giraffe at the place of origin, there are various prices on the different giraffes for the reason that there are different types. I would say anywhere from \$1,000 to \$1,500. That is at the place of origin.

Senator DIRKSEN. What is the highest priced animal you buy?

Mr. GOEBEL. Well, the highest priced animal could be those that are not allowed to be brought into this country. We are governed very strictly by our Department of Agriculture, and therefore, we are not allowed to bring in any. But all these exotic antelope which we would love to bring in but we cannot bring in for reasons from the Department of Agriculture. These are very valuable.

Senator BENNETT. You mean they are valuable because somebody has them in here. You can't bring them in, you can't buy them, so you don't price them really in a commercial sense?

Mr. GOEBEL. There are giraffes, which we could bring in under the rules and regulations of the Department of Agriculture, but there are others we cannot bring in.

Senator BENNETT. But, to take the question out of Senator Dirksen's mouth, what is the highest priced animal that you can bring in legitimately?

Mr. GOEBEL. The giant panda, but we can't bring it in because it comes from Red China. This would be the highest priced animal.

Senator BENNETT. How much would that cost you?

Mr. GOEBEL. I would say that some of these zoos would give \$20,000, \$25,000 if they could get one. Even if you get it we can't bring it in.

Senator DIRKSEN. Well, only because it comes from Red China?

Mr. GOEBEL. This is right.

Senator DIRKSEN. What about a bongo?

Mr. GOEBEL. The bongo can come in under regulations.

Senator DIRKSEN. They are rather scarce. How much do you say they cost?

Mr. TREFFLICH. \$2,500, \$3,500, because they are rare.

Mr. GOEBEL. Thank you, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. Just one question.

What is the highest priced animal that has been brought in up to this time?

Mr. GOEBEL. Well, when they were allowed to come in, I think this giant panda would be the highest priced animal. At one time they were allowed to be imported into this country.

The CHAIRMAN. What was the price?

Mr. GOEBEL. I would say around \$25,000.

The CHAIRMAN. That has actually been brought in at one time?

Mr. GOEBEL. Yes, this is years ago, before we got on the other side of the fence with Red China.

The CHAIRMAN. Which of you gentlemen wish to speak next? Will you identify yourself, please, to the reporter.

#### STATEMENT OF GEORGE DOUGLAS, DIRECTOR, AUDUBON PARK ZOO, NEW ORLEANS, LA.

Mr. DOUGLAS. My name is George Douglas, I am the director of the Audubon Park Zoo in New Orleans and have been in that capacity for the past 22 years.

This is a municipal zoo where no admission is charged. It is owned and operated and maintained by the city of New Orleans.

The zoos, gentlemen, whether they be private, municipal, or society operated are maintained for one purpose and one purpose only; that is, their educational value.

Of course, today, bill 1839, if enacted would allow for the importation of wild animals and birds into the United States duty free.

As you gentlemen may know there is currently a duty of 7½ percent on all wild animals brought into this country without a specific order from a public zoo or a zoologically owned zoo.

This means that if there is not such an order, the importer pays the 7½ percent duty and passes this duty along to whomever subsequently buys the animal, whether the purchaser be a public zoo or otherwise.

In that respect we are spending the taxpayers' money for a duty that is imposed upon an animal that is brought into this country by a dealer. If we bought the animal directly and we have no contact as zoo directors around the world as these importers do, we would be free of that duty. It would not be charged to us.

But not having those contacts we have to pay the duty because the dealer has to pay the duty to the Government.

Of course, all of our activities are strongly governed by the Department of Agriculture, and that also is applicable to the importers.

There are complaints registered by the opponents of this bill to the extent that the operation of private or roadside zoos which I am sure you all have seen in driving around the country, these operations are bad. We agree with that. We have nothing to do with them. These are better known as come-on places, clip joints, and whatnot, gambling and other features that are undesirable which exist in these places.

These zoos are not allowed to, these people are not allowed in membership of the American Association of Zoological Parks and Aquariums of which I am the past president.

We frown upon them, and we believe that the control of these zoos is not to be considered as a Federal action. We believe that the local, State, and municipal SPCA's, the State police, the public health officials, the U.S. Public Health officials and the State and municipal health departments should police these particular zoos.

Now, there are private zoos that benefit thousands of children and adults who cannot travel to larger metropolitan areas that support public zoos.



We ask this question that if this bill was defeated, would it solve the problem of the roadside zoos of not having access of other animals or future animals that they wanted? We say "No." The figure of 7½ percent would not stop a motel, a hotel, a racetrack or a roadside zoo from purchasing animals which they exhibit, and we don't believe that the defeating of this bill would stop their purchasing these exhibits if they so cared to.

Senator DIRKSEN. Well, Mr. Douglas, there can't be many of those roadside zoos, can there?

Mr. DOUGLAS. Yes, sir, there are; and, as a matter of fact, they are increasing. It seems that they start out with a wire crate, and then put up fence; there is no general admission, generally fruit jars which say "Please contribute to the food and welfare of the animals."

Then as you go inside the place you can be inveigled into gambling, if you are so inclined, and other things that are not very conducive to good government.

A few years ago in the State of Mississippi, a man, a traveler, not from the South, stopped at one of these wayside or roadside zoos, and went inside, and was inveigled into gambling and subsequently was killed and robbed.

The State of Mississippi then cracked down on the roadside zoos and closed them.

However, some of them have now reopened. These are not to be construed in the same category as the zoos that are operated by the association of the American Association of Zoological Parks and Aquariums.

This bill, as you heard from Congressman Teague, has been has received favorable reports, with minor amendments, by the Department of Commerce, Treasury Department, the Department of State, the Tariff Commission.

The Bureau of Budget interposed no objection to this bill, and I would like to state that in formulating its position the Department of Interior received the informal assurances of the Bureau of Customs that the enactment of this legislation would not result in any relaxation by the customs officials at the ports of entry in their surveillance of the traffic in wild animals.

This bill also was unanimously reported out of the House Committee on Ways and Means in the 87th and 88th Congresses. It also passed the House in both Congresses unanimously. Private zoos and municipal zoos and those operated by societies are dedicated to the preservation of animal species not only in the United States but all over the world. I give you an example of one of the greatest instances of the preservation of a bird, that is the famous bird that is known as the vanishing North American bird, the whooping crane.

In the zoo in which I am the director, the Audubon Park Zoo, we have raised four birds and with the parents a total of six. We have the only breeding whooping cranes in captivity in the world. There is only one other whooping crane in captivity and that is in the San Antonio Zoo in Texas.

Here is an instance where birds in captivity, and this is also true of animals, have brought up the population of their particular species through careful breeding by the local zoos.

Last year, out of 36 whooping cranes in the wild flock, 8 disappeared. No one knows where they went, whether they were killed

in a storm or in migration, eight disappeared. So that reduced the population considerably, and it is hoped that as soon as these birds can be sectioned and that has not been able to be done yet, that the Federal Government will capture all the whooping cranes and place them in various zoos in order that future generations can see a live whooping crane in a zoo rather than a stuffed one in a museum.

Senator DIRKSEN. You say you raised six?

Mr. DOUGLAS. Four, sir, we have the parents and four young ones.

Senator DIRKSEN. Over a period of how many years?

Mr. DOUGLAS. A period of 8 breeding years.

Senator DIRKSEN. I say that is not great argument for procreativity of the whooping cranes?

Mr. DOUGLAS. No, sir, but on the other hand I would say we have done better in captivity than the wild flock has done in the wild, and that the percentage at which they are losing birds it is quite possible that the only birds in the not too distant future that are liable to be seen will be in the public zoos.

That is why I hope that the Government will, and I think they will, eventually capture the birds and have them bred in captivity.

I will give you another instance where conservation in zoos and in private life has contributed tremendously toward the preservation of species.

In England, there are seven species of deer and antelope that do not exist in their native country. They have been exterminated. But the people in England, those wealthy people who have these great estates, have brought these deer over there years ago and have huge herds of them, none of them are native to England, but it shows that with proper attention and proper care, we can conserve species of birds as well as animals that are being depleted in their native countries.

It is my sincere hope that you all will think kindly of this bill and of its passage, and as a member of the association, American Association of Zoological Parks and Aquariums, I thank you for allowing us to appear here.

The CHAIRMAN. Thank you very much, Mr. Douglas.

Who would you like to have next?

Mr. GOEBEL. I would like to ask Mr. Frazier to please speak.

The CHAIRMAN. Identify him.

Mr. GOEBEL. Mr. Frazier, director of the Denver, Colo., Zoo.

The CHAIRMAN. Julian Frazier of the Denver Zoo, Denver, Colo. Mr. Frazier, proceed.

#### STATEMENT OF JULIAN FRAZIER, DIRECTOR, DENVER ZOO, DENVER, COLO.

Mr. FRAZIER. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, in this overall situation here, we think that most public zoos could not exist without our animal importers. We simply are tied up with administrative duties and the overall operation of our particular zoo, and we are solely dependent upon the importer to make contacts over the world and bring these animals in so that we can exhibit them in our various zoos.

The zoos can order certain animals, and receive them duty free, this is true. But sometimes we have to wait 18 months in order to

get an exhibit, if it has to be ordered by us, turn the order in to the dealer and get this animal in so that it can come in duty free.

Often times, in this country we have a potential donor for the zoo but they would like to see a picture of this animal, and they don't want to wait 18 months after they have donated their money in order to have this animal in an exhibit.

It is much to the zoo's advantage to buy an animal that can actually be seen and has acclimated itself to living in this country. This is a great advantage to the zoos, because the first 30 to 60 days after an animal comes into this country, this is the danger point, and if we lose too many animals then we lose donors who would like to give us these animals.

Many things can happen to an animal between the jungle and the zoo, sometimes ears are damaged, tusks broken, toes are lost, making them unacceptable to be shown in a zoo, and, therefore, the animal is not accepted by the zoo from the importer. This becomes an importer's loss.

Also the zoo, as I told you, can wait up to 18 months to receive a replacement for this animal. This is because of this duty that is on there. When our importers bring in animals and pay the import duty on them and the price we have to pay for them ordinarily, then it makes the price almost prohibitive for the zoos to buy them.

I remember 18 months ago our Miss Ellen Bonfils, the owner of the Denver Post, was visiting in the zoo and she said to me she would like to buy or like for me to find a baby elephant to go with the one that we have there, just for companionship and I thought this was good, and she said, "Well, you try to find one and let me pay for it."

Well, we did find one from an importer on the west coast, and it was shipped in, but this duty had been paid on the animal so that was attached to the price of this animal, and we almost didn't get the exhibit because of the higher price that we had to pay for this small elephant.

Now, when we talk about conservation and the preservation of animals in our zoos, I would like to call your attention, if you please, Mr. Chairman, to our exhibits in the Denver Zoo, and it is right in the middle of a great metropolis there. We had quite a flock of about 50 or 75 Canadian honker geese, that were staying the year round on our duck lake.

They started raising them, and the work that we have done with the State game department and the Fish and Wildlife Service in the last 4 years since I have been in Denver, the result was we raised from 75 to 100 Canadian honker geese each year.

The Fish and Wildlife Service, the State game department, replant these goslings over the State, and then into other States, and the result of that has been, the report came in in June, that we had 500 Canadian honker goslings.

We are also raising snow geese, and redheads which is very unusual to do in captivity. I know our opponents are going to bring up the subject of preservation of animals, and we think that the zoos, the recognized zoos, in this country, have done a great job with reference to conservation of animals and are protecting the rare species that come in.

Thank you very much. It has been a pleasure to appear.

Senator DIRKSEN. Mr. Frazier, you speak about rejecting animals that are defective for one reason or another. You mean they are rejected after they get here to the zoo?

Mr. FRAZIER. We have a policy in our zoo, Zoological Foundation, who has a contract with the city to operate the zoo, we have a policy that any major animal that comes in on either coast, that this animal is inspected before we accept it at the port of entry into this country, and if the animal is not in good shape, and there is some defect, why we reject it right there.

Senator DIRKSEN. What happens to these defective animals?

Mr. FRAZIER. Well, they are turned back to the importer to do whatever he can for the animal. Most of the time they go into a veterinary hospital and are given every medication that is known through the veterinary service.

Senator DIRKSEN. But if a baby elephant lost a portion of a tusk no veterinarian could paste it back on.

Mr. FRAZIER. Well, just a portion of a tusk on an elephant actually, Mr. Dirksen, wouldn't constitute the rejection because most of us in the zoo, when this elephant, especially the Indian elephant, starts growing his tusk, we take a little saw and keep those sawed a little so they don't damage the walls and building and the enclosure or building in which they are kept. So, it is not much of a thing with us.

The CHAIRMAN. Mr. Frazier, have you any estimate of the total amount of animals that are brought into this country?

Mr. FRAZIER. Total amount of animals brought into this country?

The CHAIRMAN. Animals and birds that will be brought in under this bill? Do you have anything in mind on that?

Mr. FRAZIER. I don't have those figures. But if it is necessary I think we could get you a very accurate estimate of the valuation of the animals that come in.

The CHAIRMAN. We have a representative of the Tariff Commission here and he perhaps can answer that question.

Mr. FRAZIER. Yes; thank you very much.

(In compliance with a request by the chairman, the Chairman of the U.S. Tariff Commission subsequently submitted the following statistical information:)

JULY 23, 1963.

HON. HARRY F. BYRD,  
Chairman, Senate Committee on Finance,  
U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR BYRD: In response to your request to Mr. Leikind of our staff for additional statistical information pertinent to your consideration of H.R. 1839, the following is submitted:

Articles imported:	Value in 1962
Miscellaneous animals and birds (dutiable and free)-----	\$3, 387, 628
Animals and birds for exhibition (free)-----	255, 755
Estimated value of additional free imports in 1962 if proposed bill was in effect-----	50, 000
Estimated value of dutiable imports if proposed bill was in effect (principally monkeys, worms, snails, finches)-----	3, 081, 873

Sincerely yours,

BEN DORFMAN, *Chairman.*

The CHAIRMAN. The next witness.

Mr. GOEBEL. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Your Honor, I would like to introduce Mrs. Trudie Jerkins of Tarpon Springs, Fla.

The CHAIRMAN. Mrs. Jerkins, identify yourself.

**STATEMENT OF MRS. TRUDIE JERKINS, TARPON SPRINGS ZOO,  
TARPON SPRINGS, FLA.**

Mrs. JERKINS. Mrs. Trudie Jerkins of the Tarpon Zoo of Tarpon Springs, Fla.

We exhibit, but our primary purpose is to import, animals for zoos, research, and other phases of pets, and so forth.

When these animals are taken off of a rolling ship and placed on a cold and windy deck or off of a plane and placed on an airport, it is often touch and go whether the animal will live or die. Because the animal must be cleared by a customs office, it can be hours and even days before the animal can be taken to its permanent home when even minutes are so important. Even if the animals are being specifically imported for certain zoos on a Sunday or a holiday or night, it is virtually impossible to round up a customs officer to clear it.

In the meantime, these animals are sitting out in the cold, or the wind or perhaps the hot sun or even a downpour of rain which I have checked animals in many downpours of rain, and it is really heart-breaking to check these animals with a customs appraiser at the airport or the dock and see them alive and get them home to your compound and unpack them to either find them in a state of shock or exhaustion possibly from the heat or wet from the rain or ended in many, many instances.

Every minute is valuable in getting these animals cleared so they can be uncrated and fed and watered and given any medical attention that they might need.

It is really inhumane to have these animals sitting on these docks in the airports all these hours, which vary, of course, according to the size of your shipment, whenever the customs people are available and so forth. But in many instances it ranges anywhere from 3 to 4, 5, 6, 7 hours, and in this length of time we really could save many, many lives if we could get these animals unpacked sooner.

Many years ago, as a matter of fact, as far back as 1870, Congress put in the act duties on horses and mules and animals of this nature because they were in competition with the same type of animals that were raised here in the United States.

In the course of time Congress simply reduced the language to read, "live animals."

A duty on such animals as monkeys, felines, lions, and so forth, is unconstitutional. The duty is for the purpose of protecting home industry. Any commodity that is imported that would interfere with home industry should bear a tariff.

However, the entrance of these animals that are in question today do not interfere with home industry in any way. These animals are not raised in the United States. We need animals very badly, we need them for educational work, scientific purposes, and for entertainment.

These commodities we can trade with other countries, and the majority of these animals have to come from other countries.

Many of the zoos exchange stock with other zoos which certainly is a means of cementing a better relationship.

Mr. Chairman and Senator, I thank you very much for appearing before you in behalf of bill H.R. 1839.

Thank you.

Senator DIRKSEN. Mrs. Jerkins, what kind of animals do you import?

Mrs. JERKINS. Our animals are South American animals, the smaller type animals, we don't get into elephants and giraffes.

About the largest we would import would be a jaguar in the cat family. We did bring in some pink porpoises which are very rare in the United States.

Senator DIRKSEN. Pink porpoises?

Mrs. JERKINS. Yes, sir.

Senator BENNETT. They are related to the pink elephants.

[Laughter.]

Senator DIRKSEN. I wonder what you have to do to see a pink porpoise.

Senator BENNETT. Go to Mrs. Jerkin's farm.

Mrs. Jerkins, those animals which do come in duty free because you or someone else is filling an order for a zoo, may you pick them up off the dock immediately on being notified that they have arrived or may you be there to meet the plane?

Mrs. JERKINS. Well, first let me answer it this way.

All of my animals come in and the zoo collects them afterward because they are small inexpensive animals.

Senator BENNETT. Can anyone in the panel answer that question? What I am trying to get at is if there is no duty, if an animal qualifies as a duty-free animal can this waiting period to which you object be eliminated.

Can your representative be on the dock to meet the plane or meet the ship and take the animal away immediately without any redtape or any discussion?

Mr. FRAZIER. This is right. Let me call your attention, Mr. Senator, I brought in a pair of sloths, this summer, and there was a duty on them. It was only a \$15 evaluation on this pair of sloths but we couldn't get the customs man. It would take 24 hours, and the airlines wouldn't let us take these animals to the zoo. We could go to the airport and feed them in the small crates that they were in but we couldn't take them out of the crate until they had cleared customs.

What I did, since it was such a small item, in order to save these animals from staying in there so much longer, I paid a \$1.13 on a \$15 valuation in order to get them in.

Now, we had an ocelot to come in from South America, and why, I don't know, it was kept at the port for a long period of time.

Sometimes, if it is a holiday or a weekend we will have to wait 48 hours to have them to inspect it and get your animal out of the airport or the express office, and this is the thing that is hurting us bad because this time means a lot in getting this animal out of a small crate and feed it and water and where it can get fresh air; does that answer your question?

Senator BENNETT. Yes.

Senator DIRKSEN. Where is the health and sanitation inspection? They have to set down at the port of entry. Suppose you fly something in from South America?

Mr. FRAZIER. When they come into—United Airlines is the freight line that comes into Denver, and those things are flown right straight in there and we are expected to get them out of there. If they are on a plane for 2 days, I don't think you have a serious sanitation problem. But the space that we ship those in by air has to be as small as it can be for in order not to take up too much place. If you take up too much space in a plane you pay dimensional rates instead of space rates which is prohibitive.

Senator DIRKSEN. All of the animals come in under quarantine and somebody has to inspect them.

Mr. FRAZIER. Some of your small animals don't come in under quarantine, we write to the Surgeon General and if it isn't under his jurisdiction why they can be flown straight into the airports of origin, I mean to our zoos, and then we take them to the zoo. If it is a psittacine bird or something like that they have to go into segregation and quarantine for a period of 30 days.

Senator DIRKSEN. By a psittacine bird you mean the parrot family?

Mr. FRAZIER. That is the parrot family; yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair is informed by Mr. Leikind, of the Tariff Commission, that the value of animals and birds imported at present is estimated at \$256,000. The value of those imported on which duty is paid is \$50,000. So the tax collected is only about \$3,750.

Do you agree with that statement?

Mr. FRAZIER. Well, I wouldn't have any comment on that statement, simply because I don't have—

The CHAIRMAN. \$3,750. Would that be the importation?

Mr. GOEBEL. I would say that is about right; yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. That is a very small amount.

Mr. GOEBEL. It is a very minor amount.

Mrs. JERKINS. I would like to make just one more statement here. Speaking about this importing, I thought maybe I could clarify a little bit.

For instance, our shipments may consist of 200 to 400 or 500 crates of animals, small crates and animals, but it is necessary for the appraiser to check every animal and some of them even get down to size in order to know the amount of duty that is to be paid on each one.

Now, if we did not have this, we would have the health inspector, of course, public health. But he does not have to count all the animals, and this is the time-consuming thing in clearing shipments, is having to count every individual animal that is on that plane.

The CHAIRMAN. Isn't it true they have to go through the quarantine anyway?

Mrs. JERKINS. Well, they go through the quarantine in foreign countries, sir, and they have to come in the country with a Government-approved health certificate.

The CHAIRMAN. We do not permit wild animals to come in without some inspection, do we? We must determine whether they are diseased?

Mrs. JERKINS. That is right. Every shipment that comes in from a foreign country has to be inspected, as a matter of fact by four different men.

Senator BENNETT. Are these inspections made abroad or part made abroad and part in this country?

Mrs. JERKINS. Government inspections are made here, U.S. Government inspections. They have to get through Federal—I mean a health certificate from a Government-recognized veterinarian.

Mrs. JERKINS. But it would save a tremendous amount of time if everyone didn't have to be counted and that is what hurts.

The CHAIRMAN. Are there any other proponents of the bill? We have a number of other witnesses to be heard in opposition to the bill.

Mr. GOEBEL. May I please introduce Mr. Rider from Warrenton, Va.

The CHAIRMAN. Mr. Rider, will you identify yourself, please.

**STATEMENT OF V. D. RIDER, JR., RIDER ANIMAL CO.,  
WARRENTON, VA.**

Mr. RIDER. Thank you. My name is V. D. Rider, Jr., from Warrenton, Va. I am an animal importer. I am trying to make this brief because I realize we are running far beyond out time here.

I think we have established that most public zoos have to pay duty because we have to pay duty as an importer. This is costing the taxpayer in this country a lot of money each year.

I do not agree with this figure of \$3,750. I think if we as importers would analyze the importation of animals I am sure Henry Trefflich alone pays over \$3,750 a year in the form of duty.

Now, he might care to enlarge on that.

The CHAIRMAN. You mean you question the figures then of the Tariff Commission?

Mr. RIDER. Yes, sir; I am.

For example, I represent T. H. Patterson in this country, who is probably one of the largest, if not the largest, exporter of monkeys in the world. Mr. Patterson has a capacity in India of shipping over 20,000 monkeys a month. Now those—a great percentage of those come into this country or into Europe. I would guess there are over 10,000 monkeys a month coming into this country. I know, for example, that the National Institutes of Health lets a contract each year for over 5,000 monkeys.

Senator BENNETT. They would not be dutiable.

Mr. RIDER. They are if they buy them from me and I will tell you why, because I import a lot of monkeys and acclimate them. I don't know who they are going to, and I am sure Henry Trefflich does the same thing. I pay the duty when it comes into this country. They give me a contract where I can import them direct, it is true.

We can eliminate this. I personally in the past year have acclimated over 2,000 monkeys. I know that they are probably over 10,000 monkeys per month coming into this country, at a value of \$30 to \$40 apiece. Most of these there is a duty paid on them, with rare exceptions like NIH, and so forth, where they have contracts, so I disagree with this figure of \$3,750. I expect if I check back in my files I would find I have paid over \$3,750 in year's period.

I want to stress the importance of the fact that these animals are held up a long time in New York or various ports of entry.

Last year I had a shipment of over approximately 480 monkeys that arrived over a weekend. We had to pay overtime on these monkeys at a tremendous rate. They were unloaded in a rainstorm, inspected, the cages cleaned, everything. I got them down into



Virginia. I lost over half of the shipment, none up there, understand, possibly one or two. But as a result of all this delay and everything else, I lost over half of the shipment. This occurred over a period of time. We try to acclimate a monkey or present a monkey to a zoo or hospital or research institution where it will have some value to them or some use, not something that is going to arrive there and die on their hands.

The research thing has become a very big thing in this country. There are, as I mentioned, thousands of monkeys used every year. If it weren't for the monkeys there certainly wouldn't be a polio cure today. These monkeys go to Government institutions, universities, pharmaceutical houses, and research labs, I would say 90 percent of the monkeys coming in are duty paid because we do not know when we bring them in exactly who they are going to, but within 30 days we usually do and they are usually sold during that period of time.

Gentlemen, I want to thank you for the opportunity of appearing before you and I would welcome any question or I am sure any of the members of our committee would welcome any questions that you may have.

The CHAIRMAN. I am informed by a representative of the Tariff Commission that the figures quoted applied to animals and birds imported for exhibition. The figures do not apply to monkeys and others used for hospitalization purposes or for scientific work.

In other words, it refers to the language of the bill.

Mr. RIDER. That is right, Senator.

The CHAIRMAN. The value of wild birds and wild animals imported for exhibition on which the 7½-percent tax applies is \$50,000, making the amount collected \$3,750. These figures do not include monkeys and others that go to the hospitals for medical research to which you had reference.

Mr. RIDER. Well, that is true. As I mentioned, if NIH would, for example, award me a contract to supply them with monkeys, there is no question about the fact they can get relief from this duty. But the fact remains that about 98 percent of the monkeys I bring in or a lot of these other importers, we do not know when we bring them in who they are going to but within 30 days; maybe 75 percent of them will go to these hospitals, research institutions, universities, and so forth.

We have already paid for the duty. I don't know any way of getting the duty back.

Senator DIRKSEN. You mean you don't have any standing orders for animals of this kind?

Mr. RIDER. Not on monkeys, no, sir.

Senator DIRKSEN. You just bring them in and take a chance on a market?

Mr. RIDER. In certain cases, we do have standing orders, and we have contracts on them. But honest to goodness, half the time you couldn't get these zoos or research institutions to go through the red tape to get relief on this duty.

Senator DIRKSEN. What is the average market price on a healthy monkey?

Mr. RIDER. Well, the one that is primarily used in research is your rhesus monkey on a direct shipment basis, in other words, where we bring it in and bring it on a direct shipment to NIH probably \$30, \$35 depending on weight, size, age, and so forth. If we bring it in

and acclimate this monkey from 30 to 60 days, that monkey will sell for \$60, \$70, on up to \$100, again depending on weight.

Senator DIRKSEN. So the monkey business is good business.

Mr. RIDER. Well, we have our loss problems too, and of course I really think this is exaggerated by this holdup in the port of entry.

The CHAIRMAN. Thank you very much.

Mr. RIDER. Thank you.

(At the request of the Chairman, the commissioner of Customs submitted the following letter clarifying the customs clearance procedures:)

TREASURY DEPARTMENT,  
BUREAU OF CUSTOMS,  
Washington, July 29, 1963.

HON. HARRY F. BYRD,  
Chairman, Committee on Finance,  
U.S. Senate, Washington, L. C.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: Reference is made to H. R. 1839 to amend the Tariff Act of 1930 to provide for the free importation of wild animals and wild birds which are intended for exhibition in the United States.

Testimony before your committee indicates that importers of wild animals and wild birds in some instances have encountered delays at the ports of entry that may have caused the death of the animals or birds or have jeopardized their health and well-being. You ask whether the enactment of H. R. 1839 would remedy or improve this situation by making expeditious customs clearance possible.

Paragraph 1607(b), Tariff Act of 1930, currently permits the free entry of wild animals and birds intended for exhibition in zoological collections for educational or scientific purposes, and not for sale or profit.

The proposed legislation would permit the sale of the animals and birds after importation for exhibition and would remove the restrictions on the type of exhibitions. Apparently the bill would not relieve the importers of the usual customs procedures in entering the animals and birds.

However, there are no delays necessarily involved in customs procedures in connection with the release of those types of importations. If the importer or his representative (customhouse broker) initiates the appropriate procedures promptly, the shipments may be released almost immediately upon arrival as there is a customs immediate delivery procedure applicable to these cases. All needed information to accomplish expeditious release can be secured from the collector of customs at the port of entry.

There are, of course, regulations administered by other Government agencies in connection with the importation of wild animals and wild birds. For instance, under import regulations administered by the Fish and Wildlife Service, U.S. Department of Interior, importation into the United States of certain bird species and animals such as the mongoose, and so-called flying foxes or fruit bats is restricted.

Under requirements of the U.S. Public Health Service, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, inspection by a quarantine officer of dogs, cats, monkeys, and psittacine birds is generally necessary. Only such animals in which no evidence of communicable disease is revealed are admitted.

Similar requirements with respect to wild ruminants (all animals which chew the cud, such as cattle, buffaloes, sheep, goats, deer, antelope, camels, llamas, and giraffes), various varieties of wild hogs, zebras, wild horses, burros, and ducks, geese, swans, turkeys, pigeons, doves, pheasants, grouse, partridges, quail, guinea fowl, and peafowl, are administered by veterinarians of the Animal Inspection and Quarantine Division, Agricultural Research Service, United States Department of Agriculture.

We are unable to ascertain that the requirements of other Government agencies have delayed the prompt release of wild animals and birds from customs custody. However, if any specific instances are known wherein it is believed that delay has occurred in the customs clearance of imported animals the Bureau will gladly investigate such instances with a view to determining the cause of such delay.

Sincerely yours,

PHILIP NICHOLS, Jr.,  
Commissioner of Customs.

Mr. GOEBEL. Thank you, Senator Byrd. May I present the next witness, Mr. Trefflich of New York.

The CHAIRMAN. Will you identify yourself, please.

**STATEMENT OF HENRY TREFFLICH, NEW YORK, N.Y.**

Mr. TREFFLICH. Henry Trefflich, New York City.

Mr. Chairman, and gentlemen, I have been in this importing business all my life. I have been the agent for the National Foundation for Infantile Paralysis. I have bought thousands of monkeys in and they are, were all duty-paid out of the taxpayers pocketbooks, and I am not in favor of—rather, I would like to see that this bill is being adopted, for the simple reason, it will save not only the taxpayer's money but it will save the animals' lives.

In many cases which have come to my attention of delays at the pier or at the dock, and as my colleagues have stated, their statements they have made is correct. I don't want to burden the committee any longer because I know we have taken a lot of your time.

Thank you very much.

Senator BENNETT. Can you tell us after your experience of years approximately what percentage of the monkeys you import die within the first 30 days, die before you can dispose of them?

Mr. TREFFLICH. Well, this all depends on what time of the year the animals come in.

For instance, in the fall we have more severe losses than we have during the summer months, and I would say during the trip we have a loss of about 2 percent, but due to delay on the airlines, by airlines or due to delay by the customs we probably have another 15-percent loss.

Senator BENNETT. Another what?

Mr. TREFFLICH. Fifteen percent.

Senator BENNETT. Fifteen percent?

Mr. TREFFLICH. Yes. And I think the duty that is collected costs the Government more to collect this duty than it is worth.

Senator BENNETT. That is all, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. TREFFLICH. Thank you very much.

The CHAIRMAN. Thank you very much.

Mr. GOEBEL. Thank you for your courtesy.

The CHAIRMAN. The next witness is Mr. Charles H. Callison of the National Audubon Society.

Take a seat, sir, and proceed.

**STATEMENT OF CHARLES H. CALLISON, ASSISTANT TO PRESIDENT OF NATIONAL AUDUBON SOCIETY, NEW YORK, N.Y.**

Mr. CALLISON. Mr. Chairman, my name is Charles H. Callison. I am assistant to the president of the National Audubon Society, which has its national headquarters in New York City. The National Audubon Society is the oldest and one of the largest citizens organizations in the United States concerned with the conservation of wildlife and related natural resources.

We carry on a program the purpose of which is to inform the public and interest the public in the importance of the conservation and wise use of wild animals, plants, soils, and waters in relation to how man progresses.

We wish to thank the committee for calling this hearing on H.R. 1839 because there are more ramifications and more potential dangers involved in this innocent appearing legislation than immediately meets the eye.

When a similar bill, H.R. 1972 was introduced early in the first session of the 87th Congress, the National Audubon Society addressed a letter promptly to the chairman of the House Committee on Ways and Means requesting an opportunity to be heard on the bill.

Our letter was dated February 2, 1961. We were not notified of any hearing or any contemplated action by the House committee, but on June 26, 1961, a similar measure, H.R. 7678, was reported favorably and the House subsequently passed it. We then addressed a request for a hearing to the chairman of the Senate Finance Committee but no further action was taken in the 87th Congress.

This year H.R. 1839, which I believe is identical to H.R. 7678 of the prior Congress, was reported by the House committee almost before we were aware that such legislation had been reintroduced.

Upon checking with the House committee I learned that no hearing was held, and the favorable report was ordered before any departmental reports had been filed on it. It was passed by the House on February 26, 1963.

The National Audubon Society opposes the lifting of import duties on wild birds and animals intended to be sold, exhibited, or sold for exhibition purposes for three important reasons.

1. It would encourage the needless commercial exploitation of wildlife by importers, dealers, and exhibitors and thus would endanger some species that are extremely rare or even threatened by extinction. Let me cite just three examples.

One of the rare birds highly desired by a variety of commercial concerns as a means of attracting the attention of potential customers is the West Indian flamingo. It is a tall bird of odd conformation and feeding habits and strikingly pink in color. It is frequently displayed by so-called tropical gardens that charge admission to the public, by hotels and motels, at racetracks, and other types of commercial establishments.

The West Indian flamingo is one of the rarer birds of the world. It is indigenous only to the Caribbean area where it is dependent upon a specialized kind of habitat, salt flats and shallow highly saline lakes, for feeding and nesting places. The total known population of this species has been reduced from more than 100,000 birds a half century ago to probably fewer than 20,000 today.

The National Audubon Society was responsible for the original scientific research done on the biological and ecological requirements of the West Indian flamingo. We are today cooperating with the Bahamas National Trust in the protection of the most important surviving nesting flock, which occurs on the island of Inagua in the Bahamas chain.

One of the rarest and most endangered birds of the world is the cahow, or Bermuda petrel, which was long believed extinct until a small nesting colony was rediscovered in the Bermuda Islands in 1951.

A report that the cahow was increasing under good protection was widely published in American newspapers in 1961. The National Audubon Society received information that almost at once, illegal attempts to trap cahows were made by persons wishing to profit by

selling these birds for exhibit purposes. The rarer the animal, the higher the price that can be commanded from unprincipled collectors and exhibitors.

The report to this committee by the U.S. Tariff Commission on H.R. 1839—I refer to the letter dated April 16, 1963, and signed by Mr. Ben Dorfman, chairman—mentions "monkeys, elephants, leopards, lions, and snakes" as among the animals that would most likely be imported under the proposed duty-free provision.

Mr. Chairman, there is a worldwide conservation concern for the future of the African elephant, the lion, the leopard, and other species of African wildlife that have enormous scientific and esthetic values to all mankind as wildlife in their native habitat.

Let me point out, Mr. Chairman, that when an animal is reduced to specimens in zoos; it somehow ceases to be wildlife and becomes a curious form, while indeed a curious zoological specimen, it is little more than a kind of livestock or kind of poultry in captivity.

It would be a mistake to let down the few barriers that now exist on the commercial exploitation of African fauna. The African leopard is especially endangered by a fashion fad that has made its spotted pelt highly desired among the well-dressed women of the United States and Europe. Our organization recently addressed a public appeal to American women to wear something else next season instead of leopard, and thereby help save this magnificent animal from extinction.

There are enough pressures on the leopard now without increasing the profits that can be made by a handful of concerns that engage in the business of importing wild animals for sale or rental to roadside jungle zoos, to the producers of motion pictures in Hollywood, and other commercial exhibitors.

2. Our second reason for opposing this legislation relates to the conservation of the native fauna of the United States.

One of the justifications cited for H.R. 1839 is that it would—  
serve to eliminate certain customs procedures which surround dutiable importations and thereby permit rapid customs clearance of specimens which could be damaged by delayed customs clearance.

On the contrary, we must point out, the delay involved in customs clearance is absolutely essential to the proper regulation of such imports. Customs officials have little enough knowledge of what is permissible to allow entry to under present law; if they were relieved of the responsibility of making a careful check of all wild animals being imported, no end of harm could result from the introduction, and subsequent release by uninformed or careless persons, of animals that could become serious pests in North America.

3. Our third reason for opposing H.R. 1839 is that it would encourage the crass exploitation and inhumane treatment of animals that characterize many of the so-called roadside zoos, jungle gardens, and other commercial exhibitors that have sprung up as another device for picking the American tourist. More often than not these exhibitors render an educational disservice to the public and shock the sensibilities of many of those induced to patronize them.

The National Audubon Society receives many letters complaining about the unsanitary conditions in which the animals are kept and, in time, allowed to die. This whole business needs more regulation, not less.

The payment of import duty is not required now, under present law, if the animals are in shipment to public zoological gardens where they are displayed for scientific or educational purposes.

The National Audubon Society does not object to this. Institutions such as municipal zoos are generally staffed with competent people. They serve a legitimate educational purpose. We can see the possibility, however, that quotas might have to be imposed even on the zoo trade either voluntarily or by law, if their competition for rare species threatens the total removal of some wild animals from their natural habitat.

We again thank you for this opportunity to present the views of the National Audubon Society, and we respectfully urge the committee to reject this legislation.

Mr. Chairman, our organization was joined in the appeal to the American women by the Federation of Women's Clubs and the Garden Club of America, for the record, I would like to introduce with the permission of the committee a clipping from the Wall Street Journal of July 10, 1963, which reports on this appeal by the National Audubon Society and the plight of the leopard.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection the insertion will be made. (The article referred to follows:)

[From Wall Street Journal, Chicago, Ill., July 10, 1963]

**AUDUBON GROUP OPENS ATTACK ON WOMEN'S LEOPARD SKIN COATS—ORGANIZATION CHARGES ANIMALS BEING KILLED OFF FASTER THAN THEIR CAPACITY TO REPRODUCE**

NEW YORK.—The National Audubon Society has launched a full-scale attack against women's leopard skin coats.

The audubon society is a group primarily interested in the protection of birds, but on occasion it takes stands on conservation in general.

The offensive opened with an editorial in the current issue of Audubon magazine that included an appeal to American women to stop buying the popular fur. It was expected to be continued with efforts to get American fur merchants to stop handling the skins.

"A recent fashion craze has created an extraordinary demand and stimulated a booming black market in leopard pelts," the Audubon Society said. "Leopards are now being shot, speared, and trapped at a rate 80 percent faster than their capacity to reproduce. Unless the slaughter is checked, the species is doomed."

The black market apparently refers to poaching that is said to take place in parts of southern Africa.

"This is pretty ridiculous," countered Louis Cohen, president of American Fur Merchants Association. "I'm sure I don't know what useful purpose leopards serve, but I also don't think there's much threat to them. After all, only the very rich can afford a leopard skin coat."

Despite their high price, leopard skin coat sales are increasing rapidly. Some are available for as little as \$2,500, but most cost from \$5,000 to \$10,000, according to coat manufacturers.

Nat Lehrfeld, who has made leopard skin coats exclusively since 1929, says he sold 50 percent more coats in 1962 than in 1961. It is believed the increasing demand resulted from pictures showing Jacqueline Kennedy, the President's wife, and Elizabeth Taylor, the actress, wearing leopard skin coats.

Mr. Lehrfeld won't say how many he sold last year, but he estimates that "more than 1,000" such coats are sold annually in the United States. The average coat takes five to seven skins, depending on quality. Mr. Lehrfeld says "more than 7,000 skins" were imported last year for coats. Even more were used as trim for coats and suits.

The 1963 season is too young to evaluate because most coats are sold in the early fall. But Mr. Lehrfeld says signs so far indicate another sales increase.

According to Carl W. Buchheister, president of the Audubon Society and author of the signed editorial, leaders of U.S. women's and garden clubs have already indicated support of a leopard boycott. Mrs. Dexter Otis Arnold, president of

the General Federation of Women's Clubs, and Mrs. Erastus Corning II, president of the Garden Club of America, are among them, he said.

"Is my lady so insensitive, and such a slave to fashion, that she would knowingly be a party to the extermination of one of nature's most magnificent creatures?" Mr. Buchheister's editorial asks.

"I don't think so. She once willingly gave up the aigrettes of rare herons and the skins of bluebirds and orioles."

Senator BENNETT. Mr. Callison, you heard one of the witnesses say leopard skins come in free, are you going to save the leopard by keeping a 7½-percent tariff on a live leopard when the skin of the leopard slaughtered in Africa can come in free?

Mr. CALLISON. Senator Bennett, there is enough pressure on the leopard from a number of sources now without letting down what little protection it has in the import duty brought in commercially for exhibit purposes.

Now, I am not talking about the importation of the leopard for legitimate exhibition and use in educational institutions such as municipal zoos which can now import them duty free, but we can very well foresee the day when to protect some of these rare animals in the world there may have to be quotas imposed on a zoo import, legitimate zoo imports either voluntarily or by law.

Senator BENNETT. Do you have any idea what percentage, what the relationship is when the number of leopards imported into the United States alive for exhibit, in all types of exhibit situations, compared with the number of leopard skins that are imported for the fur trade?

Mr. CALLISON. No, I don't, except I would hazard a guess that the fur trade is, exerts much the greater pressure on the leopard at present. This Wall Street Journal article has some estimates that the Journal got from the fur industry and they secured the information.

We had the information from the wildlife authorities in Africa that have been witnessing the poaching and the disappearance of the leopard. The furriers said that the sale of leopard skin coats in the United States increased by 50 percent in 1962 over 1961.

Senator BENNETT. But does that article have any numbers?

Mr. CALLISON. Yes, it does.

Senator BENNETT. What are the numbers?

Mr. CALLISON. Quoting a Mr. Nat Lehrfeld, who has made leopard skin coats exclusively since 1929 says he sold 50 percent more coats.

Senator BENNETT. That is a percentage.

Mr. CALLISON. In 1962 than in 1961, he has a figure. Mr. Lehrfeld won't say how many he sold last year but he estimates that more than 1,000 such coats are sold annually in the United States. The average coat takes five to seven skins depending on quality. Mr. Lehrfeld says more than 7,000 skins were imported last year for coats. Even more were used as trim for coats and suits.

Senator BENNETT. May I address a question to Mr. Trefflich?

Do you have any idea how many live leopards were imported in the United States last year?

Mr. TREFFLICH. Not too many because we are breeding quite a few. I myself imported 10 this year, there are cubs and there are plenty of them and they are all alive today.

Senator BENNETT. Mr. Rider?

Mr. RIDER. May I say there are probably only about 200 public or private zoos in this country that can even afford to buy a leopard,

and many of these are raising their leopard cubs, and so forth, and these are being bought by animal dealers or traded from zoo to zoo. I don't think you will find many roadside zoos that can afford a leopard.

Senator BENNETT. How much does a leopard cost?

Mr. RIDER. Depending on whether it's African or Indian I would say in the neighborhood of \$500 to \$700, your black leopard will run a thousand to \$1,500.

Senator BENNETT. So that the fur trade is responsible for maybe 50 to 70 times as many leopards as are imported for exhibition purposes. And those come in free.

Mr. CALLISON. Senator, you have enough experience with game management and have followed it long enough in Utah to know if you break off the natural reproduction of mule deer or elk in Utah your percentage is going to break down and it doesn't take very much to break the back of the leopard and it would be broken.

Senator BENNETT. I would think you would be in here asking for a quota on leopard skins and not so much concerned about 7½-percent tariff on live leopards. It seems to me that the relationship is very incongruous.

Mr. CALLISON. Mr. Chairman, I use the leopard as an example of a species of wildlife, one example that is endangered by commercial exploitation.

The importation for commercial exhibit purposes is one form of such commercial exploitation. We have stated that if we can't discourage women from buying fur coats and thereby taking pressure off the leopard skin conservation organizations may have to ask Congress to impose quotas on leopard skins and I would hope the Senator from Utah whose interest in conservation is very well known to me, would help us if that becomes necessary.

Senator BENNETT. You are not prepared yet to say, however, that you should forbid the importation of live leopards. You just want them limited to municipal zoos and organizations of that kind, and they come in duty free anyway.

Mr. CALLISON. That is right.

Senator BENNETT. So in effect now you are saying you want the exhibition of animals by private operators for profit hampered or if necessary discontinued because of its effect on the wildlife involved.

Mr. CALLISON. That is right, Senator.

We say we do not want to encourage the exploitation of a number of kinds of wild animals by removing what little barriers there now exist on this exploitation, and this tariff duty is one, even though it is minor.

Senator BENNETT. Don't we agree it is a small barrier, 7½ percent on \$500,000, \$35 on a leopard, this isn't going to turn the decision—I am inclined to believe, Mr. Chairman, that we are talking about peanuts one way or the other in this particular situation. I can't believe the importers are going to stop for the 7½ percent, and certainly I don't believe that you are going to save the species by continuing the 7½ percent.

Mr. CALLISON. Well, there is very good chance we might save the flamingo by continuing it. The flamingo is not imported now as an article of women's wear. It is imported for exhibit purposes. The use of flamingo feathers was prohibited by law a long time ago.

Senator BENNETT. How much does a flamingo cost?



Mr. CALLISON. I can't tell you.

Mrs. JERKINS. The market value is \$30.

Senator BENNETT. \$30?

Mrs. JERKINS. Yes, sir.

Senator BENNETT. \$30, 7½ percent, \$2.25. Is that going to save the flamingo?

Mr. CALLISON. It will help.

Senator DIRKSEN. Well, Mr. Callison, what do other countries do about this.

Suppose all this happens just the way you wanted it. Would that stop the exportation of leopard skins to Britain, Germany, Italy, any other country that can afford to buy them?

Mr. CALLISON. Senator, it varies a great deal from country to country, the amount of conservation consciousness that is present there. Most of the northern European countries have a very high degree of such consciousness. Some of them have very fine laws and good conservation organizations.

Other parts of the world have none. I don't think that we should let down our own interest in conservation just because other countries are not doing the job that they should be doing.

Senator DIRKSEN. Are the Americans the only ones who are importing leopard skins for fur coats or are they being sold abroad?

Mr. CALLISON. No, our position is that the commercial pressure on leopard by the fur industry comes from two sources, Europe and North America.

Senator DIRKSEN. Yes.

Mr. CALLISON. These are the parts of the world where the well-dressed women can afford to pay from \$5,000 to \$10,000 for a leopard coat.

Senator DIRKSEN. I have no further comments at the moment.

Excuse me for interrupting.

Mr. CALLISON. Yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. Thank you very much, Mr. Callison.

Any questions?

Senator DIRKSEN. Do you have an estimate of the number of roadside zoos?

Mr. CALLISON. I do not. I do not have an estimate. I am impressed that they are increasing in number from my own observations and the reports we have received.

Senator BENNETT. It is my impression as I travel across the country back to where I live that most of the roadside zoos are stocked with native fauna rather than imported fauna.

Mr. CALLISON. To some degree this is true, they are. I think they stock whatever they can get and this is an abuse that should be corrected. Some States have imposed strict regulations on the roadside zoos. Others have not.

Senator BENNETT. My impression is that they profit because they can say to the traveler, "Come in and see the fauna that are native or at least related to this particular part of the country that you have never seen in an ordinary zoo."

Out in our country, it is a coyote or a bobcat or a rattlesnake. Offhand, I can't remember having seen any roadside zoos, at least in the West, with animals in it that were not native. But I could be wrong.

Mr. CALLISON. Many of them do have a wide variety ranging all the way from reptiles to birds and mammals.

Senator BENNETT. I have an impression there are quite a few of those in Florida, maybe in California but I think when you get away from the coast you tend—they tend, to develop their exhibits out of the animals of the area.

Mr. CALLISON. Sir, I grew up in the Midwest, I am a Missourian and I have seen many of them in the State of Missouri.

Senator BENNETT. With African and Indian animals in them?

Mr. CALLISON. With South American animals, reptiles and also Indian animals in them. The State of Missouri has recently imposed strict regulations on them.

Senator BENNETT. I think this is a better way to solve the problem perhaps than to worry about depending on the tariff restrictions.

That is all, Mr. Chairman.

(The following letter enclosing a press release of the Fauna Preservation Society, London, England, was subsequently received for the record:)

NATIONAL AUDUBON SOCIETY,  
New York, July 25, 1963.

Hon. HARRY F. BYRD,  
Chairman, Senate Finance Committee,  
Senate Office Building, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR BYRD: The enclosed press release from the Fauna Preservation Society, London, England, just reached our desk and we forward it to you as an example of the reason why conservation organizations throughout the world are concerned about the lengths to which the trappers, traders, and importers catering to the zoo trade will go to secure rare and endangered wild animals, and why we oppose removing the tariff duty on wild birds and animals imported into the United States.

I request that this release be made a part of the hearing record on H.R. 1839. Thank you again for your courtesy and consideration.

Sincerely yours,

CHARLES H. CALLISON,  
Assistant to the President.

[Immediate press release from the Fauna Preservation Society, care of The Zoological Society, Regent's Park, London, N.W. 1.]

#### ILLEGAL TRADE IN ORANGUTANS

The Fauna Preservation Society has been deeply concerned about the illegal export of young orangutans from Sumatra and Borneo. The little apes are usually smuggled into transit ports by poachers who shoot the mother animals in order to obtain the young. As only one out of every two baby orangs captured usually manages to survive transportation to a zoo, the total world population of these magnificent animals (currently estimated at between 3,000 and 4,000) is declining rapidly. Unless the trade is stopped the animal is likely to become extinct within a few years. Many of the orangs were smuggled into Singapore and reexported via a clearinghouse in Bangkok.

The Fauna Preservation Society has now learnt from a highly reputable source in Singapore that the clearinghouse in Bangkok has been located and closed down by the vigorous efforts of Dr. Boon Song Lekagol of the International Union for the Conservation of Nature, an international organization with headquarters at Morges near Lausanne in Switzerland. As a result, the Singapore ring of dealers had some 85 animals on their hands for some time. Their position was made more difficult by the recent action of the local customs authorities who refused permits for export unless import licenses could be shown. The old trick of exporting orangs among batches of monkeys was too well known to be practicable.

In a letter to Lt. Col. C. L. Boyle, the secretary of the Fauna Preservation Society, the Singapore informant says: "A number of orangs died and I was afraid many more might be deliberately killed as an orang costs at least \$1 (Malayan) per day to feed and this amount is more than most dealers are prepared

to spend for months on end on a doubtful asset." It has also been learnt that a new clearing center for smuggled oranges has been established at an unspecified port in Japan.

In conjunction with the World Wildlife Fund and the International Union for the Conservation of Nature, the Fauna Preservation Society is now in correspondence with Mr. Tom Harrison, the curator of the Sarawak Museum and authorities in Singapore in a determined effort to reestablish the "orphaned" oranges in sanctuaries.

JUNE 18, 1963.

The CHAIRMAN. Thank you very much, Mr. Callison.

The next witness is Christine Stevens of the Animal Welfare Institute.

Take a seat, please.

#### STATEMENT OF CHRISTINE STEVENS, PRESIDENT, ANIMAL WELFARE INSTITUTE, NEW YORK

Miss STEVENS. My name is Christine Stevens. On behalf of the Animal Welfare Institute, I wish to express strong opposition to H.R. 1839. Our experience in observing the importation of wild animals shows that there is much suffering involved.

Such importation should be made only when a serious purpose is served and when conditions can be maintained to avoid needless suffering. To eliminate all obstacles to the unlimited importation of wild creatures for the mere purpose of commercial gain is unthinkable in a civilized nation, and we respectfully urge the distinguished members of this committee to reject this bill.

In the House debate on H.R. 1839, Congressman Mills stated:

Wild animals which would most likely be imported under the provisions of paragraph 1607(b) as amended by this bill, would include monkeys, elephants, leopards, lions, and snakes.

All of these animals except for the snakes are highly developed mammals, some of them, particularly the monkeys, are nervous and sensitive to such a degree that individuals will die simply because they cannot endure captivity—particularly captivity of the kind too often meted out by commercial speculators and dealers in exotic animals and birds.

These people, are, of course, getting animals now, though in lesser numbers than they would if there were no duty to pay or formalities to go through with customs. I remember how eager the importers were to discourage me from climbing a ladder into a plane to inspect a mixed load of wild animals which had arrived at Idlewild a few years ago. They even told me there was an escaped cobra loose in the plane in the hope of dissuading me. I saw no loose snakes, but I did see how extremely hard such a trip is on the animals.

In the cargo building a baby chimpanzee was lying crated in a box in which it had to remain flat on its back until the crate was ripped apart. This pitiful infant was being sent to a commercial exhibitor and dealer in Florida. Its fellow had died en route.

On another flight, one group of ill-constructed and overcrowded crates full of monkeys, was destined for Treflich's, the big pet shop and animal importer in New York. That is Mr. Treflich who testified here today.

Assurances that these animals would be released to comfortable "flying cages" immediately proved empty. When we went to see

them the following afternoon in the upstairs storage area which is off bounds for the public who visits the pet shop, we found the unfortunate animals still in their dirty, cramped travelling crates, in which the large ones had to maintain a crouched position, many of the monkeys with untreated bleeding sores from the rough treatment they had received on their trip and without any food or water—in short, utterly neglected.

The dreadful overcrowding I have seen in the crates only a few inches high in which beautiful, brightly colored little birds are imported, is a similarly painful sight. To increase this entirely needless and unjustifiable suffering by letting down such bars as do exist, would be a retrograde action of which our country would have to be ashamed.

What could be gained by passage of this bill? All it would do is to give a few animal dealers an additional profit. It is hard to see why these individuals should have special privileges with regard to the payment of a Federal tax.

So far from removing the tariff on the importation of wild animals and birds by commercial exhibitors or those who intend to sell to them, the imposition of stricter requirements and higher tariffs would be more appropriate.

While we believe the cruelty involved is the most urgent reason for defeating H.R. 1839, the possible extinction of rare species if this bill is passed, deserves careful thought by this committee, too.

Our country should provide moral leadership in maintaining the natural wonders of the earth—not in exploiting to the very point of extinction any of these remarkable and beautiful creatures. Passage of such a bill as H.R. 1839 would dismay our friends and delight our critics in foreign lands where our enemies like to claim that Americans care for nothing but money.

In the House debate, it was stated that the bill would eliminate certain customs procedures which make the importation of such animals and birds a difficult practice. Humane societies throughout the Nation have long struggled against the chronic mistreatment of animals in many commercial roadside zoos.

Passage of H.R. 1839 would make a bad situation very much worse than it now is.

Free importation privileges now exist for wild birds and animals intended for exhibition in zoological collections for educational and scientific purposes, and not for sale or profit. No justifiable purpose can be served by extending this privilege to those who seek personal gain at the cost of great physical and mental suffering by large numbers of intelligent and sensitive living animals.

Senator DIRKSEN. What is the Welfare Animal Institute?

Miss STEVENS. It is an organization for the protection of animals by educational means. We have—we publish a bulletin, bimonthly.

We produce manuals on the care and treatment of migratory animals which we give free to laboratories and we publish manuals for the humane education of children which we give free to school-teachers. These we give out by the tens of thousands.

I don't know whether you want any more. We inspect, as you can see, insofar as possible, well, places that animals are, slaughter houses, airports, laboratories and so on.

Senator DIRKSEN. Is it a national organization?

Miss STEVENS. That is right; yes.

Senator DIRKSEN. How is it sustained?

Miss STEVENS. By contributions.

Senator DIRKSEN. Where are its headquarters?

Miss STEVENS. In New York City

The CHAIRMAN. Thank you very much.

Miss STEVENS. I might just add one thing, if I might, to my prepared statement since having heard the testimony here. It seems to me so much emphasis has been put on the question of getting through customs rapidly. Since my prepared testimony noted as it happens an instance in which the fact that the animals got through customs had little to do with giving them any care, food or water after they did get out, it was more than 24 hours later that we found them in this condition, I wonder whether there is an important factor here in getting the animals through customs.

As you know there is a law that requires that no more than 2 percent of the animals die in transit, and that customs enforces that law.

If the customs procedure were so speeded up that this could never even be looked at it might be a very serious matter. I just throw that in. I don't know whether it is valid or not.

The CHAIRMAN. Do you have any experience in caring for wild animals, wild imported animals?

Miss STEVENS. I haven't any experience in wild, personally. Only in caring for domestic animals.

The CHAIRMAN. Wouldn't you assume that if an importer paid \$30 for a flamingo he would exercise some skill and caution to keep that bird alive since he has an investment in it?

Miss STEVENS. Well, that unfortunately is an assumption that doesn't always seem to work. If only the investment would make people take care of their animals it would be wonderful. But in all kinds of humane work we find people to allow their whole barnful of cattle to starve to death instead of selling them. These things do happen, and also importers think they can push the animals a little farther, they don't happen to have enough people around, they think that today so they will just let it go that much longer, this kind of thing happens all the time and it is a reason where animal protective societies have a tremendous job and a big problem that I hope you will not make any worse than it is now.

The CHAIRMAN. Thank you very much.

Any further questions?

The next witness is Mrs. Paul M. Twynne of the Virginia Federation of Humane Societies.

#### STATEMENT OF MRS. PAUL M. TWYNNE, PRESIDENT, VIRGINIA FEDERATION OF HUMANE SOCIETIES

Mrs. TWYNNE. Mr. Chairman, Senator Byrd, and members of the committee, I am Pearl Twynne, and I am president of the Virginia Federation of Humane Societies.

I have had a great deal of experience in checking roadside zoos, and in checking elephants and lions that were being used at shopping areas in the Virginia area, and also have seen that many of the caretakers who are using these elephants at these shopping areas do not know how to take care of the animals.

I have gone to the Washington zoo and Dr. Reed has taken me into the pens with the elephants, to show me the care that should be given to the skins of these elephants or the elephants suffer.

Elephants are not accustomed in their native habitat to work on hot concrete with sun beating down on them with no protection, there is certain particular care which they must have which these roadside places don't have the ability, the means or the facilities to handle.

I am concerned about removing this tariff barrier. In the first place, even though it may not be very much money, I understand the United States needs money very badly so I see no reason first why we should take it off, I mean even though it is only a few thousand dollars.

And we are used to thinking in billions.

But I am more concerned about the fact that these animals are ill-treated. Monkeys are packed in cages from the point of shipment to the United States. They are crammed so tightly that they cannot move and if they have young while they are in travel they cannot take care of their young or do anything for them.

This is a cruel thing.

Elephants have been imported into this country and have had outside places on ships, for instance, and have suffered severely from cold. These animals are brought in and a lot of times dealers or roadside places handle these animals, they know nothing about their care and in their native conditions and consequently the animals suffer intensely.

Pet shops handle these, and Sears, Roebuck could send them through the catalog as they do with other animals. These animals would be more commonplace if it is easier for them to be obtained. I think we should have stronger regulation. We have had so much trouble in Arlington County, Va., by pet shops that have these exotic creatures and not caring for them and particularly snakes that have been very badly treated in some of these places because they did not know how to care for them, that we have had a special ordinance approved in Arlington County establishing standards—humane standards—for the care of foreign animals that are on sale.

They have to have certain, according to our new ordinance, they must have certain size pens, they must have temperatures that are suited to their particular natures, and food.

I have seen animals starve to death and snakes dehydrated and dead that were imported because they did not know how to take care of them.

So, from a humane standpoint and also from the little bit of money we might get we urge strongly that this bill not be approved.

The CHAIRMAN. Thank you very much.

Any questions?

Thank you, Mrs. Twynne.

The next witness is Dr. E. Raymond Hall, State Biological Survey of Kansas.

Take a seat, Dr. Hall.

**STATEMENT OF DR. E. RAYMOND HALL, DIRECTOR, STATE  
BIOLOGICAL SURVEY OF KANSAS**

Dr. HALL. Senator Byrd, Senator Bennett, Senator Dirksen, I am E. Raymond Hall, director of the State Biological Survey of Kansas and State zoologist.

Of the 850 kinds of native North American mammals only a few have been tested for suitability for medical research. The five or six exotic species now used for that purpose and introduced in large numbers are used because they have been tested and found suitable.

More testing of our native mammals would result in less need for exotic introductions.

The second observation I would like to make, if I may, occasioned by some of the presentation here in the past hour, is that to this zoologist, myself, Mr. Frazier's statement that seven species of deer no longer existing in their native habitat, now live in zoos and zoological parks in England, is news.

Possibly he was referring to strains or geographic varieties or subspecies not species.

Now, bill H.R. 1839 to amend the Tariff Act of 1930 and so permit the free importation of wild animals and wild birds intended for exhibition in the United States, if passed would hinder the conservation of desirable native wildlife, and would result in some increased expense in States, to State governments that are concerned with preserving native species.

The increased expense comes about in this fashion, exotic species, sometimes become established by accidental escapes or by deliberate releases. Those kinds that succeed in establishing themselves do so at the expense of native species. These exotic species, freed of their natural enemies, can increase amazingly as the starling, the house sparrow, and nutria have done.

Attempts to eliminate escapes are expensive and often unsuccessful. The attempts to control the numbers of species that cannot be eliminated are a burdensome, continuing expense. Actually we need more and not less regulation on introducing exotic species.

H.R. 1839 would result in less regulation, consequently I recommend against passing H.R. 1839.

Thank you.

The CHAIRMAN. Thank you very much, Doctor.

Any questions?

Thank you, sir.

The next witness is Miss Mary H. Harris, Defenders of Wildlife, Inc.

**STATEMENT OF MISS MARY H. HARRIS, EXECUTIVE SECRETARY  
OF DEFENDERS OF WILDLIFE, INC., WASHINGTON, D.C.**

Miss HARRIS. Mr. Chairman, all my points have already been made and in the interest of saving time I would like to present the statement to the committee.

Senator DIRKSEN. What are the Defenders of Wildlife?

Senator BENNETT. Would you identify your organization for us?

Miss HARRIS. I am the executive secretary of Defenders of Wildlife with headquarters at Washington, D.C., a native private nonprofit educational organization.

Senator DIRKSEN. You are sustained by dues or contributions?

Miss HARRIS. By contribution.

Senator DIRKSEN. How many members do you have?

Miss HARRIS. About 14,000.

Senator DIRKSEN. 14,000?

Miss HARRIS. Yes.

Senator DIRKSEN. Scattered over the country?

Miss HARRIS. Yes; it is a national organization. We have a great many in California and throughout the country.

Senator DIRKSEN. What are your goals and purposes?

Miss HARRIS. Well, to preserve and defend all wildlife and to keep them from exploitation and methods of killing and trapping and so forth.

Senator DIRKSEN. That is all wildlife?

Miss HARRIS. All wildlife.

Senator DIRKSEN. Birds?

Miss HARRIS. Birds, fish, and all wildlife.

Senator DIRKSEN. Sparrows?

Miss HARRIS. If they are wildlife they don't seem much like wildlife any more.

The CHAIRMAN. Starlings?

Senator DIRKSEN. You recall all our problems with starlings we had over a period of time.

Miss HARRIS. Yes, of course, all things are within reason. No species should overrun another. Native bluebirds or native birds are being run out by starlings and exotics.

Senator DIRKSEN. You favor preserving the crows?

Senator BENNETT. This is the farmer speaking.

Miss HARRIS. Within reason. They have their purpose.

Senator DIRKSEN. Within reason.

Senator BENNETT. Have you tried to reason with a crow?

Miss HARRIS. They are highly intelligent, I should say.

Senator BENNETT. That is what I understand.

Miss HARRIS. They know their business in nature.

Senator DIRKSEN. What do you do about this kind of a problem where, as in the case of North and South Dakota, the pheasant hatch was so great in some years that they became real marauders of the farmers crops so they just lifted the lid, and let everybody go out there and shoot willy-nilly since that time.

Miss HARRIS. We are never against control, it is just indiscriminate slaughter of wildlife that we stand against.

Senator DIRKSEN. Of course, I am attached to the crow.

Miss HARRIS. Thank you.

The CHAIRMAN. Thank you very much.

(The statement of Miss Harris follows:)

#### STATEMENT OF MISS MARY H. HARRIS, EXECUTIVE SECRETARY OF DEFENDERS OF WILDLIFE, INC.

Mr. Chairman, and members of the committee, I am Mary H. Harris, executive secretary of Defenders of Wildlife with headquarters in Washington, D.C., a national, private, nonprofit, educational organization, dedicated to the preservation of all forms of wildlife.

Defenders of wildlife strongly oppose the enactment of H.R. 1839, on the grounds that we consider it would encourage and accelerate commercial traffic in wild animals, including exploitation of the rarer species most needing protection and preservation.



The problems regarding wild animals in roadside zoos, at the mercy of operators, often disinterested, or unfeeling, or ignorant of their needs, could be expected to multiply.

The dangers of exotic species escaping from commercial holders, becoming established, and a menace to native fauna and flora could be greatly increased.

Each of these problems is a serious one.

The Tariff Act of 1930, paragraph 1607(b) already allows free importation of wild animals for zoological, scientific, and educational institutions, but not for sale or profit. We think this law should rightly remain as it is now indicated.

We deem that H.R. 1839 is a flagrant disregard for the wildlife conservation policies of the present administration in Washington.

I should like to have this statement made a part of the record, and I thank you for the privilege of making it.

The CHAIRMAN. The next witness is Mr. C. R. Gutermuth of the Wildlife Management Institute.

Take a seat, sir, and proceed.

#### STATEMENT OF C. R. GUTERMUTH, VICE PRESIDENT OF WILDLIFE MANAGEMENT INSTITUTE

MR. GUTERMUTH. Mr. Chairman, I have a brief statement and I would like to read it into the record, if I may.

I am C. R. Gutermuth, vice president of the Wildlife Management Institute. The institute is one of the older national organizations, and its program has been dedicated to the restoration of natural resources in the public interest since 1911.

The institute, and the many organizations and individuals with which it cooperates, have a deep and continuing interest in wildlife matters here in North America and around the world. American interest and leadership in wildlife is beginning to be exerted in many parts of the world, and the scientific knowledge of our wildlife experts is being solicited for special studies and projects in many areas.

Dr. Gabrielson, the president of the institute, for example, also is the unsalaried president of the World Wildlife Fund, which is a national appeal to raise money to assist in special wildlife projects in North America as well as to provide some financial help in similar activities around the world.

Prince Phillip, the Duke of Edinburgh, is the president of a similar national appeal in England, and Prince Bernhard of the Netherlands is the head of the overall international wildlife organization with which all the national appeals are associated. I mention these groups and affiliations to show our very genuine interest in wildlife matters.

Wildlife scientists are seriously concerned about H.R. 1839. It is the opinion of most of the persons with whom Dr. Gabrielson and I have talked that enactment of H.R. 1839 would not be in the best public interest. The practical effect of the bill would be to grant duty-free privileges to all persons and groups who wish to import and sell animals and birds for use in exhibitions for any purpose. Its enactment would stimulate commercialization of wildlife regardless of their overall population status.

Animals now may be imported duty free by those who plan to exhibit them in zoological collections for education and scientific purposes. Importations of this kind are carefully regulated and conducted by people who know what they are doing and how to care for the animals under their control.

There is no assurance, however, that the general importation of birds and mammals will be handled in the same intelligent manner,

or that the animals will receive proper care. This bill presents the grave danger that some of the imported animals that are made available for general sale ultimately will be released and will prove to be as undesirable as the English sparrow and starling.

Agricultural and public health considerations always are paramount in propositions of this kind.

There also is much justifiable apprehension that enactment of H.R. 1839 would serve to hasten the extinction of rare and endangered species of birds and mammals in many parts of the world.

The decision by Congress, in its wisdom, not to enact H.R. 1839 would not deny any serious and well-intentioned exhibitors from acquiring the comparatively rare species of animals that they might wish for their collections. They can get them under existing law, by paying the duty, which, in our opinion, should not be the least bit objectionable from the standpoint of the preservation of the world's unique wildlife.

Rather, I would think that serious collectors would want to see the present situation continued so as to assure that the natural reservoirs of these unique wild species of birds and mammals are not dissipated by an artificial demand that may arise as the result of the enactment of H.R. 1839.

Considerable efforts are being made now to preserve and safeguard remnant populations of wildlife and to minimize the traffic in such animals as squirrel monkeys and marmosets. The pressure of commercialization already is endangering species of wildlife in Africa, the Caribbean, South America, and other parts of the world.

Relaxing the import restrictions would interfere with the essential conservation efforts that are being made to safeguard endangered animals in many parts of the world, such action, we feel sure, would endanger some of the wildlife resources that conservationists are seeking to protect and preserve.

It is our hope, Mr. Chairman, that H.R. 1839 will not be reported from committee.

Thank you.

The CHAIRMAN. Thank you very much, Mr. Gutermuth.

Any questions?

The committee will be adjourned.

(By direction of the chairman, the following is made a part of the record:)

WASHINGTON, D.C., July 22, 1963.

Senator HARRY BYRD,  
Chairman, Senate Finance Committee,  
Senate Office Building, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR BYRD: This communication is to express my views on the proposal contained in H.R. 1839 to amend the Tariff Act to permit the importation of wild birds and wild animals for exhibition without payment of tax, even though they are to be sold commercially.

There are several reasons why such legislation is not desirable:

(1) Certainly there is no reason that commercial importers of live animals should not pay a tax as is required on other types of imports.

(2) There are many excellent reasons why any change in the regulations concerning the importation of animals should be in the direction of much greater restriction and control:

(a) The danger of bringing in diseases and parasites carried by animals will be increased by any increase in the number of animals imported and lessening of strict surveillance of their condition.

(b) Throughout the world there are many examples of animals that have been imported and have become established with very detrimental results. Among those that are well known to Americans are the English sparrow and the starling. Less well known is the situation that has resulted in England from the introduction of the American gray squirrel, which has become a pest, and in Australia from the introduction of rabbits, which have done great harm. These are only a few of the great array of detrimental importations, not to mention the great harm done by insects and parasites accidentally introduced.

(c) The commercialization of animals results in great destruction of them in their native haunts, heavy mortality before they arrive in this country, and considerable waste of money by American citizens in purchasing animals that they do not know how to care for, with the resultant disappointment to the purchasers and, usually, great suffering and eventual death of the animals.

Instead of liberalizing the importation of wild animals, I strongly recommend legislation to permit the importation of only limited numbers of animals that are not in danger of extinction, such importation to be done only by qualified people having permits to engage in such importation. This legislation should provide that no animal may be imported if it was taken, transported, or possessed in violation of the laws of the country in which it originated.

I will appreciate it if you will include this statement in your official record of the hearing.

Very sincerely yours,

ERNEST P. WALKER.

P.S.—From 1913 to 1927 I was engaged in enforcing in Alaska and Arizona the laws regarding wildlife protection, and in the course of this time we had occasion to work under the provisions of the Lacey Act relating to the importation of animals. After 1927 I was in the Washington office of the Biological Survey for 3 years. Then for slightly more than 26½ years I was assistant director of the National Zoological Park and had frequent occasion to deal with people who were enforcing the Lacey Act. Since 1956 I have been engaged in a research and writing project dealing with the mammals of the world, which has further broadened my horizons.

E. P. W.

---

NATIONAL WILDLIFE FEDERATION  
Washington, D.C., July 19, 1963.

Hon. HARRY F. BYRD,  
Chairman, Senate Committee on Finance,  
New Senate Office Building, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR BYRD: It is our understanding that the Committee on Finance will hold a hearing July 23, 1963, upon H.R. 1839, to amend the Tariff Act of 1930 to provide for the free importation of wild animals and wild birds which are intended for exhibition in the United States. I should like permission to have this letter made a part of the record of the hearing.

First, I should point out that the National Wildlife Federation is a private organization which seeks to attain conservation objectives through educational means. The National Wildlife Federation has affiliates in all 50 States and the District of Columbia. These affiliates, in turn, are made up of individual conservationists who, when considered with other supporters of the National Wildlife Federation, constitute an estimated 2 million persons.

We would like to register our opposition to this proposal, which would allow duty-free entry of wild birds and animals imported specially for exhibition.

Properly accredited institutions such as public zoos already may import wild animals and birds for scientific and educational purposes and this, we believe, is as it should be. Institutions of this type provide adequate facilities and competent supervision. We would oppose the extension of this privilege to private exhibitors.

Basically, our opposition is based upon two objections. First, many commercial exhibitors of wildlife are inexperienced and negligent and their roadside "zoos" constitute a continuing problem for State wildlife agencies, which must regulate them. The National Wildlife Federation constantly receives a considerable volume of mail from people who are protesting inhumane treatment and unsanitary conditions which exist in some roadside menageries. Second, the importation of wildlife for commercial purposes is creating conservation problems in some areas

of the world. Some species are becoming endangered through live trapping for sale and exhibition.

In summary, we hope the Finance Committee will not see fit to encourage this traffic in wildlife through a favorable report on H.R. 1839.

Sincerely,

THOMAS L. KIMBALL, *Executive Director.*

KLINE CHEVROLET SALES CORP.,  
Norfolk, Va., July 18, 1908.

Hon. HARRY F. BYRD,  
*New Senate Office Building, Washington, D.C.*

MY DEAR SENATOR BYRD: I believe that House bill H.R. 1839 would be a detriment to this country and, therefore, protest its passage. Your voting against it will be appreciated.

By copy of this letter, I am requesting that protest be entered in the Record.

Kindest personal regards.

Cordially,

IRVING B. KLINE.

NEWPORT NEWS, VA., July 19, 1908.

Senator HARRY F. BYRD,  
*Chairman, Senate Committee on Finance,  
New Senate Office Building, Washington, D.C.:*

This is in protest of H.R. 1839. Bill would allow duty-free entry of wild birds and wild animals imported for exhibition. Bill would benefit those who wish to sell commercially. I feel that this would lead to exploitation of animals in countries where hunted, and could endanger our native species. I oppose bill on humane grounds. Birds and animals will be brought in improperly caged and improperly cared for. Strongly urge bill not be approved.

Mrs. FRANK R. MAILANDER.

THE IZAAK WALTON LEAGUE OF AMERICA,  
Glenview, Ill., July 22, 1908.

Subject: H.R. 1839.

Hon. HARRY F. BYRD,  
*Chairman, Finance Committee,  
U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.*

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: The Izaak Walton League of America would like to be on record with your committee as opposed to H.R. 1839, which would allow duty-free entry of wild birds and animals imported for exhibition or for sale for such purposes.

We understand that present tariff laws permit duty-free importation of such for scientific and educational purposes, by accredited institutions such as public zoos. We believe this to be sound.

However, we do not believe it to be in the public interest to encourage the importation of wild birds and animals for commercial exhibition purposes. Most of the commercial, roadside animal exhibits are disgusting to our membership, should be barred as inhumane by State law rather than encouraged.

Respectfully yours,

J. W. PENFOLD,  
*Conservation Director.*

THE NATIONAL CATHOLIC SOCIETY FOR ANIMAL WELFARE,  
Washington, D.C., July 24, 1963.

Hon. HARRY F. BYRD,  
Chairman, Senate Finance Committee,  
Old Senate Office Building, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR BYRD: The National Catholic Society for Animal Welfare opposes enactment of H.R. 1839 on the grounds that it would increase the importation of wildlife for undesirable purposes and under inhumane conditions. We refer to the exhibition of wild animals and birds in substandard zoos, including the many roadside zoos that are a disgrace to our country.

By causing increased traffic in wildlife, H.R. 1839 would also aggravate the problems of other nations that are trying to conserve their native wildlife, many species of which are being diminished at a rate that causes grave concern to conservationists throughout the world.

For a period of several years while on the staff of another organization, I inspected shipments of wild animals and birds, totaling many thousands, reaching eastern ports from many parts of the world. I consistently found that the wildlife that was easily and cheaply available to importers and commercial dealers was cheaply valued and subjected to such grossly inhumane conditions that one nation embargoed further shipments to this country until some improvement was assured. Enactment of H.R. 1839 would facilitate the activities of such dealers and contribute to a worsening of the conditions under which animals and birds are brought into this country.

We believe that enactment of H.R. 1839 is not in the public interest and we respectfully urge that it not be reported out of committee.

Sincerely yours,

HELEN E. JONES, Executive Director.

BOOTHBAY HARBOR, MAINE, July 20, 1963.

SENATOR HARRY BYRD,  
Senate Finance Committee,  
Senate Office Building, Washington, D.C.

As a biologist and conservationist I oppose H.R. 1839 providing for duty-free entrance of wild birds and animals for exhibition. With the very existence of many species threatened in all parts of the world such importation should be discouraged. I hope your committee will reject the bill

RACHEL CARSON.

(Whereupon, at 12:05 p.m., the committee adjourned, subject to call of the Chair.)