

captivity; established a state licensing program for all animals, incorporating the permit fee to raise the revenue; and would have allowed Fish and Game personnel to enter private premises without warrant to inspect or confiscate any animals found in undesirable conditions.

Through the efforts of concerned aviculturists and others, several noteworthy amendments have been made that significantly modify SB 1766, considerably reducing its threat. At the first Senate Natural Resources and Wildlife Committee hearings birds as a group were removed from those animals immediately banned, returning to the present law, wherein only certain avian agricultural pests are prohibited, except under permit. Unfortunately, Fish and Game under SB 1766 may add any bird back onto a regulatory list if the birds welfare so dictates.

In the second Senate Natural Resources and Wildlife Committee hearings an amendment to modify the marking or identification of permit animals was acquired. The original bill would have required closed-ring banding of all birds, where as now split bands may be used and only on birds requiring a permit. Closed banding could only be placed on young nestlings, whose parents desert the nest if disturbed. The amendment states birds shall be marked ". . . so as not to endanger the welfare of that animal. . . ."

Since the bill allowed Fish and Game to license all animals and put birds back on the prohibited list, contrary to statements made by Senator Behr, a debate over the inconsistencies nearly cost him his bill as it passed on a narrow 7 to 6 vote.

Passing the Senate floor on 25 to 0 vote, SB 1766 was heard August 21st, 1974 in the Assembly Committee of Natural Resources and Conservation. The issue of the constitutionality of Section 2454, to allow inspection of private residences without warrant arose resulting in a heated debate and the deletion of the entire section. The bill, which otherwise would have died, squeaked through 6 to 5.

Now before the assembly Ways and Means Committee, SB 1766 will go to the floor and finally to Governor Reagan for signature. Although the bill was not defeated, the significant amendments obtained will radically reduce the pressure to the aviculturist. A.F.A. has worked out an agreement with the author of the bill to reword or eliminate several items which will make the bill acceptable to all.

The thrust of SB 1766 is to guarantee humane treatment of all animals. In their zeal, the authors, unfamiliar with animal keeping and breeding, were unaware of our legitimate interest. The pressure brought by aviculturists produced results, without which the sun would have set on our hobby.

"We are paving the land surface of the United States at the rate of 7,000,000 acres a year. California alone is losing 375 acres a day. People are going more places, faster, but you think they might get hungry when they arrive?"

*Re-print of article appearing in
CountrySide & Small Stock Journal, vol. 58 No. 5, May-June '74*

GRIFFITH & CUNNINGHAM PREPARE ANNOTATED LIST OF BIRDS OF THE WORLD

An annotated list of the birds of the world has been prepared and distributed by Mr. Joseph G. Griffith and Mr. Michael A. Cunningham. The list was prepared following the publication of a United States Department of Interior amendment to the Lacey Act. The amendment declares that all but four species of approximately 8,650 species of birds in the world are considered to be injurious. This declaration was in complete disagreement with the previous declaration that only four species of birds are injurious.

Through extensive research, Messrs. Griffith and Cunningham have listed the birds of the world and have placed them into six different categories as follows:

1. Injurious.
2. Considered injurious but not proven.
3. Endangered.
4. Protected in the U.S. under Migratory Bird Act, and the various game laws, etc.
5. Protected in the U.S. under the same laws, but may be destroyed without permit.
6. Non-injurious.

In researching the bird list, the authors literally took residence in university, zoo, and ornithologist libraries. As an employee of the Los Angeles Zoo, Michael had access to valuable reference, and took advantage of the opportunity to research many of the countless details involved with such a monumental undertaking.

An effort not to be overlooked in the list preparation, was that of gathering the myriad stacks of rough notes and translating them into an organized typed form. This task was ably performed by the nimble mind and fingers of Michael's wife, Kathy.

A review of the list indicates a major disagreement with the U.S.D.I. stand. The authors feel the U.S.D.I. declaration is arbitrary and as such, was not reinforced with research adequate to formulate such a statement.

The authors intend to present their findings to all interested parties, both government and private, with the hope that such a list, based on extensive scientific review, will result in the exemption of many of the species from the injurious category.

Joe has had a great interest in birds since the age of nine. Walking through the fields near his childhood home in Boston, he became interested and fascinated with songs of the wild birds. Unable to answer all of his questions, his mother directed him to the local library where his curiosity could be better satisfied. "Opening that book was the biggest mistake I ever made in my life." He has been actively engaged in the study of birds, in one way or another, since that day.

Recently Joe has been appointed by the Pet Industry Joint Advisory Council (PIJAC), to serve on a four man negotiating Committee for each of the major branches of wildlife mentioned in the injurious species proposal. Mr. Griffith will serve on the committee for birds.