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INTRODUCTION

Edging Toward Extinction: A Report on the Status of Wildlife in Latin America, is the result of a three month research project undertaken on behalf of The Institute for the Study of Animal Problems (ISAP), a division of The Humane Society of the United States (HSUS). The project was a preliminary study with the following objectives. First, it provides ISAP and HSUS with a broader base of information on international matters pertaining to man's relationship with animals. Second, the report includes recommendations concerning the role which HSUS could perform within the growing international conservation movement. Third, the report may serve as a basis for a more detailed study if considered desirable.

It is the author's premise that the efforts of any U.S. or international agency — be it governmental or private — in the less developed nations can only be as effective as the contact organizations and individuals in each country. This is true whether the proposed activity is the creation of a national park to protect a nation's threatened fauna and flora, or a development project aimed at enhancing the socio-economic quality of human life. This notion is further discussed in Section III.

One of the first objectives of the project was the designation of and approach to organizations and individuals in Latin America and other countries who share HSUS's concern about wildlife and animal welfare issues in Central and South America. To this end a total of 156 questionnaires (see Appendix D) were sent to the twenty-one nations of Latin America, three to European-based organizations, and two to authorities in the United States. Additional questionnaires were enclosed in each mailing together with a request that they be forwarded to other appropriate authorities. By the end of the project period, only a limited number of completed questionnaires had been received from Latin America and Europe. Further responses are anticipated because the majority of the correspondents are known by the author to be concerned with and responsive to the issues with which the study deals. Concurrent with other research activities, twenty-two interviews were conducted in the Washington, D.C. area with officials of U.S. government agencies involved with domestic and international legislation and activities pertaining to Latin American wildlife, with representatives of private conservation organizations, some of whom operate in Latin America; with spokesmen for the pet industry; and with officials of the Organization of American States.

The questionnaire included a section on legislation and activities concerning domestic animals in Latin America. However, due to time constraints and the slow response to the questionnaire from Latin American animal welfare agencies, it was not possible to include a detailed analysis of this type in the report. Nonetheless, because of the importance of the domestic animal welfare issue in Latin America, an addenda concerning this area has been included as Appendix E.
SECTION I -
THE STATUS OF WILDLIFE IN LATIN AMERICA

A. Dimensions of the Problem

The wildlife of Latin America is as rich and diverse as the lands which comprise the 21 nations of Central and South America. Ranging from the dark beauty of the condor soaring above Andean peaks and the swift-running rhea of the Argentinian pampas to the resplendent quetzal of Central America’s cloud forests and the magnificent spotted cats that stalk the lowland tropical rain forests, each species has adapted marvelously to its particular environment. Within each ecosystem, a succession of mammals, birds, reptiles, amphibians, insects and plants interact to sustain one another in Nature’s timeless plan. However, the increasing encroachment of man and his activities now threatens the future existence of virtually all wildlife throughout Latin America.

Historically, aboriginal peoples survived by engaging in such varied activities as hunting, fishing, small-scale shifting cultivation and the harvesting of wild fruits and nuts directly from the forests and other areas in which they lived. Since habitat destruction by man was minimal and the animals were not usually hunted excessively, wildlife populations remained fairly stable.

In the years following the European arrival in the New World, habitats were burned and cleared by the colonists as a wide variety of domesticated plants and animals were introduced to the Americas. By the late 19th century, large-scale forest exploitation for timber, tannin, resins and dye wood for local and international markets led to a conspicuous alteration of Hispanic America’s environment. Profitable markets in North America and Europe encouraged the conversion of still more virgin lands were converted to the production of cash crops such as bananas, coffee, sugar cane and cotton.

In the second half of this century, the ever-increasing pressure of man’s activities is destroying the stability of wildlife populations in wilderness areas and restricting hunting by aboriginal peoples. The former seminomadic way of living man into conflict with wilderness and wildlife must be recognized before we can begin to deal with the issues of conservation and preservation in Latin America. The problems include explosive birthrates of 3.5% high unemployment, inflation, sluggish industrial growth, ownership of the most productive lands by a minority for the agricultural schemes ineffective, but the wild fauna and flora are being depleted, and they can be hunted, when they can be hunted, by what means, problems persist. While most provide penalties for violations, enforcement is at best minimal. The reasons are both obvious and real. Agencies charged with wildlife protection, which are usually under departments of renewable natural resources within federal ministries of agriculture, operate on restricted budgets and too few personnel. Well-trained enforcement officers are, for the most part, an unattainable luxury. Also, wildlife protection programs must often yield to the development schemes of the larger agricultural departments.

Another problem deals with the reality of the subsistence lifestyle of the “violators” — the peasants compelled by hunger to hunt any edible animal regardless of legally defined seasons. In many instances, the hunters are unaware of the existence of hunting laws. Even if they knew the laws, it is extremely doubtful that they would obey legislation that would keep food from their tables. In countries not generally known for the compassion of their officials, Latin America’s wildlife protection officers are aware of the realities of the subsistence lifestyle. Even modest enforcement of game laws would produce volatile social and political situations with which governments would rather not have to deal. Perhaps most tragic for both humanity and wildlife, the concept of “sustained yield” means little to the hunter dependent on wildlife as a food source; he cannot conserve for his grandchildren tomorrow what his children need today.

In addition to habitat destruction and overhunting, another problem closely associated with the depletion of wildlife populations is the collecting of live animals and their products for commerce. No one is certain how many thousands of live animals — birds, mammals, reptiles and tons upon tons of tropical fish — are exported legally and illegally from Latin America each year. These animals are purchased by private individuals as exotic pets, by both the legitimate and roadside zoos, and by biomedical research institutions. Similarly, the sale of animal products — the skins, hides, feathers, teeth and paws — is a multimillion dollar business.

Despite the ratification by 51 nations of the Convention on International Trade in Endangered Species of Wild Fauna and Flora (CITES), instituted in 1973 to control the export and import of rare and endangered animals and plants, enforcement officials and conservationists say that the volume of trafficking in animals and animal products, regardless of their legal status, continues to rise annually. According to U. S. Fish and Wildlife Service statistics, legal imports into the United States of wildlife products from around the world, such as fur coats, leather goods, carvings and jewelry, rose from 1.7 million items in 1972 to 91 million in 1976. Skins and hide imports increased from 900,000 in 1973 to 32.5 million in 1976. These figures represent only legal U.S. imports. How many live
animals and their products are imported illegally into the United States or to other countries is strictly a matter of conjecture. The people of the developed nations are the leading consumers of the world's wildlife. They are, therefore, the major supporters of the illicit smuggling trade. But in their desire to adorn themselves with furs, leathers and trinkets and the urge to satisfy a whim for an exotic pet, these people fail to comprehend the consequences of their actions. For the Latin American peasant living a marginal life, the opportunity to shoot and snare birds, mammals and reptiles represents sorely-needed income. But the hunter cares little whether the animals he seeks are pregnant females, nurseries that will die without special care, or members of species that are rare or endangered. Techniques of live capture and the ability to keep animals alive and healthy are largely unknown to the market hunter. Brutality during the procurement process is a horror about which most people remain ignorant. The wild animals that survive the burning of their habitat, the traps and the gunfire that are employed to capture them are often either beaten unconscious, bound with wire, nailed to trees or crammed into cages and boxes to restrain them until they are collected by the local buyer. Feeding is sporadic and meager and the animals are transported by any means available. Once the animals are in transit to their respective destinations, the standard of accommodations varies considerably. If the shipment is legal, the animals are generally caged and crated according to packing guidelines based on International Air Transport Association (IATA) regulations. While numerous authorities maintain that these shipping procedures are grossly inadequate, the conditions under which illegally transported animals are moved are far worse. Traffickers attempt to conceal their illegal shipments in a variety of ways which include stuffing smaller animals behind false panels in shipping crates and vehicles, burying them under legally transported articles, falsifying documents so that protected species appear as something else, and, when possible, by bribing officials at ports of exit and entry. Many animals perish and it has been estimated that as many as 75% of all animals captured die before arriving at their final destinations, and that for every animal which reaches its destination, ten others have died in both capture and transport.

As with the enforcement of game laws, official protection of wildlife against illegal trafficking activities is minimal throughout Latin America. Inadequate operating budgets, lack of trained personnel and allegations of corruption at all levels are factors which, when linked with the ingenuity of the smugglers, make the animal trafficking situation appear hopeless. With so much money at stake, it may appear naive to present moral and even ecological arguments on behalf of wildlife conservation. Can we expect the underprivileged and deprived to entertain metaphysical arguments on the commonality of life and the concept of man as a responsible steward of this planet's natural resources? At the very least, the planners and policy makers responsible for the future of their nations must be made to understand the consequences of unassessed development projects that will further disturb the already precarious balance between man and his environment. Man must realize that the preservation of the essential interdependencies of all life promotes his own well-being as well as that of other life forms. We already know that the extinction of a given species may well result in the collapse of a particular ecosystem and that there can be dangerous consequences to man, such as the rise of disease vector populations. The preservation and conservation of natural life forms must be viewed as important elements in the proper management of forestry, agriculture, water and soil resources — not as obstacles to be overcome in pursuit of irrational economic development.

B. On a Country-by-Country Basis

The following information deals with the status of Latin American wildlife on a country-by-country basis. The material which is presented was gathered from available resource materials, responses to the project questionnaire, and the author's own experiences in 13 Latin American nations. Each section details the particular country's pertinent legislation, activities of government and private agencies, national parks programs, the status of important animal species and the known extent of trade in live animals and animal products.

For additional information a listing of relevant institutions and contact personnel concerned with animal issues in Latin America is given in Appendix A. A bibliography of all the legislation pertaining to Latin America's wildlife (and domestic animals) which has been gathered to date may be found in Appendix B. A list of endangered animal species in Latin America, compiled from a variety of authoritative sources, makes up Appendix C.

Argentina

Argentina's wildlife-related legislation includes game laws regulating the seasons in which fauna may be hunted, a ban dating back to 1949 prohibiting the hunting of otters throughout the country, agreements with Peru and Bolivia regarding conservation of vicuna, and limits on the number of red deer and European wild boar which may be hunted by sportsmen. Several other laws cover the establishment and security of national parks and preserves, which are essential to the preservation of wildlife.

Argentina has signed the Convention on Nature Protection and Wild Life Preservation in the Western Hemisphere, but has not ratified the Convention on International Trade in Endangered Species of Wild Fauna and Flora.

The Department of Investigation and Protection of the National Office of Wildlife, Subsecretary of Renewable Natural Resources and Ecology, is the federal agency charged with wildlife management and protection in Argentina.

There are some seven private organizations concerned with animal welfare, although their main interests seem to center on domestic animal issues.

All of the country's wildlife may be considered threatened due to increasing encroachment on wilderness areas by man.

Among the wildlife products which Argentina exports in large quantities are the skins of otters, boa constrictors and tegu lizards. Argentina also exports live animals, including birds such as the endangered Red-capped parrot and reptiles, although precise figures are not available.

Belize

The game laws of Belize date back to 1944 when the tiny Central American nation was known as British Honduras. The wildlife protection ordinance specified which animals may be hunted with and without hunting licenses, established seasons on game animals, and made provisions on the law's enforcement. Independent since 1973, Belize is planning to implement a national parks program. An estimated 65% of the country's territory consists of tropical forests and is habitat for a rich array of wildlife.
The Department of Lands and Forests, under the Ministry of Agriculture, is responsible for wildlife matters in Belize.

To date, Belize has not ratified the Convention on Nature Protection and Wildlife Preservation in the Western Hemisphere, but has ratified the Convention on International Trade in Endangered Species of Wild Fauna and Flora. A handful of private organizations are working to improve attitudes and legislation relevant to animals.

Although development projects are less expensive in Belize than in most other Latin American countries, wildlife and their habitat should be considered threatened until comprehensive protective legislation, national parks programs, and ratification of the two Conventions mentioned above are promulgated.

The export of live animals and animal products is subject to the issuance of licenses by the Customs and Forestry departments. Traditionally, animal products — mostly skins of jaguar and caiman — from Mexico, Guatemala and Honduras have passed through Belize for onward shipment.

Bolivia

Bolivia has made numerous legislative efforts over the last 16 years to protect its wildlife and natural resources from overexploitation. Laws banning the hunting of certain animals, establishing seasons on others, and the implementation of taxes and regulations governing the use of other animal resources have all been largely ineffective. Bolivia's unstable political situation has not helped and government enforcement of wildlife protection measures has been ineffective. Laws prohibiting the hunting and trading of vicuna and members of the cat family are generally disregarded.

The Department of Wildlife, under National Parks, Hunting and Fishing, within the Center for Forestry Development, is charged with enforcement of Bolivian legislation regarding wild fauna.

Although a member nation of the Convention on Nature Protection and Wildlife Preservation in the Western Hemisphere, Bolivia has not ratified the Convention on International Trade in Endangered Species of Wild Fauna and Flora.

Private sector activities relating to animal issues were unknown when this report was compiled.

Both legal and illegal exports of animals and animal products from Bolivia include all monkey and marmoset species found within the country, crocodilians, lizards, birds and cats. Many authorities consider Bolivia to be one of the largest exporters of wild fauna in Latin America.

Brazil

Although Brazil has enacted several wildlife protection laws, including several agreements with neighboring countries, the intensive development occurring in the Amazon Basin and other parts of the country make adherence and enforcement impossible. Hunting seasons on certain species, established by the Instituto Brasileiro de Desenvolvimento (IBDF), vary among Brazil's states. Trapping, although prohibited by law, is done illegally.

Brazil has some 18 national parks and six biological preserves administered by the IBDF officials, an agency primarily concerned with forestry development. IBDF officials admit that the allotted park areas will continue to be reduced in size as development activities encroach on their perimeters.

A second system of national parks and preserves exists in Brazil and is administered by the Fundacao Nacional de Indio (FUNAI), the government agency charged with protection of Brazil's aboriginal peoples. Unfortunately, the fate of both the park areas and the Indians themselves is in question as development activities continue to claim Indian lands.

Among the numerous government agencies involved with the management and protection of wildlife in Brazil are the Special Secretariat of the Environment, under the Ministry of the Interior; a section of the National Council for Scientific and Technological Development; the Division for the Protection of Nature, under the Brazilian Institute of Forestry Development, and several other government-sponsored research organizations.

There are many private organizations concerned with animal welfare, but most are apparently involved with domestic animal matters. One, the Fundacao Brasileira para a Conservacao da Natureza, is involved with wildlife issues.

Brazil has ratified both the Convention on Nature Protection and Wildlife Preservation in the Western Hemisphere and the Convention on International Trade in Endangered Species of Wild Fauna and Flora.

According to the Special Secretariat of the Environment, no live animals may be legally exported from Brazil. Similarly, commerce in skins and other animal products is prohibited except for those derived from animals bred in captivity. Authorities say they cannot verify that animals and products for export were bred in captivity. Illegally exported items include caiman species, monkeys, jaguar, giant otter, and a wide variety of bird species. Illegally exported products are said to be received by Colombia, Peru, Bolivia, Uruguay and French Guiana whence they are usually forwarded to markets in North America and Europe.

Chile

Chile's wildlife legislation includes laws prohibiting the hunting of vicuna and birds during nesting season, the establishment of hunting seasons for wild game, and enforcement regulations. Hunting seasons generally extend from April to August, although seasons vary among species. Rabbits, hares and beavers are among the mammals which may be legally trapped. The use of steel or leg-hold traps is prohibited.

Chile has ratified both the Convention on Nature Protection and Wildlife Preservation in the Western Hemisphere and the Convention on International Trade in Endangered Species of Wild Fauna and Flora. The wildlife section of the National Forestry Corporation is charged with protection of the country's fauna.

Chile has one of the oldest national parks programs in Latin America, having designated its first area in 1925. There are at least eight private organizations which deal with the welfare of both wild and domestic animals.

Animals and animal products legally exported from Chile include rabbits, hares, foxes, nutrias and seals, most of which pass through West Germany. Illegally exported items include chinchillas, sea otters and fresh water otters which, according to some sources, exit via Argentina. Most exports, both legal and illegal, are destined for European markets.

Colombia

Although currently undergoing a full revision, Colombia's wildlife regulations include the protection of all fauna subject to hunting, trapping and commercial exploitation. In an effort to commit the nation to the rational utilization of its
renewable natural resources, the government established INDERENA, the Institute for the Development of Renewable Natural Resources, in 1968. A super-agency charged with the management of the nation's forests, fisheries, national parks programs, flora, fauna, soils and waters, INDERENA has come under attack from some conservationists and scientists for failing adequately to protect Colombia's forests and wildlife. INDERENA admittedly views the country's forests as a "cash crop" to be exploited and many are fearful that, without intensive reforestation efforts, the forests and their inhabitants will soon disappear.

Colombia has ratified the Convention on Nature Protection and Wild Life Preservation in the Western Hemisphere and, according to INDERENA officials, the country plans to ratify the Convention on International Trade in Endangered Species of Wild Fauna and Flora.

There are 24 national parks and preserves, all of which have been created in this decade.

Some four private agencies dealing with the welfare of domestic animals are located in Colombia's major urban centers.

Before the government ban on the exportation of live animals and animal products in 1974, Leticia, a city of some 14,000 residents situated on the Amazon River in southern Colombia, was one of Latin America's main trading centers. Five years later it remains one of the region's most important conduits for illegal trafficking. Although there is an INDERENA office in Leticia, blackmarket activities in the animal trade persist. According to authoritative sources in Leticia, average skin prices paid by dealers from North America and Europe are $65 for ocelot, $100 for jaguar, and $50 for margay. Live animals are less expensive than skins due to curing costs. Prices for live primates are $43 - $90 for an immature Capuchin monkey, $90 for a wooly monkey, $30 - $45 for a squirrel monkey, and $30 - $60 for a marmoset. Live tropical birds range from $150 - $300 for a macaw, $60 - $150 for an Amazonian green parrot (more if tamed), and $75 for a toucan.

In addition to the lucrative sale of skins, hides, tropical fish and live animals for the pet and zoo trades, more than one million primates were exported from the country between 1953 and 1974 to laboratories in North America and Europe for cancer and other biomedical research activities.

Barranquilla, on Colombia's northern coast, is another town through which illegal animal trafficking is said to flourish. Countries receiving illegally exported wildlife and animal products from Colombia include Panama, the Netherlands, Japan, West Germany, Spain, Italy and the United States.

Costa Rica

Although Costa Rica has one of the most progressive wildlife protection and national parks programs in Latin America, authorities say that the high rate of development in tropical forest areas accounts for the country's rapidly declining wildlife populations. Passed in 1970, the Conservation of Wildlife Law establishes hunting seasons for the country's game animals, confers upon the Ministry of Agriculture and Cattle Ranching the responsibility for the management and protection of Costa Rica's wildlife, and establishes the national parks and preserves program. The nation's wildlife regulations are currently being revised.

In addition to the National Parks Service, there is a Wildlife Division which also deals with wildlife matters. Both agencies are under the mandate of the Ministry of Agriculture and Cattle Ranching.

A nongovernment institution, the Tropical Agronomy Center for Research and Teaching (CATIE), located in Turrialba, Costa Rica, includes a Wildlands Management Unit within the organization's Forestry Department. The Wildlands Management Unit offers technical assistance to many Latin American countries on wildlife management and national parks planning and management. Several other private agencies deal with animal welfare issues in Costa Rica, including an Audubon Society chapter in the nation's capital, San José.


Before a vigorous government crackdown around 1975, smuggling of wildlife and animal products was a serious problem in Costa Rica. Today, according to government officials and conservationists, virtually no animals or products are exported from the country. Those caiman and cat skins which do leave Costa Rica are said to exit to Nicaragua.

Ecuador

Ecuador's Forestry and Agricultural Development Law includes regulations on hunting and game animals. In 1969, the country first prohibited the export of wild animals. The Wildlife Protection Law, implemented in 1970, establishes guidelines for commerce in wild species, while the national parks and preserves act was enacted in 1971. The Wildlife Section of the General Office of Forestry Development, under the Ministry of Agriculture and Cattle Ranching, is charged with protecting Ecuador's fauna.

Ecuador currently has six national parks, including the Galapagos Islands National Park and three areas in the country's Amazon Basin region. Despite having ratified both the Convention on Nature Protection and Wild Life Preservation in the Western Hemisphere and the Convention on International Trade in Endangered Species of Wild Fauna and Flora, Ecuador, like that of other Amazon Basin countries, faces a threat to its wildlife through development activities.

Several private organizations concerned with animal issues operate in the country, including a national branch of the World Wildlife Fund.

In 1977, the government issued regulations governing the export of wild animals and their products. Based on current information, it can only be determined that sea turtles are illegally exported from Ecuador. Legally exported animals include birds and mammals which are shipped to the United States, West Germany and the Netherlands.

El Salvador

The only law on wildlife or conservation shown in the Index to Latin American Legislation for El Salvador is one enacted in 1977 prohibiting the utilization in any way of turtles and their eggs. (Laws are listed daily in the country's Diario Oficial.)

El Salvador, with less than 3% of its densely populated territory forested, has an extensive list of threatened endangered, and extinct species. The Parks and Wildlife Department is charged with the protection of the nation's fauna and habitats. Although it has ratified the Convention on Nature Protection and Wild Life Preservation in the Western Hemisphere, El Salvador has not ratified the Convention on International Trade in Endangered Species of Wild Fauna and Flora.
Among the animal products exported from El Salvador are live iguanas and the skins of boa constrictors. It is unclear from the information available whether these exports originated in El Salvador or were forwarded, legally or illegally, from another country.

French Guiana

A department of the Republic of France, French Guiana is subject to the laws of the motherland, according to the Embassy of France. Specific regulations governing hunting and other wildlife matters were unavailable at the time of writing. It is presumed that the Departmental Office of Agriculture manages wildlife affairs in French Guiana, but to date no responses to inquiries have been received.

France has not ratified the Convention on Nature Protection and Wild Life Preservation in the Western Hemisphere, but did ratify the Convention on International Trade in Endangered Species of Wild Fauna and Flora with the reservation that it may import as many crocodile and turtle products as it wishes.

It is known that French Guiana exports the skins of crocodiles and caimans. In 1978, the United States imported more than 11,500 caiman and crocodile skins from French Guiana. Other export information was unavailable at the time of writing.

Guatemala

Guatemala’s hunting laws were enacted in 1971 to protect 16 endangered species of mammals and birds. The widespread destruction of habitat and inadequate reforestation efforts have greatly diminished the range of forest dwelling species in Guatemala. Despite their protected status, the majority of the country’s wildlife are nonetheless subject to hunting pressures. The only protected species not hunted is the quetzal bird, but widespread clearing of its forest habitat contributes to the dwindling population trend.

Guatemala’s National Parks Service maintains protected areas and manages the country’s wildlife populations.

Several private organizations and the University of San Carlos in Guatemala City are involved in welfare issues concerning the country’s wildlife and domestic animals.

Although Guatemala is a member of the Convention on Nature Protection and Wild Life Preservation in the Western Hemisphere, it has not ratified the Convention on International Trade in Endangered Species of Wild Fauna and Flora.

Among the species legally and illegally exported by Guatemala, both alive and for their products, are boa constrictors and a variety of other snakes, iguanas, jaguar, ocelots, margay and numerous species of birds. Puerto Barrios, on the Caribbean coast of Guatemala, is said to be an important conduit for illegal animal trafficking from Guatemala and other neighboring Latin American countries.

Guyana

Legislation found to date on Guyana’s wildlife dates back to the period prior to the nation’s independence from Great Britain. Some sources say that Guyana is formulating new laws to deal with wildlife and national parks, but at the time of writing, no information has been received from correspondents in Guyana.

Government agencies known to deal with wildlife matters in Guyana are the Ministry of Agriculture, the Guyana Museum and Zoological Park, and the Faculty of Natural Sciences of the University of Guyana. No information was available on private sector activities.


No information was available to aid in distinguishing which species and animal products are exported either legally or illegally. Several Latin American countries and conservationists have alleged that Guyana serves as a conduit for illegal animal trafficking. Statistics published by the Wildlife Permit Office of the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service list Guyana and Surinam as the countries of origin for three shipments of caiman skins in 1977 totalling 6,643 specimens.

Honduras

The six-year old Department of Renewable Natural Resources, under the Ministry of Natural Resources, includes units concerned with wildlife, ecology and fisheries. Members of the Wildlife Unit work on the formulation of protective legislation for wildlife and their habitat. Marine turtles are protected by law, although enforcement is so poor that large numbers of turtles and their eggs are taken annually. In 1977, the legal sale of live cats and their skins was banned.

The Wildlife Unit has recently conducted an inventory of 14 prospective national park sites. Honduras’ first national park may soon be created on 7,000 hectares of cloud forest at La Tigre near Tegucigalpa, the nation’s capital. A long-range plan exists for the creation of a wildlife refuge in the Rio Platano region of Colon and Gracias a Dios departments.

No information regarding organizations concerned with animal issues was available at the time of writing.

Honduras has not ratified the Convention on Nature Protection and Wild Life Preservation in the Western Hemisphere or the Convention on International Trade in Endangered Species of Wild Fauna and Flora.

While the export of live animals and their products is believed to be minimal, some smuggling is said to occur from the Mosquitia, a wilderness area in northeastern Honduras rich in caiman, boa constrictors, jaguar, ocelot, and birds of prey. In 1977, Honduras legally exported 618 live iguanas and 68 live boa constrictors to the United States. Export figures to other countries are unavailable.

Mexico

Although Mexico’s federal hunting and game laws are among the oldest and most thorough in Latin America, enforcement is a serious problem. With one of the highest birthrates in the world, Mexico’s people continue to move into the nation’s wild areas in search of land and food. Animals, such as the tapir, which are protected year round, are nonetheless hunted for their meat. Foreign sportsmen continue to seek trophies in Mexico with the result that jaguar and other endangered species are still hunted, both within the legal seasons established by the government and illegally. Mexico is said to be redrafting its wildlife laws. The 1936 Convention for the Protection of Migratory Birds and Game Mammals between Mexico and the United States, supplemented by the addition of 32 phylogenetic families in 1972, remains in effect.

The Ministry of Agriculture’s Subsecretary of Forestry and Fauna is charged with managing and protecting the nation’s wildlife. Other government agencies
and institutions, such as the Natural History Museum of Mexico City and various universities, conduct research on wildlife problems. There are 47 national parks and preserves in the country.

Mexico has ratified the Convention on Nature Protection and Wild Life Preservation in the Western Hemisphere and is said to be near to ratifying the Convention on International Trade in Endangered Species of Wild Fauna and Flora.

More than a dozen private animal welfare organizations operate through Mexico, but their activities appear to be concerned mainly with domestic animal issues.

In addition to the hunting of jaguar, both legally and illegally, Mexico exports raw skins, hides and manufactured animal products such as watchbands, shoes, handbags and belts fashioned from crocodilians, iguanas and other lizards. Sea turtles and parrots are among the many other animals that are exported, legally and illegally, from Mexico.

Nicaragua

Nicaragua's hunting legislation, enacted in 1956, was updated in 1972 to establish seasons on most wildlife and prohibit indefinitely the hunting of those species which are most endangered (however, members of the cat family remain on the seasons list). In early 1977, legislation was passed prohibiting the hunting and capture of certain animal species for commercial purposes. Exploitation of other species is still permitted on a seasonal basis. The same law prohibited the exportation of turtle eggs for a ten year period. Despite the 1977 legislation, many rare animal species can still be hunted and trapped legally. Nicaragua lists 14 mammals and 17 birds as being in danger of extinction as development of the country's eastern tropical forests continues to destroy wildlife habitat.

The Wildlife Department of the Ministry of Agriculture is responsible for the management and protection of Nicaragua's wildlife. However, with three distinct government agencies responsible for the utilization of natural resources, and virtually no coordination among them, wildlife is often the loser to forestry, water, cattle ranching and agrocolonization projects.

A National Parks Service, under the natural resources agency CATAS-TRO, has designated an area in the tropical forest region of northeastern Nicaragua as a protected area which may become a national park. Existing parks in the country focus on Nicaragua's numerous volcanos, some of which include cloud forests. Nicaragua has ratified both the convention on Nature Protection and Wild Life Preservation in the Western Hemisphere and the Convention on International Trade in Endangered Species of Wild Fauna and Flora.

Although no records of Nicaragua's exporting of live animals or their products was available at the time of writing, both neighboring Honduras and Costa Rica maintain that animals from their respective countries are exported illegally through Nicaragua.

Panama

Panama's 1967 game laws, which provide for the protection of 17 species of animals, are currently being updated by officials of RENARE, the Department of Renewable Natural Resources, under the mandate of the Ministry of Agriculture. Most edible birds, mammals and reptiles are theoretically protected by law, however, hunting pressures are high and enforcement is said to be nonexistent. Members of the cat family — viewed by farmers and ranchers as a threat to their livestock — are not protected. At the public market in Panama City, jaguar skins sell for about $50 dollars each.

Panama's first national park was created in late 1978 in an effort to protect the main watershed around the Panama Canal's Gatun Lake from deforestation by peasants seeking new homesteads. Plans are also underway to establish Frontier National Park in Darien Province adjacent to the Colombian border. In the Canal Zone there are two biological preserves, Barro Colorado Island in Gatun Lake, administered by the Smithsonian Tropical Research Institute, and Madden Forest Reserve near Panama City.

In addition to the work of RENARE, the Museum of Natural Sciences conducts research projects relating to Panama's wildlife and their habitats.

Private organizations involved with wildlife issues include the Panama Audubon Society and the Sociedad Amigos de la Naturaleza.


Despite its ratification of CITES, Panama is still reputed to be one of Latin America's major stopovers for illegally exported live animals and animal products. When asked which species of animals are illegally exported from Panama, one official simply replied, "You name it." Parrots and other birds, all species of monkeys, a wide variety of crocodilians, iguanas and other reptiles, turtle products and virtually any mammal that can be caught, skinned and transported are smuggled out of Panama to markets in the United States, Japan and Europe. In 1977, part of Panama's legal exports to the United States included more than 245 live baby caimans, 371 live baby boa constrictors, 3500 live baby iguanas and 350 watchbands made from caiman hides.

Paraguay

With no response to the project questionnaire received at the time of writing, the only existing hunting or conservation law located for Paraguay in the Index to Latin American Legislation (1950 - 1979) was a decree regulating the hunting of certain species of wild fowl.

It is known that a National Parks and Wildlife division exists within the Department of Forestry Management.

To date there is no information on private sector agencies dealing with wildlife or domestic animal matters.

Paraguay has ratified the Convention on Nature Protection and Wild Life Preservation in the Western Hemisphere as well as the Convention on International Trade in Endangered Species of Wild Fauna and Flora.

U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service records show that in 1978, 9000 iguana skins were imported into the United States from Paraguay. It is also known that snake skins are exported.

Peru

Peru's forestry and wildlife law, enacted in 1975, prohibits the hunting of a variety of endangered species, including jaguar and tapir, and establishes hunting seasons on other species such as capybara, white-lipped and white-collared peccaries and brockett deer. (As in most other Latin American nations, the more than 50 aboriginal Indian tribes of Peru's Amazon basin are not required to abide
by the hunting laws.) Some Peruvian officials maintain that the nation's wildlife and its habitat are not currently threatened because of the lack of intensive development efforts throughout the country. Other authorities, however, maintain that Peru is a major source and conduit of illegally exported animals and animal products.

The Conservation Branch of the General Office of Forestry and Fauna in the Ministry of Agriculture is responsible for the protection and management of Peru's wildlife.

A national parks program was instituted in Peru in 1968, although some areas were designated as protected as early as 1961. Peru currently has five national parks, four national reserve areas and two national sanctuaries. An additional two parks, two national reserves and three national sanctuaries are planned.

In addition to bilateral conservation agreements with other countries whose territories contain expanses of the Amazon basin, Peru has ratified both the Convention on Nature Protection and Wild Life Preservation in the Western Hemisphere and the Convention on International Trade in Endangered Species of Wild Fauna and Flora.

Two private agencies work with domestic animal welfare issues, and there is also a national branch of the World Wildlife Fund in Peru.

As has been noted, Peru is reputed to be an important stopover and source country for a wide variety of smuggled wildlife and animal products. Two Amazon basin towns, Iquitos and Pucallpa, are said to be major collection and distribution points for virtually every animal species found in the region's tropical rain forests. While documentation on legally exported animals shows few exports — e.g., 50 tamarins exported to the United States in 1977 — illegally exported mammals, reptiles, birds and insects are conservatively said to number in the tens of thousands.

Surinam

No information on Surinam's wildlife legislation was received by the time of writing. A territory of the Netherlands, Surinam is known to have a Ministry of Agriculture in which an office of Animal Husbandry and Fisheries operates. Conceivably, this office is also involved with wildlife matters. A private agency, the Foundation of Nature Preservation in Surinam (STINASU) is known to operate within the country.

The Netherlands, despite its interests in Surinam, has not ratified the Convention on Nature Protection and Wild Life Preservation in the Western Hemisphere.

Neither has the Dutch government ratified the Convention on International Trade in Endangered Species of Wild Fauna and Flora.

While the exact extent of legal and illegal animal exports from Surinam is not presently known, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service statistics show that in 1977, the United States imported more than 6,643 caiman hides shipped jointly from Surinam and Guyana. How much of Surinam's wildlife trafficking is channeled through the Netherlands is unclear at this time.

Uruguay

Uruguay's wildlife legislation regulates the hunting, exploitation and sale of all native and migratory species. Over the years, laws have been enacted to protect ostriches, waterfowl, otter, foxes and wolves throughout the country.

In 1970, the National Parks and Wildlife Service was created within the jurisdiction of the Forestry Office. In the same year the Office of Legal Control was established within the Ministry of Livestock and Agriculture to implement “management” plans for the nation's wildlife.

Two private organizations are involved with animal welfare issues in Uruguay.


While exact numbers on Uruguay's export of wildlife and animal products are not readily available, one authority has said that the country's wildlife export figures were so large that they could not be enumerated by Uruguayan officials.

One figure available from the U.S. Department of the Interior shows that in 1978 the U.S. shoe industry imported 5,158 boa constrictor skins from Uruguay.

Venezuela

Wildlife legislation enacted by Venezuela in 1970 established seasons and other restrictions on the hunting and commercial utilization of wildlife by all but the aboriginal peoples living in the Orinoco River basin.

Three government agencies, the National Wildlife Council, the National Center of Wildlife Investigation (under the Ministry of Agriculture) and the Ministry of Environment and Renewable Natural Resources, deal with matters concerning the nation's wildlife. Due to minimal efforts to develop Venezuela's southern region, there are relatively few pressures on wild animal species in that area.

Venezuela has 24 national parks and natural monuments. In addition to government agencies, there are six private organizations which deal with wildlife and domestic animal issues.


While information relating to the export of wildlife and animal products had not been received at the time of this writing, it is known that Venezuela legally exports caiman and crocodile hides.
SECTION II —
INTERNATIONAL AND UNITED STATES ACTIVITIES AND LAWS CONCERNING LATIN AMERICAN WILDLIFE

A. International Activities and Laws

The first people to wonder at the wildlife of Latin America were those who migrated from Asia through North America and into Central and South America. They marveled at the animals and, in addition to utilizing those that provided food, clothing and adornment, they incorporated the most strange and colorful creatures into their beliefs. Then, almost four centuries ago, a new influx of immigrants began. Searching for wealth and renown, the adventurers — the Spanish and Portuguese followed by the Dutch and the English — told tales not only of dazzling treasures and enticing new lands, but of animals unknown to European man. It was not long before the naturalists began their explorations, breathlessly collecting, cataloging and sketching the life of the tropical rain forests, the savannas, and the Andean highlands.

Centuries later man knows more about Latin America’s wildlife. At the same time we realize how much more there is to learn before man can claim to understand the intricate workings among these life forms. One thing we do understand now is that due to man’s everincreasing encroachment on wildlife habitat and his ceaseless exploitation of the animals themselves, the future of Latin American fauna is in question.

In less than four hundred years — a very short span of time from an evolutionary viewpoint — man’s question has changed from ‘what is it?’ to ‘how can we save it?’ The problem of disappearing species is one that is now being considered on a global scale. In response to this and corresponding questions, international organizations and laws have been formed which, ideally, support national and regional efforts to address the problems. The following is a survey of some major international activities and laws which, in addition to their broader range of considerations, address the problems confronting the wildlife of Latin America.

The Convention on International Trade in Endangered Species of Wild Fauna and Flora (CITES) is the first major international attempt to preserve endangered wildlife and plants. Initiated in 1973, CITES establishes a system of import, export and reexport regulations designed to prevent the commercial overexploitation of animal and plant species considered to be endangered.

CITES views the protection of wild animals and plants from the standpoint of how trade — the import, export or reexport — of a given species would effect its status in its native country. Under the terms of CITES, “trade” includes all international shipments, whether private, commercial, scientific or other. Also included are marine mammals imported from the high seas. “Species” is defined to include “any species, subspecies, or geographically separate population thereof,” thereby recognizing the problem that a particular subspecies might nevertheless face extinction although the species itself is not threatened.

CITES recognizes that many species need protection now, while safeguards are urgently required to protect others which could be threatened by rising demands. Wild fauna and flora are listed in three appendices to CITES and are accorded varying degrees of protection depending upon their appendix listing. Appendix I lists species which face extinction and are, or may be, affected by trade. Appendix II includes species which, although not presently threatened with extinction, may become so if trade were not carefully regulated to prevent their overexploitation. This appendix also lists other species which closely resemble those in need of protection. Appendix III represents a special category in which any party-country can list indigenous animal or plant species that are protected domestically but which also require international protection. In addition to formal meetings of CITES parties held every few years, there are provisions for submitting amendments to the document’s appendices. Parties can also enter a “reservation” on a species which means that they will be treated as nonparties regarding trade in that particular species.

Some 982 species of wild animals and plants have been listed as endangered by the 51 nations which have ratified CITES.

Among the problems confronting member-parties of CITES is that, while most exporting nations have regulations, importing nations may have none. Thus, the problems which the source countries have in enforcing laws and monitoring the flow of animal exports are aggravated by the worldwide demand for animal products which encourages smuggling and discourages effective controls. Another problem is the reservation clause, a diplomatic nicety, which enables a country to be both a CITES member as well as a consumer of whatever animal products mean profitable business to special interests.

The Convention on Nature Protection and Wild Life Preservation in the Western Hemisphere, implemented in 1940 under the auspices of the Pan American Union, provides for the conservation of species and genera of flora and fauna native to the Americas in their natural habitats. The Convention also promulgates the creation of national parks and preserves as well as the preservation of nature monuments, strict wilderness preserves and migratory birds. The control of international trade of specially protected species of wildlife is also provided for in Article IX by requiring a certificate of lawful exportation from the country of origin.

With the majority of Western Hemisphere nations having ratified the Convention, many conservation-minded scientists and planners sought stricter adherence to the substance of the agreement in recent years.

The Convention Between the United States of America and The United Mexican States For the Protection of Migratory Birds and Game Mammals, implemented in 1936, permits under regulation the rational use of certain migratory birds; provides for enactment of laws and regulations to protect birds by establishing closed seasons and refuge zones; prohibits the killing of insectivorous birds, except by permit when they are deemed detrimental to agriculture; and provides for the enactment of regulations on transportation of game mammals across the United States-Mexican border. The United States implemented the treaty by amending the Migratory Bird Treaty Act of 1918, an agreement between the United States and Great Britain (acting for Canada), which established regulations regarding the exploitation of migratory birds.

The Man and the Biosphere Program (MAB) was begun in 1970 under the auspices of United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (UNESCO). Intergovernmental in structure and oriented towards the management of problems arising from the interactions between man’s activities and natural systems, MAB activities cover 14 international projects including tropical forests,
temperate forests, grazing lands, arid zones, fresh water, mountains, islands, biophere reserves, pesticides/fertilizer, engineering works, urban ecosystems, demographic change, perception of environmental quality and pollution.

Certain of these project areas have particular relevance to the status of wildlife in Latin America. MAB’s tropical forest project involves studying and documenting the ecological effects of increasing human activities on tropical and subtropical forest ecosystems. The biosphere reserve project promotes the conservation of national areas and the genetic diversity they contain. The ongoing results of the MAB projects, may help alleviate the pressures being exerted on wildlife habitat throughout Latin America.

The International Union for the Conservation of Nature and Natural Resources (IUCN), is an international organization whose activities concern Latin America’s wildlife and the preservation of its habitat. With headquarters in Morges, Switzerland, IUCN is a private organization which studies and monitors changes in global environment due to human activities. Included among IUCN’s many works are the in-process World Conservation Strategy, which seeks to establish priorities for the protection of representative samples of ecosystems and their inhabitants; the Commission on National Parks and Protected Areas (CNPPA), which is reviewing the status of protected areas throughout the world; the Trade Records Analysis of Flora and Fauna in Commerce (TRAFFIC), which monitors and makes recommendations regarding international trade of wild animals and plants; and the maintenance of the Red Data Book, which lists those species of animals and plants which are considered endangered, rare or vulnerable.

The World Wildlife Fund, with international headquarters in Morges, Switzerland, works closely with its national affiliates throughout the world. In addition to the World Wildlife Fund-U.S., which funds numerous research projects relating to wildlife and their habitat in Latin America, there is a national branch, PRODENA-WWF, in Peru.

The International Society for the Protection of Animals (ISPA), with its main office in London and field office, in Massachusetts and West Germany, is active in promoting animal welfare activities throughout Latin America. In addition to conducting animal rescue projects where dams have flooded vast areas of jungle, ISPA officials consult with representatives of Latin American governments and private animal welfare agencies on matters concerning both wildlife and domestic animals. ISPA is planning to open a field office in Bogota, Colombia, and another in either Buenos Aires, Argentina, or Sao Paulo, Brazil.

The World Federation for the Protection of Animals (WFPA), located in Zurich, Switzerland, has council members and regional correspondents from around the world. Working in cooperation with the International Society for the Protection of Animals, the two organizations undertook a global survey in 1977 on animal protection legislation and slaughter, but the response to the project questionnaire was disappointing (only one response was received from Latin America). Nonetheless, WFPA continues to work with numerous private animal welfare organizations in Latin America as well as with international bodies whose concerns include Central and South America.

B. United States Activities and Laws

Despite an exhaustive battery of legislation designed to protect international wildlife, adherence to the major international conventions on wildlife protection and commerce, and conservation and protection activities by both a vigorous private sector and various government-sponsored agencies, the United States is the world’s largest importer of wildlife and animal products. U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service statistics show that in 1977 the United States imported 100 million fish, 200,000 reptiles, 100,000 mammals and many thousands of exotic birds. But even the seemingly insatiable demand for live animals is surpassed by the volume of trade in wildlife products — the coats, shoes, belts, watchbands, jewelry and other accessories made from the skins, hides, teeth and other parts of the world’s wildlife.

The Lacey Act: At the end of the last century man began to understand that his activities were responsible for the extinction of scores of wildlife species around the world. Concerned about the recent extermination of the passenger pigeon and the depletion of other species due to excessive market hunting, the U.S. Congress passed the Lacey Act in 1900. This was an early effort to prevent further depletion of wildlife resources, and hence extinctions. The Lacey Act sought to bolster the wildlife conservation laws of the states and to protect agriculture and horticulture by banning the importation of certain species of wildlife deemed to be detrimental to agriculture. On the conservation side, the Lacey Act supplemented state laws for the protection of game and birds, with the added dimension of implementing regulations regarding their use in interstate commerce. The “importation of injurious wildlife” provisions of the Act did not cover “natural history specimens for museums or scientific collections” nor did the Act consider the destructive effects that the importation of wildlife products had on wildlife populations.

Over the years various amendments to the Lacey Act expanded the provisions of the original legislation to include broader interpretations of both native and injurious wildlife. But it is only since 1969 that the movement to protect endangered wildlife species, both in the United States and abroad, began to gain momentum. While the Lacey Act was an important first step, it is limited in both the species of wildlife it protects and the kind of protection it offers.

The Endangered Species Act: The passage of The Endangered Species Act of 1973 was the culmination of numerous attempts by private and government agencies to have substantial legislation enacted to cover both domestic and foreign species of wildlife. The 1973 Act has two antecedents: The Endangered Species Conservation Act of 1969 was the culmination of numerous attempts by private and government agencies to have substantial legislation enacted to cover both domestic and foreign species of wildlife. The 1969 Act prohibited the importation into the United States of such threatened species, except for certain limited purposes such as zoological, educational and scientific activities. It also strengthened the domestic provisions of the 1966 Act and also authorized the listing of wildlife “threatened with world wide extinction.” Furthermore, the 1969 Act prohibited the importation into the United States of such threatened species, except for certain limited purposes such as zoological, educational and scientific activities and captive breeding for the preservation of species. The 1969 Act also amended section 3 of the Lacey Act to expand the scope of the ban on interstate and foreign commerce in unlawfully obtained wild animals and birds to include reptiles, amphibians, mollusks and crustaceans.

The Endangered Species Conservation Act of 1969 also authorized consultation through the U.S. Department of the Interior (DOI), in cooperation with the U.S. Department of State, with foreign countries to determine which species of foreign wildlife were threatened. The intention was to encourage foreign governments to provide protection for their native endangered species (and to take
steps to prevent additional species from becoming endangered, to provide technical assistance to other countries for the development and implementation of protection programs, and to promulgate bilateral and multilateral treaties for the protection of endangered wildlife. To this end, the 1969 Act directed the departments of the Interior and State to promote an international ministerial meeting for the purpose of implementing “a binding international convention on the conservation of endangered species.” The agreement which this meeting produced was the basis of the Convention on International Trade in Endangered Species of Wild Fauna and Flora (CITES), which is discussed earlier in this section.

The Endangered Species Act of 1973, which repealed the Endangered Species Conservation Act of 1969 and amended the Endangered Species Preservation Act of 1966, also implemented CITES. In addition to implementing CITES, the 1973 Act directs the President to implement the 1940 Convention on Nature Protection and Wildlife Preservation in the Western Hemisphere. The 1973 Act also directs the DOI to encourage foreign nations to implement their own endangered species protection programs and authorizes the granting of U.S. financial and wildlife personnel assistance to achieve these ends. Under the Act, the DOI is also authorized to conduct law enforcement investigations and research in consort with foreign countries.

While it is recognized that U.S. control over activities injurious to wildlife carried out by foreign countries is limited, the 1973 Act not only prohibits the importation of endangered and threatened wildlife species through U.S. adherence to CITES, it also stipulated that the actions of the U.S. government may not imperil the continued existence of endangered or threatened species in foreign countries.

A few years later, taking this facet of the 1973 Act at face value, several private U.S. conservation groups brought suit against the U.S. government over the assistance which it was providing to Panama for the construction of the Pan American Highway through the rain forests of the country's Darien Province. The effects of the highway, the groups argued, would not only be injurious to Panama's wildlife, but could permit the spread of foot-and-mouth disease to Central and North America through the transport of infected livestock.

As a result of this and other actions, an amendment was added to the Foreign Assistance Act in 1977 which required that any development projects funded and administered by the U.S. government must provide environmental impact statements showing that the planned activities will not be ecologically damaging to the nations involved. Even broadly interpreted, this provision could include adverse affects upon endangered wildlife species and their habitat.

By 1978 the World Bank, funded in part by the United States, had also included provisions for environmental impact analyses in its mandate.

U.S. Department of the Interior (DOI): Both the National Park Service and the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service are agencies of the DOI which work with Latin American governments. The National Park Service funds the Division of International Park Affairs which provides consultation to foreign governments concerning national parks and preserves and other critical habitats of wildlife. The DOI's Fish and Wildlife Service funds: a) the Office of International Affairs, which consults with foreign nations on matters pertaining to wildlife protection and management; b) the Division of Law Enforcement, whose agents enforce federal laws regarding hunting and the importation of foreign animals and animal products; c) the Federal Wildlife Permit Office, which issues or denies permits for the importation of foreign species of wildlife and animal products and serves as a management authority on U.S. laws and the importation of foreign species; and d) the Endangered Species Scientific Authority (ESSA), an autonomous authority created in 1977 whose duties include advising the Federal Wildlife Permit Office on matters concerning the import and utilization of endangered species of animals and plants.

Enforcement of wildlife legislation is done by agents and inspectors of the Division of Law Enforcement with assistance from Customs and other federal agencies. The U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service has designated eight ports of entry for the importation of wildlife and animal products: Miami, New York, Chicago, San Francisco, Los Angeles, New Orleans, Seattle and Honolulu, with most of the legally imported Latin American wildlife and animal products entering the United States at Miami. While the designation of the eight ports of entry was made because of the small number of agents and inspectors, customs officials halt those unauthorized shipments of wildlife which they catch at other ports. There are only six wildlife law enforcement agents at New York, and fewer in Miami. Although import and export forms are collected and kept at the ports of entry, they have not been monitored and tallied on a national scale since 1972, according to an official of the ESSA. ESSA is presently undertaking the implementation of a computerized monitoring system.

During the period of October 1, 1976, to September 30, 1977, 1,205 cases involving wildlife importation violations (from all countries) were compiled by the Division of Law Enforcement. Agents seized some 21,110 specimens which the importers conservatively estimated at a value of $209,571. Despite enforcement efforts, it is widely known—if not accepted—that a considerable amount of wildlife traffic enters the United States illegally. The lack of funding for additional enforcement personnel is considered to be the major stumbling block to curtailing illegal entries. One government official, pessimistic about the future of world wildlife, maintained that as long as there is a large market for wild animals and their products, traffic will continue to “move freely.” There is also a feeling among government officials that environmentalists in the private sector expect dramatic results from federal agencies charged with stemming the flow of illegal imports. Noting the agency's inability to “perform miracles,” government authorities say that the private agencies criticize the government for not having the information which they themselves do not have. Although the government finds itself accused of being both ineffectual and too strident by disparate wildlife interests, it is trying, nonetheless, to improve its monitoring and enforcement capacities.

The U.S. Department of State has several activities which concern Latin America's wildlife. These include the operations of the Bureau of Oceans and International Environmental and Scientific Affairs; the Man and the Biosphere Program office, which liaises with UNESCO's international program; and the environmental review activities of potential projects before the Bureau of Latin American and Caribbean Affairs.

Other Organizations: Among U.S. government-funded activities which involve the status of wildlife in Latin America are the Smithsonian Institution's Office of Biological Conservation in Washington, D.C., and the Smithsonian Tropical Research Institute in Panama, which conducts a wide variety of research projects relating to the wildlife of the humid tropics.

The Peace Corps continues to provide personnel who work with officials of departments of renewable natural resources and national parks programs.
throughout Latin America, although the highly acclaimed technical assistance program operated in conjunction with the Smithsonian Institution was terminated in 1978.

Despite the desire and effort to provide effective assistance on matters regarding the problems of wildlife in Latin America, the personnel of relevant U.S. government agencies are generally frustrated by the magnitude of the problems and a lack of both adequate funding and staffing. As the number and complexity of federal and international laws grow, additional monies and manpower are required for full compliance. However, the monitoring and enforcement of legislation suffer from a serious shortage of both.

Non-Government Organizations (NGO): The majority of the numerous private sector conservation and animal welfare organizations in the United States limit their activities to domestic concerns. Essentially, the reasons for this restriction have to do with inadequate funding, the attention required by problems within the United States, and what one U.S.-based conservationist terms “the enormity and seemingly hopeless plight of wildlife in the less developed countries.”

Of those NGO’s that do operate outside the United States, their international programs are for the most part narrow extensions of the organization’s domestic activities. This is not to say that their activities are either token or ineffectual. International conservation activities, such as the funding and legal assistance made available for the creation of national parks in other countries by such organizations as the World Wildlife Fund-U.S. and The Nature Conservancy not only result in tangible results, but are important in developing the credibility and recognition by government and private wildlife agencies located in the host countries.

Because the destruction of habitat is the major threat to wildlife in Latin America, NGO assistance with land acquisitions for national parks and preserves is of primary importance. However, as discussed earlier, neither a national park nor a federal statute is assurance that wildlife can be protected. Among the impeded activities which require increased support from the NGO’s are public education programs, such as those promoted by the Rare Animal Relief Effort (RARE) in Surinam and other countries.

Another crucial endeavor to which the NGO’s can contribute is the increased production of educational films and literature concerning the plight of wildlife in the less developed countries and the ways in which the United States, through its private business sector, encourages habitat destruction and trafficking in wildlife and animal products. While several private conservation organizations currently produce outstanding materials, such as the National Wildlife Federations’ magazine, International Wildlife, increased efforts are needed to stimulate public awareness in the United States and other developed countries.

Consumer Organizations: Another aspect of the U.S. private sector’s involvement with Latin American wildlife is the “consumer organizations” whose concerns lie with promoting the importation of either animals or animal products for commercial purposes. Among the organizations which encourage commerce in living wildlife are the U.S.-based Pet Industry Joint Advisory Council (PIJAC) and the Pet Industry Distributors Association (PIDA), Great Britain’s Pet Trade Association Limited (PTA), and the International Pet Trade Organization (IPTO), headquartered in the Netherlands.

Among the arguments advanced to promulgate the importation of live animals is that CITES is a document which promotes the conservation rather than the preservation of species. Conservation, say the pet interests, involves the managed harvesting, captive breeding, and translocation of displaced animals while preservation dictates that animals incur no disruptions whatsoever.

While the importance of captive breeding programs are generally supported by pet trade advocates, most acknowledge that the current demand for exotic pets cannot be met by such activities. Managed harvesting of live specimens, they say, will prevent increasing deaths due to habitat destruction and provide money for both primary collectors and indigenous conservation efforts.

In a statement issued to the delegates attending a meeting of CITES held in San Jose, Costa Rica, in March of 1979, a spokesman for the PIJAC, which represents 98 member associations and some 1,000 institutional members, said:

...the useless killing of many species in the wild, especially those which transgress to agricultural areas, rather than their managed taking and export is unwarranted and contrary to the spirit of conservation and this Convention; it is also inhumane...while the pet trade to some may be luxury, it is a natural resource for many countries — a natural resource which can and should be properly managed. Certain species have also been determined to provide sociological and therapeutic benefits to man.

The pet industry is ready, willing and able to work with any management authority to assist in encouraging and establishing captive breeding programs and managed harvesting programs for export similar to those established in the United States and other countries.

According to Marshall Meyers, General Counsel for PIJAC, captive breeding is not necessary for all species of animals since some, like fish and certain birds, reproduce prolifically in the wild.

CITES is impossible to administer because of all of its regulations, says Meyers. All nonhuman primates were placed on the list regardless of their status. In many of the countries where they occur, nonhuman primates are shot as pests because of their numbers.

Referring to the pet trade, Meyers says that individual situations should determine whether a person should be permitted to keep an exotic animal as a pet. Permits should be issued according to an individual’s knowledge and the facilities available for the animal(s). The pet trade has been blamed for many of the negative situations found in zoological parks. However, zoos have become more sensitive to these problems and are attempting to rectify them. Mindful of existing differences, the pet trade would like to improve its relationship with the conservation and environmental groups.
SECTION III - CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The American naturalist Joseph Wood Krutch has written that for a species to become extinct is for it to be “lost forever in the most absolute of all deaths.” Our awareness of extinction is a frightening concept, new to man’s consciousness. Some maintain that it is an awareness born of luxury, that for the primitive man who slew the last mammoth or the subsistence peoples who excessively hunt the animal inhabitants of their world, survival is the only concept to be understood. But all must agree that the total extermination of a species not only endangers the ecosystem to which that species belonged, it diminishes the soul of man. Evolution has taught us that all life is a struggle to survive and that some species are bound to perish in that contest. But even if we consider man as a component of the natural world — which we should — there can be no justification for his extermination of other species. Ignorance can be no excuse when rational alternatives exist.

In order for a species to survive, it must adapt to the changes in its environment — the loss or introduction of other species, climate, and other subtle factors which historically have occurred over long periods of time. The rule is simple: adapt or die. But the rise to dominance of Homo sapiens has been accompanied by their ability to dramatically alter environments with dire consequences for nonhuman life forms. It has been estimated that in the eighteen centuries prior to 1600 (the beginning of the modern age), some 120 kinds of mammals and 150 types of birds had disappeared. It is calculated that only a quarter of these lost animals were lost through natural causes; that the rest were exterminated by man and his activities. Studies show that since the seventeen century, the rate of extinction is increasing with the passage of time. The number of extinctions in the twentieth century is said to be one species lost every year. Based on current information and future projections, the prognosis for the surviving species is grim.

At the current rate of development, it is estimated that the tropical rain forests of Latin America — those great reservoirs of biological diversity — will be destroyed nearly entirely in the next century. Not only would we lose the myriad species of animals and plants, many of them undiscovered which live there, but it is postulated that the destruction of the forests themselves could have immense repercussions on the global environment. Similarly, man’s activities in other geographical regions of Latin America threatens native species of animals and plants, edging them even closer to extinction. It is, therefore, with these points in mind that the following recommendations concerning the preservation and conservation of Latin America’s wildlife are made.

1) Because the efforts of any U.S. or international organization aspiring to work with Latin American counterparts in solving problems can only be as effective as the contact agencies and individuals to be dealt with in each country, it is essential that liasons be carefully considered and developed. It is recommended that the organizations and contact individuals noted throughout the report and listed in Appendix A be supported and consulted as new programs and activities are undertaken. Using their expertise in legal, fundraising and other areas, private organizations within the United States can help to strengthen existing organizations with similar concerns.

2) Each Latin American nation should conduct environmental impact studies prior to the implementation of development projects. This may not only save some degree of wildlife and habitat, but could prevent the expense and waste of ill-conceived planning. In the past and present, many countries have promoted costly projects in agriculture, colonization and engineering only to discover later that soils and other environmental factors were unsuitable. Priority should be given to implementing land-use surveys and inventories in order that rational decision-making can be employed within the framework of national and local development activities.

When a specific project has been approved, care should be taken to preserve adjacent areas of habitat and its wildlife. The careless use of powerful herbicides and insecticides throughout Latin America has become a severe problem affecting man, wildlife and vegetation. Regulations regarding the import and production of pernicious chemicals and their use need to be implemented and enforced.

3) With or without the assistance of international aid institutions, development activities which can serve as alternatives to the destruction of existing wilderness areas should be promulgated. Improved management of arable lands already under cultivation and the conversion from cash crops for export to food products for domestic use could help to alleviate the food shortages suffered by many Latin American countries. At the same time, alternate industries in fisheries, forestry (with reforestation activity), and manufacturing which would not only provide employment but goods for domestic use and export, could be developed. All governments have a responsibility to resist economic exploitation by business interests, both domestic and foreign, and to ensure that large profits derived from their activities do not leave the country to be invested elsewhere.

4) Increased activity in the area of public education is essential if the problems relating to the conservation of wildlife and their habitat are to be rectified. Public education programs dealing with birth control in Costa Rica and wildlife conservation in Honduras and Brazil have already shown successful results.

5) Although further study is required, research activities demonstrating the feasibility of wildlife husbandry have already indicated that such animals as tapirs and manatees offer substantial nutritional benefits. Moreover, it is maintained by ecologists and other scientists that wildlife farming is more productive than the yield gleaned from ranching activities involving domestic animals. By pursuing wildlife husbandry with a variety of species, habitat destruction for relatively unproductive cattle ranching activities would be lessened, and ecosystems preserved.

6) The establishment of departments of renewable natural resources, usually enacted when a country’s environmental awareness is beginning to bloom, means institutional leadership for the formulation of future conservation legislation and activities. The continued and increased support of these departments by appropriate U.S. and international agencies is urged.

While the problems associated with the enforcement of conservation laws and the protection of national parks and preserves are recognized, additional financial and technical assistance is needed for the training of management and enforcement personnel, shelter and transportation facilities, and environmental
awareness programs such as those promoted by the national parks services and wildlife agencies of various countries. The economic asset of tourism in national parks where healthy wildlife populations thrive freely has already been demonstrated in several less developed countries.

7) Ratification by all Latin American nations and compliance with both the Convention on Nature Protection and Wild Life Preservation in the Western Hemisphere and the Convention on International Trade in Endangered Species of Wild Fauna and Flora (CITES) should be vigorously promoted by those countries which are already members and by international organizations involved with Latin America such as the Organization of American States, The World Bank, and appropriate agencies of the United Nations and the U.S. government.

8) Enforcement of national and international conservation and wildlife laws must be pursued more actively. It is recommended that an international body, to include officials of member nations of CITES, authorities of the International Union for the Conservation of Nature and Natural Resource’s TRAFFIC group, and other appropriate technical advisors, form a monitoring and enforcement agency to operate wherever required. In Latin America, this agency, with the cooperation of the various governments, would operate in such key export areas as Leticia and Barranquilla, Colombia; Iquitos and Pucallpa, Peru; Panama City and Colon, Panama; Bluebell, Nicaragua; Puerto Barrios, Guatemala; Belize City and Stann Creek, Belize; and along the Mexico–United States border.

Failing the establishment of such an enforcement body, increased assistance for inspection at major export points should be made available to those countries expressing an interest in curtailing illegal trafficking operations. Funding for these activities could come from a variety of sources including the implementation of special taxes levied on the sale of wildlife and animal products. Some authorities, appalled at the magnitude of wildlife exports streaming from Latin America, some authorities have proposed a moratorium on wildlife trade for a six-month to one-year period in order to allow wildlife populations to re-establish themselves. Failing the implementation of so “drastic” an action, it is recommended that efforts be made to improve the regulation of trade activities and distribute the profits more equitably among the chain of people involved.

One of the more obvious ways that this could be accomplished — at least as far as legal trade is concerned — is for national and/or state governments to nationalize trade activities.

9) In order to curtail injuries and deaths, humane methods of capturing and confining wild animals should be developed. The use of tranquillizers (in guns and bait) should be required and improved methods of netting should be developed. Despite the economic disadvantages, Latin American countries should consider prohibiting the hunting of their wildlife by foreign sportsmen. Failing this action, they should limit the number of hunting permits issued to foreigners while increasing license fees.

10) While it has been noted that U.S. government foreign assistance activities are bound by law to consider the environmental impact of new development projects, no such requirement exists for U.S.-based companies who sell their products or technical assistance to foreign countries. It is urged that the U.S. government impose legislation requiring U.S. companies operating abroad to adhere to the environmental laws of the United States when pursuing commercial interests overseas. Similarly, host countries should require that foreign companies operating within their national territories adhere to existing laws on conservation and the environment. Bound by U.S. regulations, companies could no longer engage in the sale of chemicals and other products harmful to the environment. U.S. companies should also be required to submit environmental impact studies to the governments of the host country and the United States prior to the final sale of heavy machinery to be used for large-scale development projects which would alter existing wilderness areas.

11) The U.S. government should consider prohibiting the import and sale of all live animals and animal products for commercial purposes. Importation of live animals for certain scientific activities — which must be narrowly defined — can be considered by appropriate authorities. It is the author’s feeling that the confinement of most wild animals by the public serves no worthwhile purpose. While tropical fish and smaller lizards and snakes may be exceptions, larger reptiles and all members of the cat family do not make acceptable pets and suffer high mortality rates in captivity outside of zoological gardens. The issue of zoological gardens is becoming increasingly controversial, despite new designs in group and open habitats. While zoos can perform an important function in the captive breeding of endangered and threatened species, inadequate budgets and squalid conditions plague many institutions.

12) Within the United States, the adversary relationship which currently exists between private conservation organizations and the government agencies involved in conservation activities is, in the main, unproductive. Having worked with both sectors, it is the author’s conviction that individuals dedicated to the difficult task of solving national and international conservation problems should work more closely together. While it will doubtless remain necessary for private organizations to involve some government bureaus in court actions in order to effect change, NGO’s must bear in mind that the government agencies dealing with conservation issues are bound by federal laws and budget restrictions. Furthermore, despite the pressures for funding and recognition which virtually all of the private conservation organizations face, their members should adopt more cooperative attitudes. Assuming that the conservation goals of the private groups are very similar, one should expect the support of all for worthwhile endeavors.

In conclusion, any activities undertaken by U.S. conservation organizations in Latin America should first carefully consider the nature of the project and the country in which it is to be promoted. There are several countries which seem to offer greater potential for success than others. Costa Rica, Mexico, Venezuela, Argentina and Chile are among the nations which already have good infrastructures with which foreign conservation efforts can align their endeavors. While some other countries may have less than optimal government or private sector organizations, their needs could therefore be perceived as being greater. Belize a country which claims 62% of its national territory as wilderness area and which has minimal development pressure, would provide an excellent focal point for the development of national parks and related conservation programs.

If the diversity of life as we know it is to survive on this planet, governments
in consort with private organizations must establish national guidelines for the utilization and conservation of all natural resources. The specter that man will plunder the earth and destroy its other inhabitants along with himself in consort with private organizations must establish national guidelines for the utilization and conservation of all natural resources. The specter that man will
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Appendix A — Relevant Institutions and Contact Individuals Concerned with Animal Issues in Latin America. (This is not a complete listing)

United States of America

Dr. Gerald Bertrand
Office of International Affairs
U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service
Department of the Interior
Washington, D.C.

Mr. Bill Long
Bureau of Oceans and International Environmental and Scientific Affairs
U.S. Department of State
Washington, D.C.

Dr. Richard S. Felgar
Senora Desert Museum
Tucson, Arizona 85703

Mr. Curt Freese
Office of International Affairs
U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service
Department of the Interior
Washington, D.C.

Dr. Thomas E. Lovejoy
World Wildlife Fund Washington, D.C.

European Commission

Mr. Karl Frücht
World Federation for the Protection of Animals
Secretariat
Dreikonigstrasse 37
CH-8002 Zurich, Switzerland

Mrs. Françoise Burhenne
Legal Officer
Environmental Law Centre
International Union for Conservation of Nature and Natural Resources
Adenauerallee 214
D 5300 Bonn, West Germany

Argentina

Sr. Guillermo Aníbal Surraco, President
Asociacion de Proteccion al Animal “El Refugio”
San Martín 499 (10-21)
Buenos Aires, Argentina

Lic. Claudio Blanco
Jefe de Departamento Investigacion y Proteccion
Dirección Nacional de Fauna Silvestre
Subsecretaría de Recursos Naturalis Renovables y Ecologia
Paseo Colon 922
2° Piso
Buenos Aires, Argentina

Sr. Osvaldo I. Dulom, President
Federacion Argentina de Entidades Protectora de Animales
Calle Quito 4378/Codigo Postal No. 1212
Buenos Aires, Argentina

Dr. Eduardo O. Gonzales Ruis
Director Nacional de Fauna Silvestre (Int.)
Ministerio de Economía
Secretaría de Estado de Agricultura y Ganaderia
Buenos Aires, Argentina

Liga Argentina de Proteccion de Animales
Fidal General Roca
General Roca, Prov. de Rio Negro

“Sarmiento”

Sociedad Protectora de Animales
Santiago del Estero 649
Buenos Aires, Argentina

Sociedad Argentina Protectora de los Animales
Lavalle 1334
Oficina 34-paso 30
Buenos Aires, Argentina

Sociedad Protectora de Animales de Escobar
Secretaria: Sarmiento 249
Escobar-R.C.C.B.M.
Argentina
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Argentina (Continued)

Sociedad Protectores de Animales
"Sarmiento"
Roca 756, Gualeguaychu, Entre Rios
Argentina

Belize

Mr. E.O. Bradley, B.S.F.
Principal Forest Officer
Forest Department
Ministry of Trade and Industry
Belmopan, Belize

Mr. H.C. Flowers, B.S.F.
Chief Forest Officer
Forest Department
Ministry of Trade and Industry
Belmopan, Belize

Mr. Evan Young
Permanent Secretary
Ministry of Agriculture, Surveys and Lands
Belmopan, Belize

Bolivia

Lic. Gaston Bejarano B.
Jefe del Departamento Vida Silvestre
Parques Nacionales, Caza y Pesca
Centro de Desarrollo Forestal
Av. Camacho 1471, 2° Piso
La Paz, Bolivia

Brazil

Clube de Flora e fauna
M. Fritz Muller
Rua Reninga 210
Petropolis, Brazil

Fundacao Brasileira para a Conservacao da Natureza (FBCN)
SO9 106 – Bloco A
Apto 207
70.000 – Brasilia – DF
Brazil

Dr. Antonio Dantas Machado
Director
Humid Tropic Program
National Council for Scientific and
Technological Development
Brasilia, Brazil

Maria Tereza Jorge Padua
Diretora da Divisao de Protecao da
Natureza–IBDF
Palacio da Desenvolvimento
13° Andar – IBDF–IBN
Brasilia, DF-70.000
Brazil

Dr. Paulo Nogueira Neto
Director
Special Secretariat of the Environment
Ministry of The Interior
Brasilia, Brazil

Dr. Luiz Scaff
Director
Goeldi Museum
Belém, Para, Brazil

Brazil (Continued)

Sociedade Paraense de Protecao dos Animais
Avenida Bras de Aguia 307
Belém, Pará
Brazil

Sociedade Union Internacional Protetora
dos Animais
Rio de Janeiro
Brazil

Unio Internacional Protetora dos Animais
Rua Alvaro de Carvalho 238
Sao Paulo
Brazil

Chile

Comite Pro Defensa de la Fauna y Flora
Santiago, Chile

Instituto de Ecologia
Santiago, Chile

Liga Proteccion al Caballo contra la Crueldad
Casilla 3675
Santiago, Chile

Dr. Jurgen Rottman
Jefe, Seccion de Vida Silvestre
Corporacion Nacional Forestal
Avenida Bulnes 285
Dep. 401
Santiago, Chile

Sociedad Amigos de las Animales
Santiago, Chile

Sociedad de Vida Silvestre
Santiago, Chile

Mr. Godofredo Stutin
Union de Amigos de los Animales
Huanfanos 972
Oficina 508
Santiago, Chile

Colombia

Asociacion Defensora de Animales ADA
Calle 46
No. 22-48
Bogota

Colombia

Dr. Jorge Hernandez Camacho
Jefe Division Fauna Terrestre
INDERENA
Avenida Caracas, 25-A-66
Bogota, Colombia

Dr. Jesus M. Idrobo
Instituto de Ciencias Naturales
Universidad Nacional de Colombia
Bogota, Colombia

Sra. Margarita Marina de Botero
Informacion Oficier
INDERENA
Bogota, Colombia

Colombia

Sociedad Colombiana para el bienestar de los
Animales y Defense de las Plantas
Presidente: Sra. Cecilia de Melendez
Carrera 30, No. 45-A-88
Bogota, Colombia

Colombia (Continued)

Sociedad Protectora de Animales
Calle 41, No. 44-A-29
Medellin (Antioquia)
Colombia

Costa Rica

Asociacion Costarricense para la Conservacion
de la Naturaleza
San Jose, Costa Rica

Asociacion Nacional Protectora de Animales
P.O. Box 26
San Francisco Dos Rios
San Jose, Costa Rica

Ms. Joaana Barnes
Audubon Society of Costa Rica
Apto 162
Guadelupe
Costa Rica

Lic. Eduardo Lopez Pizarro
Jefe, Departamento de Evaluacion de Recursos
de Fauna Marina y Continental
Direccion General de Recursos Pesqueros
y Vida Silvestre
Ministerio de Agricultura y Ganaderia
San Jose, Costa Rica

Dr. Craig MacFarland
Chief
Wildlands Management Unit
CATIE
Turrialba, Costa Rica

Dr. Rudolfo Saenz Forero
Vice Ministro de Recursos Naturales
Ministerio de Agricultura y Ganaderia
San Jose, Costa Rica

Dr. Joseph Tosi
Typical Science Center
San Jose, Costa Rica

Mr. Alvaro F. Ugalde
Director
National Parks Service
San Jose, Costa Rica

Dr. Carlos E. Valerio G.
Director General de Desarrollo Forestal
Ministerio de Agricultura y Ganaderia
San Jose, Costa Rica

Dr. Lie. Francisco Serrano
Jefe, Unidad de Parques Nacionales y
Vida Silvestre
Servicio Forestal y de Fauna
Direccion General de Recursos Naturales
Renovables
Ministerio de Agricultura y Ganaderia
Cantón El Matucano, Soayango
El Salvador

French Guiana

Mr. M. Groene
Director of Agricultural Services
Cayenne, French Guiana

Prefecture de Region
Direction Departementale de la Agriculture
Rue Friedmon
97305 Cayenne, French Guiana
South America
Appendix B — Bibliography of Legislation of Latin American Nations, the United States of America, and International Treaties and Conventions Pertaining to Latin American Wildlife and Domestic Animals.

The majority of the Latin American Legislation listed in Appendix B was culled from the eight volumes and card catalogue of the Library of Congress’s Index to Latin American Legislation, which includes the years 1950 through 1979. Although earlier legislation concerning wildlife “conservation” or utilization exists — sometimes originating in the Spanish colonial period — only the more recent legislation, which includes contemporary concepts of conservation, is listed.

The designations of Latin American legislation are as follows: 1) Laws are passed by legislatures or national assemblies; 2) Decrees are executive announcements which do not necessarily require approval by legislatures or assemblies; and 3) Resolutions are administrative announcements issued by government agencies.

The abbreviations given after each article of legislation — e.g. B.O. Oct. 8, 1971 — represent the official government publication which announced the legislation and its date of publication. The abbreviation code is as follows:

- Argentina — B.O. (Boletín Oficial)
- Bolivia — G.O. (Gaceta Oficial)
- Brazil — D.O. (Diário Oficial)
- Chile — D.O. (Diario Oficial)
- Colombia — G.O. (Gaceta Oficial)
- Costa Rica — G.O. (Gaceta Oficial)
- Ecuador — R.O. (Registro Oficial)
- El Salvador — D.O. (Diario Oficial)
- Guatemala — E.G. (El Guatemalteco)
- Paraguay — C.O. (Gaceta Oficial)
- Peru — R. (Registro)
- Uruguay — D.O. (Diario Oficial)
- Venezuela — G.O. (Gaceta Oficial)

The following countries and their laws are not included in the Index to Latin American Legislation: Belize, a British protectorate, with laws dating back to British rule as well as its own laws enacted since independence in 1973, French Guiana, a department of France, with French laws; Guyana, formerly a British colony, with new laws enacted by the Guyanese Parliament, and Surinam, a territory of the Netherlands.

International


United States of America

List of Acts of 1900 granted authority to the Department of the Interior (Agriculture prior to 1939 reorganization) for conservation, preservation and restoration of game and other birds. Also provided for the regulation of introduced American or foreign birds or animals in new locations. Section amended over the years since introduction.


Humane Methods of Slaughter Act of 1978, October 10, 1978. In addition to the requirement that all state and federally inspected slaughterhouses in the U.S. use humane slaughtering methods, the law requires that all meat imported into the U.S. must have been humanely slaughtered.

Argentina


Hunting Law: Decree 22,630 prohibits the hunting of otters in all parts of the Republic. (B.O. Sept. 21, 1949)

Hunting Law: Decree 19,334 of 10/14/50 provides that the hunting regulations shall continue until a new Regulation to Law 13,908 is approved. (B.O. Sept. 28, 1950)

Hunting Law: Decree 15,501 of 8/20/53 declares that the protection, conservation and exploitation of wild animals is of public interest. Forbids fishing and hunting except in the cases specifically authorized by the decree. (B.O. Sept. 17, 1953)

Animal Industry: Decree 3083 of 2/26/54 approves a plan to fight depredations on cattle. Program for eradication of animals that harm cattle such as foxes, and pumas to be initiated on January, 1954, and for 3 years in the Patagonia. (B.O. Mar. 12, 1954)

Animal Industry: Law 14,346 of 10/27/54 established penalties for people who mistreat animals or make them victims of acts of cruelty. (B.O. Nov. 5, 1954)

Animal Industry: Decree 5,514 of 6/29/53 regulates the transportation of animals and established conditions that must be met by carriers. (B.O. July 10, 1961)

Animal Industry: Law 16,888 of 7/4/66 regulates the slaughter of cattle under the supervision of the Junta Nacional de Cárneos. Other provisions on this matter contained herein. (B.O. July 19, 1966)

Conservation: Law 18,594 of 2/6/70 adopts the new law on national parks, national monuments and national reserves. Repels Articles 1-19 and 22-12 of Law 12,103 and Articles 1,2,3,6,7 and 8 of Decree-Law 664 of 1958. (B.O. Feb. 23, 1970)

Conservation: Decree 637 of 2-6-70 regulates Law 18,594 on national parks, national monuments and national reserves. (B.O. Feb. 23, 1970)


Animal Industry: Law 18,811 of 10/3/70 authorizes the Executive Power to regulate, throughout the national territory, the functioning and licensing of establishments engaged in slaughtering animals, or in the manufacture or storage of products of animal origin. The Executive Power shall regulate all sanitary and hygienic aspects of the manufacture, industrialization and transportation of said products. (B.O. Nov. 2, 1970)
**Animal Industry**


- Law 19,262 of 10/4/71 approves Argentina's adherence to Agreement on conservation of vicuna, signed in La Paz on 8/16/69 between Peru and Bolivia. (B.O. Oct. 8, 1971).

- Law 19,282 of 10/11/71 approves Argentina's adherence to Agreement on conservation of vicuna, signed in La Paz on 8/16/69 between Peru and Bolivia. (B.O. Oct. 8, 1971).

- Law 19,292 of 10/11/71 established the boundaries of national parks and reserves therein listed. (B.O. Nov. 16, 1971).

- Decree 1,991 of 5/23/74 prohibits the slaughter of male horses under 12 years and female horses under 15 years for commercial purposes and established regulations to protect the species. (B.O. May 29, 1974).


- Law 21,751 of 2/17/78 exempts from import, export and other taxes the import and export of animals made by the Municipal Zoo of Buenos Aires resulting from Agreements of exchange with similar establishments of other countries. (B.O. Nov. 4, 1977).


**Bolivia**

- Supreme Decree 6683 of 9/17/64 forbids, for the period of 3 years, the hunting of certain useful wild fauna in some departments of the country. (C.O. Sept. 23, 1964).

- Supreme Decree 6935 of 10/23/64 clarifies Supreme Decree 6683 of 9/17/64 excluding from prohibition provisions of the Departments of Beni and Pando, regarding the prohibition for hunting certain wild species. (C.O. Oct. 28, 1964).

- Hunting Law: Decree — Law 7,784 of 8/36/66 sets up a chart of fees and imposes on various products recovered through exploitation of forestry, fishing and hunting, including lumber, plants, gus, furs and skins, bird feathers, fish and turtles, and others. (C.O. Aug. 3, 1966).


- Hunting Law: Decree 8,367 of 6/16/68 prohibits the hunting of vicuna and the trade in live animals of the cat family, or in their hides and furs. (C.O. July 5, 1968).

- Hunting Law: Decree 8,533 of 11/16/68 prohibits exploitation, importation and trade in live vicunas, or any products such as skins, furs, etc for 10 years because of possible extinction of the animal. (C.O. Nov. 6, 1968).

- Conservation: Decree 6,660 of 21/9/69 stakes out national forest reserves in various zones of the nation to insure protection of these resources. (C.O. Feb. 19, 1969).

- Conservation: Decree 8,731 of 4/9/69 prohibits the hunting, exportation, importation or any kind of trade with respect to skins, furs, or by-products of the live vicuna. (C.O. Apr. 13, 1969).


- Conservation: Supreme Decree 9,328 of 7/2/70 approves the regulation concerning crimes and violations and the penalties for the same for persons attempting against the renewable natural resources. (C.O. July 31, 1970).

- Conservation: Supreme Decree 9,370 of 8/22/70 adopts provisions concerning the exploitation of wild cinchona (quina silvestre). The Ministry of Rural Affairs and Agriculture shall grant exploitation permits under the conditions hereby established. (C.O. Aug. 28, 1970).

**Belize**

- Cruelty to Animals: Ch. 80, C.L., 1924, established humane guidelines with respect to both domestic and wild animals and make provisions for the enforcement of the references therein. (Laws of British Honduras, Vol. III, chapter 128, 1960).

**Brazil**


- Conservation: Decree 78,017 of 7/12/76 promulgates the agreement with Colombia on conservation of flora and fauna in the Amazon territories of both countries. Ratified by Legislative Decree 72 of 12/3/73. (D.O. July 13, 1976).

**Chile**


- Hunting Law: Decree 881 of 11/19/59 prohibits the hunting of the vicuna during any time of the year because the species is becoming scarce. (D.O. Dec. 14, 1959).

- Hunting Law: Decree 50 of 11/19/60 prohibits the hunting and sale of rabbits for 6 months in Malheco province and Nacimiento department. (D.O. Feb. 12, 1960).


- Conservation: Decree 82,363 amends Articles 1 and 2 of Decree Second Section (sic) 4,444 of 11/15/29 regulating Law 6,401 of 7/11/29 (Hunting Law). Articles amended concern periods when the hunting of wild animals is prohibited. Several decrees herein mentioned are repealed. (D.O. Apr. 4, 1963).


Costa Rica

Animals: Decree 19 of 11/9/54 enacts a Regulation on ownership and keeping of dogs, establishing a registration and license system. (L.G. Jan. 27, 1954).
Animals: Legislative Decree 2,093 of 12/4/56 adopts the Law on Preservation of Wild Animal Life. This includes regulations on hunting for sport, prohibits commercial hunting and creates certain reserved areas for animal propagation where hunting is totally restricted. (L.G. Dec. 25, 1956).
Animals: Decree 9 of 9/5/57 adopts a regulation on the control and eradication of rabies in animals. (L.G. Sept. 10, 1957).
Animals: Legislative Decree 2,391 of 7/2/59 provides that all dogs must be registered, vaccinated and kept on leashes. (L.G. July 8, 1959).
Hunting Law: Decree 3 of 1/19/61 of the Ministerio de Agricultura y Canadentia adopts rules for obtaining a hunting permit, the types of weapons to be used, seasons when hunting is allowed, etc. (L.G. Feb. 4, 1961).
Conservation: Law 2,790 of 7/20/61 adopts the Ley de Conservacion de la Fauna Silvestre on Law for the conservation of wild animals. Law covers fishing, hunting, etc. (L.G. July 29, 1961).
Conservation: Decree 3 of 7/1/62 approves the Regulation of Law 2,790 of 7/20/61 or law on conservation of wild animals. Regulation contains provisions governing fishing and hunting. (L.G. Aug. 21, 1962).
Conservation: Decree 5 of 6/7/65 amends the Regulation of the Law on Conservation of the wild fauna. (L.G. June 12, 1965).

Ecuador

Animal Industry: Decree 11 of 6/19/59 approves the text of a basic statute on animal health and sanitation. (R.O. June 24, 1959).
Natural Resources: Decree 3 of 2/22/51 adopts the basic law on maritime fishing and hunting. (R.O. Feb. 23, 1951).
Natural Resources: Decree 17 of 7/4/59 declares the islands of the Archipelagos of Colon and Galapagos to be national parks. (R.O. July 20, 1959).
Conservation: Resolution 800 of 10/24/69 issues the regulation on hunting and exportation of wild animals. (R.O. Dec. 31, 1969).
Conservation: Decree 816 of 11/20/70 established regulations pertaining to the commercial utilization of a species’ wild population. The law notes Ecuador’s adherence to the Inter-American Technical Committee for the conservation of the Flora and Fauna of the Amazon Basin. The legislation lists protected species of wildlife.
Hunting Law: Decree 193 of 2/1/74 prohibits the hunting, trading and slaughtering of llamas, as well as the industrialization and sale of their wool and hides. (R.O. Mar. 6, 1974).
Conservation: Resolution 015B of 4/15/77 issues the regulation on commercial exportation of living or dead specimens of the wild fauna and the parts theory. (R.O. May 14, 1977).

El Salvador


Guatemala

Animal Industry: Decree 870 of 1/18/52 adopts the law protecting animals of any kind useful for production or reproduction purposes. (E.C. Jan. 26, 1952).

Guyana

Wildlife: Wild Birds Protection Act, chapter 71.07, Laws of Guyana. An Act for the protection of certain wild birds against trapping, wounding, killing or exporting. Forty-eight families are absolutely protected while twelve families are protected during close season. September 10, 1939.
Honduras

Mexico

Nicaragua
Hunting Law: Decree 160 prohibits the hunting of wild animals brought in from foreign countries. (L.G. Dec. 21, 1955).
Hunting Law: Decree 206 of 10/16/56 issues the basic law on hunting of game. (L.G. Nov. 3, 1956).
Hunting Law: Decree 15 of 8/20/58 regulates the hunting season for 1958-59, and assigns dates for open and closed seasons according to the type of game. Decree 13 of same date sets aside as a refuge for wildlife the Peninsula de Corinaguata. (G.O. Sept. 2, 1956).

Panama
Conservation: Decree 153 of 6/28/66 designates a forest reserve zone to be known as National Park and Biological Reserve "Altos de Campana," a portion of land described as in the Districts of Capira and Chame, Province of Panama, which shall be administered by the Forest Service of the Ministry of Agriculture. (G.O. July 6, 1966).
Conservation: Decree 218 of 8/25/66 creates a Working Commission to study the regulations to be issued toward the conservation of the wild fauna in the national territory. (G.O. Sept. 14, 1966).
Conservation: Decree-Law 39 of 9/2/666 issues the regulations concerning the national forests, which are declared of public interest. (G.O. Oct. 26, 1966).
Conservation: Decree 14 of 11/7/67 declares as forest land the areas within the boundaries set by the rivers Indio, Chagres, Pequeni, Aqua, Cara, Catun and Aqua Sucia. Its exploitation is hereby regulated. (G.O. Mar. 9, 1967).
Conservation: Decree 23 of 1/30/67 creates the National Commission for the Protection of the Wild Fauna as well as several Provincial Commissions. Forbids or limits the hunting of a number of wild species. Listed herein. (G.O. Mar. 10, 1967).

Paraguay
Animal Industry: Decree 11, 057 of 3/16/70 requires that animals to be slaughtered for exportation must be vaccinated against foot-and-mouth disease. (R.O. 1970 I, p. 486).

Peru
Conservation: Law 14, 552 of 7/13/63 creates the Servicio Forestal y de Caza attached to the ministry of Agriculture, and established its functions. Repeals Article 8 of Law 7, 643 and Law 8, 928 and 10, 315. (E.P. July 20, 1963).
Conservation: Supreme Decree 95 of 12/30/66 approves the Regulation on classification and use of soils based on their agrological quality. (E.P. Feb. 9, 1967).
Natural Resources: Resolution 166-69-VI-SERPAR of 11/18/69 approves the Regulation of Zoological Parks. (E.P. Nov. 21, 1969).

Uruguay
Conservation: Decree 90 of 1/12/64 prohibits the hunt, exploitation and sale of indigenous zoological species until further notice. Exemptions are made. (D.O. Apr. 1, 1964).
Conservation: Decree 149 of 3/24/66 prohibits until further notice the hunting and trading of all indigenous zoological species existing throughout the national territory, as well as the destruction of their broods and nests. Exceptions are provided. (D.O. Mar. 30, 1966)


Conservation: Decree 193 of 3/16/67 prohibits until further notice, the hunting of all indigenous zoological species throughout the national territory. Exceptions are provided. (D.O. Apr. 4, 1967)


Conservation: Decree 229 of 3/28/68 prohibits, until further notice, the hunting and sale of all indigenous zoological species throughout the national territory and provides for exceptions. (D.O. Apr. 3, 1968)

Conservation: Law 13,723 of 12/16/68 declares the defense, improvement, enlargement and creation of forest resources and industries to be of national interest. (D.O. Dec. 20, 1968)

Conservation: Decree 140 of 3/20/69 maintains in force, until further notice, the prohibition against the hunting and sale of all indigenous zoological species. Exceptions are provided. (D.O. Mar. 11, 1970)

Animal Industry: Decree 431 of 9/10/70 established fines to be imposed for violations to sanitary provisions on animals. (D.O. Sept. 17, 1970)


Hunting: Decree 204 of 3/16/72 keeps in force until further notice the prohibition of hunting and trading indigenous zoological species throughout the national territory. (D.O. Mar. 21, 1972)

Hunting and Conservation: Decree 273 of 4/4/74 adopts regulations concerning prohibition of hunting and commercialization of all indigenous zoological species living in the national territory. Exceptions and penalties are included. (D.O. Apr. 25, 1973)


Conservation: Decree 437 of 6/4/74 approves the season for hunting otters and foxes in the national territory temporarily and according to regulations provided therein. (D.O. June 12, 1974)

Hunting: Decree 241 of 3/20/75 establishes provisions regulating the hunting of native zoological species in the national territory, with penalties for violators. (D.O. Apr. 10, 1975)

Hunting: Decree 604 of 7/13/75 permits temporarily, until 9/30/75, the hunting of otters and wolves in the national territory, according to regulations therein established. (D.O. Aug. 8, 1975)

Venezuela


Hunting Law: Resolution of 3/25/55 provides that hunting licenses that had been granted by civil authorities are cancelled and limitations imposed upon those granted by the Department of Fish and Hunting of the Ministry of Agriculture until a study is made of causes of near extinction of some species. (C.O. Mar. 4, 1955)


Conservation: Resolution RNR-S-543 of 11/11/65 prohibits all kinds of commercial operations with wild animals, whether dead or alive, and their products. (G.O. Nov. 13, 1965)

Conservation: Law of 8/11/70 enacts the law on protection of wild animals. Revokes the hunting law of 8/10/44. (C.O. Aug. 11, 1970)

Conservation: Resolution RNR of 9/10/70 creates, as an honorary entity, the Consejo Nacional de la Fauna Silvestre to advise the Executive Power on matters concerning the protection of wild fauna. (C.O. Sept. 10, 1970)


Conservation: Decree 589 of 5/12/71 provides for the functioning of the Centro Nacional de Investigaciones de Fauna Silvestre in the Dirección de Recursos Naturales Renovables del Ministerio de Agricultura y Cría. (C.O. May 13, 1971)

Conservation: Decree III of 5/26/74 created the Consejo Nacional de Conservación de los Recursos Renovables and repeals Decree 112 of 7/31/59, which created the Comisión Nacional de Recursos Renovables. Its duties and functions are included. (C.O. May 27, 1974)

Hunting: Resolution 483 of 12/29/75 regulates the issuance of hunting licenses issued for scientific research. (G.O. Dec. 30, 1975)


Appendix C —

List of Endangered Animal Species in Latin America

Many authorities consider all of Latin America's wildlife to be threatened due to the ever-increasing destruction of their habitats. The species listed as endangered in the three appendices of the Convention on International Trade in Endangered Species of Wild Fauna and Flora (CITES) represent those most often utilized in legal and illegal trade activities. The following list, although not definitive, is compiled from a variety of sources. Unless otherwise indicated, the animals listed below generally range throughout Central and South America.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Common Name</th>
<th>Scientific Name</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mammals</strong></td>
<td><strong>Tamaulipan Tapeworm</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anteater, collared (Tamandua)</td>
<td>Myrmecophaga tridactyla</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anteater, giant</td>
<td>Myrmecophaga tridactyla</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Armadillo, giant (Peruvian Amazon)</td>
<td>Dasyus novemcinctus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Armadillo, naked-tailed (Costa Rica)</td>
<td>Dasyus novemcinctus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Armadillo, pink fairy (Argentina)</td>
<td>Dasyus novemcinctus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bat, white-lined (Uraguay)</td>
<td>Vampyrus lineatus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bear, Mexican grayish (Mexico)</td>
<td>Ursus arctos nelsoni</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bear, spectacled (Ecuador and northern Peru)</td>
<td>Ursus arctos melanoleucus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bobcat, Mexican (Mexico)</td>
<td>Felis (Lynx) rufus escuade</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cat</td>
<td>Felis catus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chipmunk, all South American species</td>
<td>Ctenochila sp.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Civet, banded palm</td>
<td>Felis chaus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coati</td>
<td>Felis chaus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deer, marsh (South America)</td>
<td>Cervus elaphus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deer, pampas (South America)</td>
<td>Cervus elaphus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dog, Bush</td>
<td>Canis lupus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dog, Bush</td>
<td>Canis lupus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dolphin (La Plata River)</td>
<td>Tursiops truncatus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fox, Argentine gray</td>
<td>Canis lupus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Giraffe</td>
<td>Giraffa camelopardalis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hare, North American</td>
<td>Oryctolagus cuniculus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hare, South American</td>
<td>Oryctolagus cuniculus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jaguar</td>
<td>Panthera onca</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jaguarundi</td>
<td>Felis yagouaroundi cacomita</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jaguarundi</td>
<td>Felis yagouaroundi cacomita</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jaguarundi</td>
<td>Felis yagouaroundi cacomita</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manatee, Amazonian (Amazon and Orinoco river basins)</td>
<td>Trichechus inunguis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manatee, West Indian (eastern Central America)</td>
<td>Trichechus manatus</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Common Name

**Mammals (Continued)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scientific Name</th>
<th>Common Name</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Felis wiedii nicaragua</td>
<td>Margay</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Felis wiedii salvina</td>
<td>Margay</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Callithrix flaviceps</td>
<td>Margay, buff-headed (Amazonia)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Callicebus goeldii</td>
<td>Margay, pygmy (Amazonia)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cebuella pygmaea</td>
<td>Margay, white-eared (Amazonia)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Callithrix aurita</td>
<td>Monkey, black howler</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alopaca pigra</td>
<td>Monkey, howler</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alopaca pallida (villosa)</td>
<td>Monkey, red-backed squirrel (Costa Rica and Panama)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saimiri oerstedii</td>
<td>Monkey, spider (Costa Rica and Nicaragua)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Atelis geoffroyi frontatus</td>
<td>Monkey, spider (Panama)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Atelis geoffroyi panamensis</td>
<td>Monkey, woolly spider (southeastern Brazil)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brachyteles arachnoides</td>
<td>Ocelot</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Felis pardalis mearnsi</td>
<td>Ocelot</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Felis mearnsi</td>
<td>Olingo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bassaricyn gabbii</td>
<td>Olingo, giant (northern South America)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bassaricyn sumichrasti</td>
<td>Otter, giant (northern South America)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pteronura brasiliensis</td>
<td>Otter, long-tailed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lutra longicaudis (including L. platensis and L. annectens)</td>
<td>Otter, marine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lutra felina</td>
<td>Otter, southern river</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coendou spinosus</td>
<td>Porcupine, prehensile-tailed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chaetopotes albinaeus</td>
<td>Porcupine, thin-spined (eastern Brazil)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bradypus torquatus</td>
<td>Prairie dog, Mexican</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bradypus grayi</td>
<td>Puma, Costa Rican</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bradypus boliviensis</td>
<td>Rabbit, volcano</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sciurus deprepi</td>
<td>Rat, Phillips Kangaron</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leontopithecus leonii</td>
<td>Saki, white-nosed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Leontopithecus spp.)</td>
<td>Sloth, two-toed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(all species)</td>
<td>Sloth, three-toed (western Amazonia)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sloth, three-toed (northern South America)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Squirrel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tamarin (Brazil)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tamarin, golden-headed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tamarin, golden-lion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tamarin, golden-rumped</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tamarin, pied</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tamarin, white-footed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tapir (Central American)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tapir (South American or Brazilian)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tapir, mountain (Colombia and Ecuador)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Uakari (Amazonia)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Uakari, bald</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Uakari, black</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Uakari, red</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Vicuna</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Wolf, gray</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Wolf, maned (central South America)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Birds (Continued)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scientific Name</th>
<th>Common Name</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cock-of-the-rock</td>
<td>Birds (Continued)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Condor, Andean</td>
<td>Condor, Andean</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cotinga, banded</td>
<td>Cotinga, white-winged</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Curlew, eskimo</td>
<td>Curlew, eskimo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Duck, Mexican</td>
<td>Duck, Mexican</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eagle</td>
<td>Eagle, harpy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Falcon</td>
<td>Falcon, peregrine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flamingo, Andean</td>
<td>Flamingo, Andean</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flamingo, Chilean</td>
<td>Flamingo, Chilean</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flamingo, James.</td>
<td>Guan, black-fronted piping</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guan, horned</td>
<td>Harriers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hermit, hook-billed (Hummington)</td>
<td>Harriers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Macaw</td>
<td>Harriers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Macaw, glaucous</td>
<td>Harriers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Macaw, indigo</td>
<td>Harriers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Macaw, little blue</td>
<td>Harriers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Macaw, scarlet</td>
<td>Harriers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parakeet, golden</td>
<td>Harriers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ocellated turkey</td>
<td>Harriers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parrot, red-browed</td>
<td>Harriers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parrot, red-capped</td>
<td>Harriers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parrot, red-spectacled</td>
<td>Harriers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parrot, thick-billed</td>
<td>Harriers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parrot, vinaceus breasted</td>
<td>Harriers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quail, Montezuma</td>
<td>Harriers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quetzal, resplendent (Costa Rica)</td>
<td>Harriers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quetzal, resplendent (Central America)</td>
<td>Harriers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Raptors (Costa Rica)</td>
<td>Harriers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rhea, common (Uruguy)</td>
<td>Raptors (Costa Rica)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rhea, common (Argentina, Peru, Bolivia and Uruguay)</td>
<td>Raptors (Costa Rica)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Siskin, red</td>
<td>Siskin, red</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Siskin, yellow-faced</td>
<td>Siskin, yellow-faced</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Swan, black-necked</td>
<td>Siskin, yellow-faced</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Siskin, yellow-faced</td>
<td>Siskin, yellow-faced</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turkey, ocellated (Central America)</td>
<td>Turkey, ocellated (Central America)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Woodpecker</td>
<td>Turkey, ocellated (Central America)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Imperial</td>
<td>Turkey, ocellated (Central America)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Reptiles**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scientific Name</th>
<th>Common Name</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alligator</td>
<td>Alligatoridae (all species)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boa</td>
<td>Boa (all species)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caiman, Apaporis River</td>
<td>Caiman (all species)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caiman, black</td>
<td>Caiman (all species)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Birds**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scientific Name</th>
<th>Common Name</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cock-of-the-rock</td>
<td>Birds (Continued)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Condor, Andean</td>
<td>Condor, Andean</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cotinga, white-winged</td>
<td>Cotinga, white-winged</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Curlew, eskimo</td>
<td>Curlew, eskimo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Duck, Mexican</td>
<td>Duck, Mexican</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eagle</td>
<td>Eagle, harpy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Falcon</td>
<td>Falcon, peregrine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flamingo, Andean</td>
<td>Flamingo, Andean</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flamingo, Chilean</td>
<td>Flamingo, Chilean</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flamingo, James.</td>
<td>Flamingo, James.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guan, black-fronted piping</td>
<td>Harriers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harriers</td>
<td>Harriers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Macaw</td>
<td>Harriers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Macaw, glaucous</td>
<td>Harriers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Macaw, indigo</td>
<td>Harriers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Macaw, little blue</td>
<td>Harriers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Macaw, scarlet</td>
<td>Harriers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parakeet, golden</td>
<td>Harriers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ocellated turkey</td>
<td>Harriers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parrot, red-browed</td>
<td>Harriers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parrot, red-capped</td>
<td>Harriers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parrot, red-spectacled</td>
<td>Harriers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parrot, thick-billed</td>
<td>Harriers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parrot, vinaceus breasted</td>
<td>Harriers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quail, Montezuma</td>
<td>Harriers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quetzal, resplendent (Costa Rica)</td>
<td>Harriers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quetzal, resplendent (Central America)</td>
<td>Harriers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Raptors (Costa Rica)</td>
<td>Harriers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rhea, common (Uruguy)</td>
<td>Raptors (Costa Rica)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rhea, common (Argentina, Peru, Bolivia and Uruguay)</td>
<td>Raptors (Costa Rica)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Siskin, red</td>
<td>Siskin, red</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Siskin, yellow-faced</td>
<td>Siskin, yellow-faced</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Swan, black-necked</td>
<td>Siskin, yellow-faced</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Swan, coscoroba</td>
<td>Siskin, yellow-faced</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Timonius, red-winged</td>
<td>Siskin, yellow-faced</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Timonius, solitary</td>
<td>Siskin, yellow-faced</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turkey, ocellated (Central America)</td>
<td>Siskin, yellow-faced</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Woodpecker, imperial</td>
<td>Siskin, yellow-faced</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Reptiles**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scientific Name</th>
<th>Common Name</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alligator</td>
<td>Alligatoridae (all species)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boa</td>
<td>Boa (all species)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caiman, Apaporis River</td>
<td>Caiman (all species)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caiman, black</td>
<td>Caiman (all species)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agamid</td>
<td>Caiman crocodilus aporioriensis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Melanosuchus niger</td>
<td>Caiman crocodilus aporioriensis</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix D —
Project Questionnaire Form, English and Spanish

Request For Information

The Institute for the Study of Animal Problems — ISAP (a division of The Humane Society of the United States), requests your participation in a research project which it is conducting on the problems, activities and legislation concerning the welfare status of domestic animals and wildlife in Latin America. As evidenced by the questions which follow, you will see that the main concern of ISAP is the welfare of individuals and not necessarily the conservation of species.

1) If you do not have information on each area, please respond to those items in which you are knowledgeable. We would appreciate your sending the enclosed extra copies of this form to those individuals or agencies able to provide additional assistance.

2) Whenever possible, please send or arrange for ISAP to receive copies of appropriate legislation and information pertaining to the topics included in the questionnaire. Please list legislation by name and year of enactment, whenever possible.

3) Please provide the names and addresses of other individuals and agencies (government and private) relevant to this study who may be able to assist us.

4) You are invited to add your own comments concerning the various areas of this questionnaire wherever you feel they would be appropriate.

5) When referring to animals, please identify the types as fully as possible (e.g., use both common and Latin names).

6) Please include any statistical information you may have when noting animal-related activities such as exports, domestic consumption, etc.

7) Please list any relevant publications (books, magazines) with title, author, publisher, year and country of publication.

ISAP is requesting information concerning the following matters (you may place information after each item or use a separate sheet of paper):

Animals and Legislation

A. Does your country have legislation dealing with wild animals and...

1. Hunting? ___ Existing ___ Proposed ___ Existing, but being revised ___ None
   a. Are there hunting seasons and if so, when are they?
   b. Which animals are included?

2. Trapping? ___ Existing ___ Proposed ___ Existing, but being revised ___ None
   a. Are there trapping seasons and if so, when are they?
   b. Which animals are included?

3. The live animal trade for pets, zoos and laboratory research? ___ Existing ___ Proposed ___ Existing, but being revised ___ None
   a. Which species of live animals, if any, are exported legally?
   b. Which species of live animals are usually exported illegally?
   c. Approximate prices paid for exported live animals?
   d. How are live animals transported to the departure point and the final destinations?
   e. Which countries receive legally exported live animals?
   f. Which countries receive illegally exported live animals?
   g. For what purposes are exported live animals used?
   h. Which countries, if any, serve as stop-over points for legally and/or illegally exported live animals?

4. The skin trade? ___ Existing ___ Proposed ___ Existing, but being revised, ___ None
   a. Which species of animals, if any, are exported legally for their skins?
   b. Which species of animals are usually exported illegally for their skins?
   c. Approximate prices paid for animal skins at source and at destination (if known).
   d. Countries receiving legally exported skins.
   e. Countries receiving illegally exported skins.

5. The protection of endangered, rare and threatened species...
   a. From hunting? ___ Existing ___ Proposed ___ Existing, but being revised ___ None
   b. From live animal trade? ___ Existing ___ Proposed ___ Existing, but being revised ___ None
   c. From the skin trade? ___ Existing ___ Proposed ___ Existing, but being revised ___ None
   d. From habitat destruction? ___ Existing ___ Proposed ___ Existing, but being revised ___ None
   e. Does your country maintain a list of endangered, threatened and rare animal species?
     __ yes __ no __ plans to __ no plans to

B. Does your country have humane laws dealing with domestic animals and their use...

1. General anti-cruelty legislation? ___ Existing ___ Proposed ___ Existing, but being revised ___ None

2. In the food industry? ___ Existing ___ Proposed ___ Existing, but being revised ___ None
   a. Methods of transportation before slaughter? ___ Existing ___ Proposed ___ Existing, but being revised ___ None
   b. Methods of slaughter? ___ Existing ___ Proposed ___ Existing, but being revised ___ None
   c. Kinds of animals and approximate numbers used in food production?
C. ¿Qué gobierno agencias son encargadas con enforces legislación relacionadas con:

D. ¿Qué gobierno agencias están involucradas con materias concernientes con:

50

Solicitud De Informe

El Instituto para el Estudio de Problemas de Animales — ISAP (una división de la Sociedad Humanitarista de los Estados Unidos) solicita su participación en un proyecto para estudiar los problemas, actividades y legislación concernientes al bienestar de los animales domésticos y silvestres en Latinoamérica.

Como es evidente en las siguientes preguntas, usted podrá ver que el interés principal de ISAP es el del bienestar de los animales y no necesariamente la conservación de las especies.

Quedamos sumamente agradecidos si usted nos ayuda de la siguiente manera:

1. ¿Tiene su país leyes humanitarias que tratan con animales domésticos y su uso?
   a. ¿Qué especies de animales, si hay, son exportados legalmente para su piel?
   b. ¿Qué especies son usualmente exportadas en forma ilegal para su piel?
   c. Si no hay, ¿existen planes de unión?

2. En la industria alimenticia _____ existe _____ propuesto _____ existe, está en revisión _____ no hay
   a. ¿En los métodos usados en el transporte de los animales a los mataderos existe _____ propuesto _____ existe, está en revisión _____ no hay
   b. ¿En métodos de carne usados? _____ existe _____ propuesto _____ existe, está en revisión _____ no hay
   c. ¿Tipos de animales y aproximado número, usados para la producción de alimentos existe _____ propuesto _____ existe, está en revisión _____ no hay

3. Se usa para estudio en laboratorios, científicos? _____ existe _____ propuesto _____ existe, está en revisión _____ no hay
   a. ¿Qué métodos de control se empleará?
   b. ¿Qué programas y cuántos, hay establecidos para la reproducción de animales?
   c. ¿Cuáles son los principales estudios que envuelven el uso de animales en laboratorios científicos (ejm. Producción de vacunas, estudio de drogas, estudios sobre el cáncer, estudio de infecciones contagiosas, etc.)

5. Actividades deportivas tales como carreras de caballos, corrida de toros, rodeos _____ existe _____ propuesto _____ existe, está en revisión _____ no hay

Animales Y Legislación

A. Tiene su país legislación que trate con animales y...

1. Caza? _____ Existe _____ Propuesto _____ Existe, está en revisión _____ No hay
   a. ¿Tienen temporada de caza? Si la respuesta es sí, ¿cuándo?
   b. ¿Cuáles especies están incluidas?

2. Jaeces? _____ Existe _____ Propuesto _____ Existe, está en revisión _____ No hay
   a. ¿Hay temporada de jaeces? Si la respuesta es sí, ¿cuándo?
   b. ¿Cuáles animales están incluidos?

3. El comercio de animales para uso doméstico, en zoológicos y para estudio en laboratorios. _____ existe _____ propuesto _____ existe, está en revisión _____ No hay
   a. ¿Qué especies de animales son exportados legalmente?
   b. ¿Qué especies son usualmente exportadas en forma ilegal?
   c. ¿Qué especies son generalmente exportadas en forma ilegal?
   d. ¿Cómo son transportados los animales a su destino?

4. Su uso para estudio en laboratorios, científicos? _____ existe _____ propuesto _____ existe, está en revisión _____ no hay
   a. ¿Qué métodos de control se emplearán?
   b. ¿Qué programas y cuántos, hay establecidos para la reproducción de animales?
   c. ¿Qué especies son usualmente utilizados en laboratorios científicos (ejm. Producción de vacunas, estudio de drogas, estudios sobre el cáncer, estudio de infecciones contagiosas, etc.)

5. Actividades deportivas tales como carreras de caballos, corrida de toros, rodeos _____ existe _____ propuesto _____ existe, está en revisión _____ no hay
Appendix E —

A Discussion of the Status of Domestic Animals in Latin America
and Recommendations to The Humane Society of the United States

While there is no dearth of information and activity concerning the status of wildlife in Latin America, the problems of animal welfare and humane legislation — regarding both wild and domestic animals — are areas that require urgent attention and assistance from U.S.-based organizations such as The Humane Society of the United States. With the exception of rather limited activities in these areas by the International Society for the Protection of Animals (ISPA), the World Federation for the Protection of Animals (WFPA), and the Fund for Animals, virtually no activities from outside Latin America are being undertaken to relieve the situation.

Some forty-two animal welfare agencies are listed as operating in the twenty-one nations of Latin America (see Appendix A). The majority of these occur in Mexico, Brazil, Argentina and Chile. Legislation on the conservation and hunting of wildlife far outnumbers that regarding the welfare of domestic animals (see Appendix B).

An attitude exists among many individuals involved with U.S. animal welfare activities that the countries of Latin America are hopelessly behind the United States, Canada and Europe in regard to humane legislation and animal welfare concepts. But considering that the United States passed its first federal humane slaughter act in 1958 — some seventy-five years after similar legislation was enacted by Switzerland — Latin America may be seen as being less than a generation “behind” the United States. Indeed, existing humane legislation in some Latin American nations can provide a foundation upon which future efforts can be based.

At the same time, there is a consensus among the individuals interviewed in the U.S. which is also based on the author’s discussions with Latin American authorities, that both private organizations and state and federal government agencies in Latin America would benefit from the assistance — legal, financial and moral — that U.S. organizations can provide. Assistance is needed to help Latin American organizations promote the concept of animal welfare as well as to help governments formulate new laws and comply with new regulations, such as U.S. government legislation prohibiting the importation of meat products not slaughtered under humane guidelines.

A notable contact person developed during the course of the project is Dr. Braulis Orejas-Miranda, Scientific Affairs, Organization of American States (OAS). An eminent authority on animal problems in Latin America, Dr. Orejas has repeatedly expressed his desire to cooperate with The Humane Society of the United States in establishing liaison with both government and private agencies involved with animal issues throughout Latin America. Two recent meetings could lead to further involvement of the humane movement in North America. One, the “Technical Meeting on the Conservation of Migratory Animals of the Western Hemisphere and their Ecosystems,” convened in Panama City on June 4-8, 1979, and was the fourth in a series of meetings attempting to bolster the 1940 Convention on Nature Protection and Wild Life Preservation. The Panama meeting was organized to lay the foundation for the second meeting, an assembly of the OAS legal department, scheduled for July 24-27, 1979, in Washington, D.C.

It is recommended that the humane movement consider the implementation of a Latin American program through which the OAS and private and government agencies in Latin America can be encouraged and assisted in the promulgation of animal welfare and conservation activities. The success of such a program could possibly lead to the establishment of a “Pan American Humane Association.”