

Wildlife Act Review

Issues Paper questions – Response 18:

Contributor: Individual

Primary interests:

- Protection and conservation of wildlife and habitat
- Rehabilitation of sick, injured and orphaned wildlife
- Wildlife welfare

Question responses

1.4.1 Should the Act prescribe a general duty of care related to wildlife conservation or biodiversity protection more broadly? Why or why not? How could it work in practice?

The Act should prescribe a general duty of care related to wildlife. In the regional area where I live I have witnessed too many "hit and run" on wildlife. This is particularly prevalent now with the "post lockdown" surge in traffic (tourists, new residents, construction). Currently only people who care check if there is a joey in the pouch or if the animal is badly injured. Unfortunately too many times it happens too late.

This responsibility should rest with the driver of the vehicle that hit the animal.

This duty of care could extend to road authorities and lead to the implementation of reduced speed limit in areas where wildlife is active at dawn and dusk in a similar fashion to school zone.

1.5.2 Should any additional animal species or taxa (groups of species) be included in the definition of 'wildlife' or 'protected wildlife'? Should any species or taxa be excluded and therefore be exempt from some provisions in the Act?

Non-indigenous species should not be protected but eradicated to preserve our unique fauna and flora.

1.5.3 Should 'game' animals be defined as wildlife in the Act or defined some other way or excluded from the Act entirely?

Game animals should be excluded from the Act entirely. They are introduced species causing damage on the native vegetation and competing for food with native wildlife.

Provided June 8/2021