

## Wildlife Act Review

### Submission Comment 57:

Contributor: Individual

#### Primary interests:

- Protection and conservation of wildlife and habitat
- Wildlife welfare

#### Comment

Second submission

Section 5.4 raises the issue of guidance given to judges on these matters. While a civil penalty (5.5.1) may be applied, yielding a conviction with lower standard of proof, it does allow the offender to see this as a cost of doing business. It might not be a deterrent to future offending. 5.5.6 may offer the solution. If the benefit of wrong doing is measured, then applying this might stop wrong doing for profit.

As described in section 1.5 - I find it interesting how some species can be permitted to be destroyed in some parts of the state, while still being protected in other farms or places (Authority to Control Wildlife permit system). Perhaps there can be a trade of un-protected individuals to be pets in other places. Perhaps there could be a wider trade in individual native species if we cannot protect them as a community of creatures. The government could offer a licence to take from the environment rather than kill them within it. A licence could be issued and the specific property from which removed creature certified when taken. Individuals are prepared to put in a lot of effort to protect and care for their native pets. My late mother was a registered breeder of possums and could vouch for their market value as pets. I have an interest in section 1.2. We seem to have an approach of catching out wrong doing, and then punishing the wrong doers. We seem not to look at encouraging those wanting to enhance the environment. Section 2.4 may cover this.

Provided May 30/2021