

Wildlife Act Review

Issues paper questions - Response 2

Contributor: Individual – Kim Dutton

Primary interests:

- Private and/or commercial keeping, breeding, trading, displaying and/or processing of wildlife or wildlife products
- Protection and conservation of wildlife and habitat
- Rehabilitation of sick, injured and orphaned wildlife
- Wildlife welfare
- Hunting of wildlife
- Eco-tourism involving wildlife
- Protections for marine mammals
- Research relating to wildlife
- Offences and penalties relating to wildlife
- Licenses and authorisations
- Compliance and enforcement
- Traditional owner cultural values and use of wildlife

Question responses

1.1.1 In what ways does the Act succeed or fail in representing contemporary expectations for, and values relating to, wildlife in Victoria? Please provide examples from your own experience.

The Act does not protect wildlife.

1.1.2 Are there conflicts between the interests or expectations of different stakeholders or community members regarding wildlife in Victoria? Please provide examples from your own experience.

Wildlife is seen as expendable and human animals don't seem to realise we all share this planet together. We need to leave wildlife alone to live their lives free from harm. We should not be killing them to make money from their bodies as they all have an integral part to play in the balance of nature.

1.1.3 How can the Act balance the diverse interests of Victorians in protecting, conserving, managing and using wildlife? How might such competing interests be better reconciled in legislation? Are there examples from other sectors or other jurisdictions (both in Australia and internationally) that may be useful?

I don't know.

1.2.1 Are the current purposes of the Act satisfactory? If not, what should the desired outcomes, objectives or purposes of the Act be? How should the objectives and purposes of the Act relate to the desired outcomes? How would they ensure desired outcomes are achieved?

The Act is unsatisfactory because innocent lives are tortured and murdered. The objectives and outcomes should be to PROTECT and CONSERVE wildlife. More people need to realise that all

species have our place on this planet and I don't know how to get people to understand this simple concept.

1.2.2 If objectives and purposes are likely to be competing, how could the tensions be resolved?

I don't know.

1.2.3 Are there examples of well designed legislation from other jurisdictions (both in Australia and internationally) with clearly stated objectives and purposes that could inform Victorian law?

I don't know.

1.3.1 Is the Act a barrier to self-determination for Traditional Owners or Aboriginal Victorians? If so, what specific elements give rise to barriers and how might these barriers be reduced or eliminated?

Traditional owners are treated abysmally by most white humans, particularly, white police. I think this idea of white supremacy is at the heart of the problem and I do not know how to get people to realise they are deserving of respect.

1.3.2 Should the Act recognise the cultural significance of Country and wildlife to Traditional Owners and Aboriginal Victorians? Should the Act explicitly recognise the value of Indigenous Ecological Knowledge for the stewardship of Country and the conservation of wildlife?

Yes and yes.

1.3.3 Should the Act prescribe a role for Traditional Owners and Aboriginal Victorians as key partners in decision making about conserving wildlife? What could that role look like?

Yes. If traditional owners and Aboriginal Victorians made up 90% of the humans paid to manage natural areas everyone would benefit. Nature would be safer and not destroyed . One of the problems of white people, particularly white men, is that they believe they are all powerful and can do whatever they want to anyone or anything which is not in their best interests. Indigenous people would manage burnouts and take care of wildlife, Their respect for country goes a lot further than white people's low respect. Generally, indigenous people TAKE CARE of nature, they don't destroy it for money.

1.3.4 Should the Act afford additional protection and the ability to return species to country because of their cultural significance?

Yes

1.3.5 Does the Act provide appropriate mechanisms for Traditional Owners and Aboriginal Victorians to use wildlife? Should the Act support commercial use of wildlife by Traditional Owners and Aboriginal Victorians?

No and no.

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?

Yes because we need wildlife. Without wildlife Victoria is doomed. It work by allowing 90% of indigenous people to be custodians of nature instead of greedy white people who just want to exploit everyone and everything.

1.5.1 Are there any definitions that are unclear or confusing or that cause problems for achieving the outcomes and objectives of the Act?

Unsure

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?

All fauna in nature should be included whether introduced or native. We need to allow nature to balance itself without white humans interfering.

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

Yes

2.1.1 Do you have any comments on the interactions between the Wildlife Act and other legislation?

No

2.1.2 Should wildlife, flora and fauna generally be regulated by a more inclusive statute?

Yes.

2.1.3 Should game management be regulated under its own Act? What are the advantages and disadvantages of such an approach?

It is not a game for the poor non human animals. They don't know the rules of the "game". They don't even know they are playing a "game". ALL SPECIES are important. Game management should not be a thing. People need to stop playing this cruel "game".

2.2.1 How do regulatory differences between states help or hinder wildlife management? Please provide examples from your own experiences.

Unsure

2.2.2 How can the review of the Act address differences in regulation across land tenure regimes?

Unsure

2.3.1 In what ways does the Act succeed or fail in protecting and conserving wildlife habitat? Please provide examples from your own experience.

I have seen degraded land caused by introduced species like cows and sheep who tear grass and roots out of the soil leading to soil erosion and land degradation. This is irresponsible land management. Kangaroos eat a tiny portion of grass compared to sheep and cows and the only nibble the tops of grass resulting in the grass regrowing. Allowing logging to continue is also irresponsible. In East Gippsland greater gliders live in forests where logging is still happening and trees are not supposed to be killed due to the presence of these animals.

2.3.2 How should the Act provide for the protection and conservation of wildlife habitat?

The Act should make all natural areas safe from any more clearing for any reason..

2.3.3 Should the Act prescribe duties for landowners about protecting and conserving wildlife and wildlife habitat on their land? What could those duties look like?

Yes. It should be law that all landowners plant endemic flora on 50% of "their" land. The Victorian government would provide the seedlings and volunteers could help. I would be one of them.

2.4.1 Do property rights related to wildlife need clarifying? If so, how?

How can someone own wildlife? If land owners think they own wildlife because they live in or on that land or if they pass through they are dreaming. It needs to be made clear that wildlife are not owned by anyone.

2.4.2 Should private landowners have greater rights to use of wildlife on their property?

No

2.4.3 Should the Act recognise sentience of some wildlife and, if so, what would this achieve? How would this recognition affect the rights and responsibilities of governments, businesses and individuals?

Yes. It would achieve a solemn respect for wildlife. If animal sentience was acknowledged in the Act it would help tremendously because that would then lead to more acknowledgement that non human animals should have the same rights as humans to live free from harm.

2.4.4 What rights and responsibilities should Traditional Owners and Aboriginal Victorians have related to wildlife?

Their totem foral and fauna should be left alone by white Victorians. Their traditional methods of exploiting wildlife could be allowed but not by using white people's methods..

3.1.1 Should the Act include statements of principle and criteria to guide regulators, duty holders and the public? Why are such principles important? If you do support including principles, what do you think they should be and why?

Yes because clear and empathetic guide regulators would, hopefully, reduce or stop the genocide. Native flora and fauna are not to be damaged or killed for any reason by white Victorians. The reason is to protect nature.

3.2.1 Should the Act include provisions for consultation with the community on certain issues? What issues should undergo community consultation?

I don't believe so. Yes the community should be involved but how to achieve this? Politicians love their power and generally don't want the community having any power in what happens.. Clearing land, "harvesting" kangaroos, murdering non indigenous or introduced fauna , logging, mining and any other purpose that degrades nature and removes homes of wildlife and killing introduced invasive weed species should have community consultation.

3.2.2 How can community involvement in decision making under the Act be improved?

The Act should state that no decisions are made without 50% of Victoria's humans stating whether we agree or disagree and why regarding Victoria's government's plans put on the table.

3.2.3 Are there currently barriers to private sector actors having meaningful involvement in wildlife management and conservation in Victoria? What are those barriers and what problems do they create for achieving the objectives of the Act? How might any such barriers be removed or minimised?

Yes. See above.

3.3.1 Should the Act enable wildlife management plans? What provisions should be included for such plans?

Yes. As above.

3.4.1 Should the Act simplify and clarify the provisions relating to the various licences, permits and authorities? Is there scope to reduce regulatory burden without undermining the intended outcomes of the Act?

Simplifying and clarifying laws is a good idea. I think laws are written in such a way on purpose to confuse us.

3.5.1 Is the Act transparent about who pays for regulatory services?

Unsure

3.5.2 Is full cost recovery appropriate, or should fees for some licences and activities be subsidised? What role is there for user pays or beneficiary pays principles? What, if any changes, should be made and why?

Unsure

3.6.1 Should the Act contain provisions that allow for issuing mandatory codes of practice, standards or guidelines?

Yes

3.6.2 What activities could most benefit from the development of mandatory codes or standards?

Kangaroo "harvesting", clearing land for housing, shops, introduced slaves or any other purpose.

4.1.1 Does the Act require an adequate degree of transparency about, and accountability for, decision making on matters relating to wildlife? If not, how could this be improved? For example, which activities/decisions/criteria should be more transparent? Which parties should be more accountable and for what?

Yes. All humans who hurt nature should request permission first from indigenous people, 50% of Victorian humans and the Victorian government.

4.2.1 Should the Act include provisions that require and enable establishment of a scientific advisory committee or advisory panels to provide expert guidance to key decision makers such as the Minister, the Secretary or the regulator on specific matters relating to wildlife? Why or why not? What other approaches are available?

Yes. Providing expert guidance is crucial because, at the rate flora and fauna species are going extinct, we need knowledgeable and compassionate people to help.

5.1.1 Should the Act include other offences?

It should be illegal to clear any more land. It should be a requirement of all landholders to replant 50% of "their" land with tubestock of endemic species with vokunteers' and the government's assistance.

5.1.2 Should any offences be repealed?

Unsure Jail time or people who hurt nature.

5.2.1 Are the maximum penalties in the Act adequate to punish and deter offenders? If not, what should they be?

Unsure

5.3.1 Should the Act contain general provisions creating continuing offences and allowing for additional penalties?

Yes

5.4.1 Should the Act contain provisions to permit community impact statements relating to the harm caused to wildlife?

Yes

5.4.2 Should the Act contain specific provisions to guide sentencing of offenders convicted under the Act?

Yes

5.5.1 Should the Act contain civil penalty provisions? If so, what penalties should be included? Are there examples from other jurisdictions (both in Australia and internationally) that could also apply in Victoria?

Unsure

5.5.2 Should the Act allow for infringement notices for minor offences? Are there examples from other jurisdictions (both in Australia and internationally) that could also apply in Victoria?

Yes. Unsure.

5.5.3 Should the Act contain provisions enabling regulators to enter into enforceable undertakings? Are there examples from other jurisdictions (both in Australia and internationally) that could also apply in Victoria?

Yes. Unsure.

5.5.4 Should the Act contain provisions allowing for compensation orders or mandated bonds/financial assurances? Are there examples from other jurisdictions (both in Australia and internationally) that could also apply in Victoria?

Yes. Unsure.

5.5.5 Should the Act contain provisions allowing for the making of costs orders? Are there examples from other jurisdictions (both in Australia and internationally) that could also apply in Victoria?

Yes. Unsure.

5.5.6 Should the Act contain provisions allowing for the making of a monetary penalty order? Are there examples from other jurisdictions (both in Australia and internationally) that could also apply in Victoria?

Yes. Unsure.

5.5.7 Should the Act contain specific provisions to allow for the forfeiture of property used in the commission of an offence under the Act? Are there examples from other jurisdictions (both in Australia and internationally) that could also apply in Victoria?

Yes. Unsure.

5.5.8 Does the Act contain adequate regulatory tools, sanctions and remedies to punish and deter wildlife crime? If not, what additional tools, sanctions and remedies should be included within the Act?

No. Jail time.

5.6.1 Does the Act contain the necessary powers and provisions to enable authorised officers to enforce the Act? What powers and provisions should be available to authorised officers? Are there examples from other jurisdictions (both in Australia and internationally) that could also apply in Victoria?

Unsure.

5.7.1 Does the Act provide appropriate provisions for the review and appeal of decisions?

Unsure.

5.8.1 Should the Act provide for third-party civil enforcement under the Act? How might this make a difference in achieving the intended outcomes of the Act?

Yes. It might deter people from their destructive ways.

Provided April 30/2021