

**North Peace Rod and Gun Club/Peace-Liard Region BC Wildlife Federation
Peace River North Candidates' Questions**

Funding for Fish and Wildlife Management

Hunting and angling in British Columbia contributes over 1 billion dollars through direct, indirect and induced impacts. These two activities account for over 20,000 jobs. License and fee revenue is currently not dedicated to go back to the management of the resource.

1. Do you support a dedicated funding model for fish and wildlife management where all license fees and revenues are returned to the resource?

Government should adequately fund Fish & Wildlife Management. The inclusion of licence fees into the funding model makes sense but it will take a large source of funding to support fish & wildlife management.

Science-based Fish and Wildlife Conservation Management

A science-based approach to fish and wildlife conservation management has been usurped by political interference in the past. One example of this is the moratorium placed on grizzly bear hunting in 2001. Another example is a lack of predator management to ensure the long-term viability of healthy wildlife populations and species at risk such as mountain caribou.

2. Do you support a science-based approach to fish and wildlife conservation management including the management of predators where it is supported by science?

Yes I support science-based approach of Fish & Wildlife management. Government has to provide staff and fund these types of projects and as you know the funding for these programs has been reduced dramatically over the past few years.

Resident Priority to Fish and Wildlife

Over the past 3 decades access to and allocation of fish and wildlife opportunities for British Columbians have been reduced in favour of commercial interests.

3. Do you support British Columbians' priority to access and harvest of fish and wildlife in British Columbia?

Yes British Columbian's should have priority.

Best Practices – Habitat and Watershed Sustainability, Mitigation and Compensation

Extraction and use of oil, gas, hydro-electric, mining, water rights and fish farming often does not look at carrying capacity, cumulative impacts or a landscape-level based approach to development, nor is there a compensation plan for these impacts. Other issues such as the Federal Government's changes to the *Fisheries Act* and *Water Act* which has left little protection for fish, wildlife and its habitat.

4. Do you support a landscape-level approach to resource extraction and use?

There needs to be public involvement that addresses planning for resource extraction. The BCWF and those represented by them through associated clubs need to be included in this planning process. Under former NDP governments the LRMP process allowed direct involvement by local groups to be included in these plans. Many of these LRMPs are now past their review dates and need to be brought up date with existing and required information. Government needs to fund this type of government service.

5. Do you support a compensation program which allocates revenues from extraction to be re-invested in fish and wildlife habitat and management?

Fish and Wildlife Habitat and Management require adequate funding. The provincial budget should adequately fund this important public service. Designated funding may be one way that could adequately deal with this issue but it is the type of funding that could easily be discontinued by future governments. I will work to see that adequate funding is available for these programs if elected.