

2051883D M

Don 14/9/87

PROCEEDINGS OF A COLLOQUIUM  
ON WILDLIFE CONSERVATION IN CANADA

OTTAWA  
MAY 7-8, 1986



QL  
84.24  
C6413  
1986

CONTENTS

Program	iv
Opening Statement Honourable Tom McMillan Minister, Environment Canada	1
Opening Statement Honourable Vincent Kerrio Minister of Natural Resources, Ontario	5
Wildlife Policy in Canada: Precedents, Perceptions and Prospects Peter H. Pearse	7
A Time for Change J. Barry Turner, M.P.	23
Doing More with Less: Wildlife Management Financing in the 1980s Kenneth A. Brynaert and Stephen D. Hazell	39
An Alternative View of New Sources of Finance for Wildlife Management David B. Perry	63
Background Comments on Cooperative Research Units Robert A. Jantzen	79
Cooperative Arrangements for Wildlife Management James H.C. Walker and Linda J. Foubister	93
A Cooperative Wildlife Habitat Conservation Program David J. Neave	103
Sharing Funds for Wildlife Management F.A.G. Carter	115
Highlights of the Open Discussion David A. Munro, Moderator	132

Published by authority of the  
Minister of the Environment  
Canadian Wildlife Service

©Minister of Supply and Services Canada, 1987  
Catalogue No. CW66-87/1986E  
ISBN 0-662-15384-7

Copies available from

Distribution Section  
Canadian Wildlife Service  
Environment Canada  
Ottawa, Ontario  
K1A 0E7



A Colloquium

on

WILDLIFE CONSERVATION IN CANADA

Château Laurier Hotel, Ottawa, 7-8 May, 1986

Program

6 May

19:00 **Reception and Dinner** - Adam Room  
- hosted by Honourable V. Kerrio (Ontario)

7 May

**Main Proceedings** - Banquet Room

09:00 - 10:15 **Welcome to the Colloquium**, David A. Munro, Moderator

Opening Statements:

- Honourable Tom McMillan, Minister of Environment, Canada
- Honourable Vincent Kerrio, Minister of Natural Resources, Ontario

Setting the Scene:

- Dr. Peter Pearse, Professor of Forestry, University of British Columbia: Managing Canada's Wildlife: Perceptions, Policies and Process

10:15 - 10:45 **Coffee Break** - Alcove

10:45 - 12:30 **Commissioned Papers** - Banquet Room

- Wildlife Users Equipment Tax, Barry Turner, M.P.
- Aspects of Financing and Administering Wildlife Management, K.A. Brynaert, Executive Director, Canadian Wildlife Federation
- The Business Community and Wildlife Management, David Perry, Canadian Tax Foundation

12:30 - 14:00 **Buffet Lunch** - Drawing Room

14:00 - 15:15 **Commissioned Papers** (continued)

- Cooperative Arrangements for Wildlife Research, Robert Jantzen, Former Director, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service
- Cooperative Arrangements for Wildlife Management, Jim Walker, Director, British Columbia Wildlife Branch
- Collaboration for Habitat Conservation, D. Neave, Executive Director, Wildlife Habitat Canada
- Sharing Funds for Wildlife Management, F.A.G. Carter, Former Assistant Secretary for Federal-Provincial Relations, Privy Council Office

15:15 - 17:00 **Open Discussion**, David A. Munro, Moderator

18:30 **Reception** - Adam Room

20:00 **Ministers' Private Dinner** - Gatineau Room

8 May

**Main Proceedings** - Banquet Room

09:00 **Open Discussion and Statements** by Non-Governmental Organizations

10:15 - 10:30 **Summary** by D. Munro

10:30 - 11:00 **Coffee** - Alcove

11:00 - 11:30 **Press Conference** - Banquet Room  
Statement by Co-Hosts: Honourable Tom McMillan  
Honourable Vincent Kerrio

11:30 - 13:00 **WILDLIFE MINISTERS' CONFERENCE: CLOSED SESSION** - Banquet Room

13:00 - 14:00 **Lunch** - Renaissance Room

OPENING STATEMENT

The Honourable Tom McMillan  
Minister, Environment Canada

Mr. Chairman, House of Commons colleagues, including the former Federal Environment Minister, Charles Caccia, Ladies and Gentlemen, mes chères amis, it is a great pleasure to welcome you to this, the Wildlife Conservation Colloquium. Je suis heureux d'être parmi vous ce matin, je vous souhaite la bienvenue à la capitale nationale. I thank the Province of Ontario and in particular my good friend and colleague, the Honourable Vincent Kerrio, the province's Minister of Natural Resources, for co-hosting such an important meeting. I also welcome my provincial colleagues, the Honourable Yvon Picotte of Quebec, bienvenue à Ottawa, the Honourable Colin Maxwell of Saskatchewan, the Honourable Bill Matthews of Newfoundland and the Honourable Red Pederson of the Northwest Territories. Colleagues, I'm pleased that you could come to Ottawa for the Colloquium, and I regret that recent and pending provincial elections have prevented others of our colleagues from joining us. I am delighted to meet the provincial and territorial ministers for wildlife as a group, for the first time in my case, and to be joined by so many others vitally interested in protecting and enhancing this important Canadian national and natural resource. I've met many of my colleagues and many of you individually on different occasions, but I think that it will be particularly useful for all of us to sit down together as we will today and tomorrow, to learn from each other and to stimulate, foster and promote each other's thinking.

Those of us responsible for the management of wildlife programs should, I think, consider ourselves fortunate. Our product, wildlife, needs little introduction to the Canadian people. Wildlife is by nature, by definition, compelling, as anyone who has ever sat through a Disney movie can testify. Loving wildlife is a very North American thing to do.

According to Statistics Canada, more than 15 million Canadians spend an estimated 4.2 billion dollars each year participating in wildlife-related recreational activities. Those activities contribute 8.8 billion dollars and 185 thousand jobs to the Canadian economy. Because wildlife is a renewable resource, such economic benefits can be sustained forever, if federal and provincial governments, non-governmental organizations and the public at large, exercise good stewardship and good husbandry.

The state of our wildlife is also a barometer of the health of the environment as a whole. When toxic chemicals reach levels that harm birds and hurt animals we know that human health is also threatened. Wildlife, however, has a more fundamental value to Canadians and to our country. A value that I can express most easily by asking you to contemplate for just a moment, life without birds, life without mammals and insects, trees, and flowers, and all the others forms of vibrant life that surround us and that we take for granted. It is the nature of us as humans, a particular species among others on the planet, to be fascinated by other species. In fact, it is our ability to appreciate, even to love



their beauty, that sets us apart from other species. At the same time we know that we are not, and we cannot be, alone on this planet. Given our power to change the land and the landscape, we have to act responsibly to ensure the survival of ecosystems and the species that depend on them, including, of course, ourselves.

The enormity, the sheer magnitude of our responsibility combined with our already mentioned interest in wildlife, should make conservation programs easy. But if that were the case, we wouldn't be gathering as we are today, in Ottawa, from one end of the country to another, at this Colloquium, to pool our combined intellectual resources to come up with better strategies. The simple truth is that governments have less and less discretionary funding available to them and most wildlife programs are in that category of discretionary funding. Recent cuts by all governments unhappily reflect this new reality. Governments must therefore help stimulate ideas and create new sources of revenues that will not increase the burden of debt on either current or future generations of Canadians. The role of the private sector in that connection is essential. Certainly creative ways will have to be found to engage governments and the private sector in joint initiatives that benefit wildlife.

A central idea for our Colloquium, to address both the funding and improve delivery of wildlife programs, was sparked at a wildlife minister's conference in Toronto in January of 1985. The need for brainstorming was great then and it is even greater now. In the next day and a half we will have a distinct and even unique opportunity to explore well-thought out options for generating revenues for wildlife programs. Those of us around this table and in this room in government, have an advantage in being able to do so with non-government interest groups. Not only are they major clients of government wildlife programs, they are also in every sense of the word, our partners in wildlife conservation. Without their dedication and without their involvement, our society would simply not have the wildlife resources it now enjoys.

Clearly one of the main messages of the 1980's, and certainly an underlying theme of the Colloquium, is that concerted and collective action by everyone concerned is necessary. Without an effective partnership, our treasured wildlife heritage cannot long be sustained. We in Canada have, for the most part, effectively carried out our responsibilities for wildlife management over the years, but much more will need to be done by all of us in the future. The problems confronting wildlife, and hence wildlife managers, have grown increasingly complex and difficult to resolve. It is no longer practical to consider management plans for just single species, or even for wildlife alone; rather we must develop and we need to implement integrated plans, taking into account the needs of land managers who have other, and often conflicting, ambitions for land use.

Conservation implies wise use, which is the key to healthy wildlife, and it carries too, the promise of sustainability. Soil and water conservation are every bit as important for wildlife as they are for agriculture. Bountiful populations of flora and fauna are a product of a healthy landscape and yet, habitat is being lost across the country at an alarming and even scandalous rate. The results in terms of wildlife are obvious to all of us. We must find improved methods of working with agricultural interests, with the forest industry, and with others who have a stake in the land base that supports wildlife. We on the government side of the wildlife cause, must improve ways of persuading other agencies within our own respective governments, that protecting wildlife is not just an exercise in tree-hugging, it is an economic and social imperative. Indeed, wildlife underpins thousands of jobs in this country while contributing immeasurably to our quality of life.

The recently proposed North American Waterfowl Management Plan exemplifies the kind of trail-blazing approaches we must take collectively if we are to maintain wildlife populations. It also typifies the new types of partnerships that must be formed if we are to succeed. The Plan is largely a response to the alarming decline in the populations of ducks on the prairies and of some species in eastern Canada. Canada and the United States both recognized that although there are many other factors, the primary cause is the loss of waterfowl habitat. I am pleased to confirm today that I have obtained official approval from Cabinet to complete arrangements with the United States towards a formal agreement. Next week in Washington I shall be meeting with U.S. Secretary of the Interior, Don Hodel, to advance the Plan. I hope, soon thereafter, to be able to co-sign with him a declaration of intent endorsing the North American Waterfowl Management Plan, the biggest single step required to get the Plan itself launched. The Plan is as exciting as it is forward looking. I want now to pay tribute to the commitment of the waterfowl experts, Canadian and American, federal, provincial and state, who worked long and hard to develop it. The North American Waterfowl Management Plan is primarily about land management. Its most significant application will be on agricultural lands, primarily but not exclusively in the Prairie Provinces. But friends, don't be surprised if you see some of that effort being made in my own province, Prince Edward Island. The free traders may have left P.E.I. off the map, but we wildlifers are going to put the island back on it. Implementation of the Plan calls for the conservation of soil and water and provides long-term benefits, not just to waterfowl but to agriculture, and to the economy generally. Every single Canadian will benefit from what will be one of the great steps forward in social development policy in this country. In fact, the Plan when it is completed, will be one of the most ambitious bilateral programs ever undertaken in social policy by Canada and the United States.

OPENING STATEMENT

The Honourable Vincent Kerrio  
Minister of Natural Resources, Ontario

Let me repeat, land use planning is indispensable to wise integrated resource management. It blends ecology and economics, bringing together the best available information on the capability of land, on the sustainability of different uses and on the needs of the present and the future. It enables us to decide what serves the public interest best and what damages the natural environment least. It has been estimated that implementing the Plan will require an investment of 1.5 billion dollars Canadian over a 15-year period. Of that, almost 1 billion dollars is to be spent in Canada, and of that proportion, an average of 18 million dollars per year will have to be obtained from Canadian sources.

Now the need for such large sums means that we must be imaginative, just as we must be realistic, in a world where the user-pay concept is becoming increasingly necessary. Fortunately, wildlife users have shown a mature understanding of the user-pay idea, as long as there are observable links between sources of funds and the purposes for which those funds are employed. People who pay expect to see their money used in ways that have meaning for them. They don't mind having a deep pocket into which they dig deeply if they can be assured that in paying an extra tax or otherwise coming forward with an extra contribution to the cause, the money raised is used for a purpose that means something to them.

I myself am strongly attracted to a concept that my colleague Barry Turner, has championed zealously inside and outside of government. It is thoughtful, innovative, courageous and practical, and because of those very qualities it will have a hard time getting support in certain quarters of government. But Barry has my own support in principle, and I hope you will give such progressive ideas, his and others, a sympathetic hearing at this Colloquium.

The challenges facing us in developing and delivering wildlife conservation programs are great. But I firmly believe that we can and we must address them. We can either moan about the loss of easy public funding, or we can show, as wildlife people have always been very skillful in showing, how wildlife conservation needs can be met when people are determined, imaginative and energetic.

I am confident that by noon tomorrow we will have established a consensus on how we can work together to save our great wildlife inheritance, to nourish it with loving care and to bequeath it intact to our children and to theirs. We need do nothing more, we must do nothing less.

It is indeed a pleasure to share the duties of hosting this Colloquium with the Honourable Tom McMillan. Our purpose here is to generate ideas for achieving more funding for wildlife management programs and discovering how to make better use of the funds. We are not here to debate the necessity of individual wildlife projects. We all know that there are many deserving projects to fund if we hope to improve or even maintain our wildlife.

We need to do much creative thinking at this meeting to find the right balance of what will work at both the national and the local levels. Balancing the national picture with the local picture requires the implementation of an old philosophy on a scale that is entirely new. It involves engaging the user-interest groups, not only in funding, but in actual project implementation. In Ontario we have initiated a number of programs that directly involve people in projects in their own communities. Two of those programs are CFIP and CWIP, which stand for Community Fisheries Involvement Program and the Community Wildlife Involvement Program respectively. Through these programs, my ministry provides the expertise and capital funding, and the interest groups provide the planning and labour, mostly on a voluntary basis. Since the programs began, we have approved more than 440 such projects ranging from seeding old logging roads with clover and grass for deer and bear to creating a spawning channel for salmon and trout on the Sidham River. The fish began using the channel this spring, and it was just completed last year. We as a government put minimal funding into a project that took many, many hours and ten-fold our investment by those who undertook the task. These projects have saved Ontario literally millions of dollars. The concept behind our efforts is that people like to be involved and, when given responsibility, they do a great job of managing and improving their own resources. People take pride in their work and that is one of the positive facets of human nature which we as a group would do well to recognize and enlarge on. Human effort is likely the greatest resource we have to employ for the benefit of all. And the new concept is to mobilize human effort at the local level. Governments over many years have had the notion that you could throw money at a particular circumstance or situation, but this did not always correct the problem. We have to find the right balance of programs at the local, provincial and territorial levels.

Finding ways to do more with the money we already have is the same as finding new sources of funding. Any new money we put into wildlife management can certainly be justified by the amount of money that wildlife-related spending puts back into the economy. Total sales in wildlife-related expenditures contribute over a \$1 billion to Ontario's economy alone. My ministry spends \$15.5 million on wildlife management. In Ontario, hunters spend more than \$136 million. Trappers harvest more than \$13 million in pelts, and wildlife enthusiasts, such as birdwatchers, spend more than \$80 million annually. Provincial income from all wildlife

expenditures is estimated at \$533 million. The money is there in our economy. The question is how do we tap it and direct it back toward wildlife management. I know that representatives of interest groups and our ministry staffs are attending at this gathering. We will be consulting those people because they are experts in these particular fields and can offer many substantial ideas about how to increase sources of revenue for the various projects.

There is much work to be done. From the impressive collection of ideas and proposals we must put together a plan for future action that will meet the needs of wildlife conservation not only in Ontario and the territories but in this great nation of ours. Thank you very much.

**WILDLIFE POLICY IN CANADA:  
PRECEDENTS, PERCEPTIONS AND PROSPECTS**

by  
**Peter H. Pearse**

An Address Prepared for the  
**MINISTERS' COLLOQUIUM ON WILDLIFE MANAGEMENT**

Ottawa, May 7, 1986

Forest Economics and Policy Analysis Project  
The University of British Columbia

Wildlife Policy in Canada:  
Precedents, Perceptions and Prospects  
by  
Peter H. Pearse

---

#### Introduction

I am more than usually honoured to have been asked to address this colloquium because I know there is a certain suspicion about economists among wildlife managers. Economists are too prone to pontificate on subjects they know nothing about; their metric of benefit-cost analysis is too narrow to embrace the subtle values of wildlife and environmental quality, and they have a reputation for being both inconsistent and incomprehensible. I thought it would be useful to acknowledge these virtues at the outset of my presentation, before I go on to demonstrate them.

I carry a double burden, because I am also a forester; one of those who wildlife managers associate with habitat disruption. But there is much more distrust between economists and foresters. Economists regard foresters and their entrenched principles for regulating harvests over time with disdain, and foresters tend to think that economists, with their insistence on applying compound interest rates to investments in long-term crops, are fundamentally subversive. So my career has been somewhat schizophrenic, and often lonely. Occasionally, I have taken refuge in wildlife management problems.

I have been asked to speak about wildlife management policy in Canada. But I want to emphasize that I have no formal training in wildlife management. I have been caught up in it occasionally because I find it interesting; because it has intersected with my policy work on forests and fisheries and water resources; and because I see in it such enormous, untapped opportunities.

I also like to hunt and fish. And, like all hunters and fishermen, I know exactly what is wrong and what should be done, and my ideas are uncluttered by scientific knowledge.

In any discussion about wildlife policy, it is important to keep in broad perspective the forces that policy-makers of the past have been responding to. This explains how we got to where we are today. I want to suggest to you that some of the objectives of earlier policy-makers are still relevant and some are not. This means that our present policies are not altogether attuned to our modern circumstances and needs. Indeed, I want to argue that our current policy framework is inadequate to protect the public interest in wildlife. And that, in turn, leads me to suggest that we have some new opportunities we should try to take advantage of.

#### The Changing Significance of Wildlife Resources in Canada

It is hard to generalize about wildlife in Canada. We are dealing with a huge variety of species, whose habitats occupy half a continent. To provide the context for my later remarks, I want to note only that the wildlife of Canada is remarkably diverse and prolific. If we can all agree on this elementary fact I need not dwell on it, because most of you know more about it than I do.

Because I want to talk about resource management *policy*, it is important to bear in mind as well the historical significance of wildlife in Canada. This is because policy responds to problems and needs as they arise, so our present policy framework is the accumulation of responses in past years to problems and circumstances that assumed enough importance at the time to attract the attention of governments. Those of us who indulge in analysis of public policies soon learn that they can be understood only in the context of circumstances at the time they were introduced.

A variety of influences thus moulded our present policy framework. The fur trade, which had such great economic and strategic significance during the early history of Canada, was obviously an enormous influence on wildlife policy. So, today, though the fur trade has long been overtaken by other staple industries, the legislation and institutional arrangements governing trapping and the wild fur industries is deeply entrenched, stable to the point of rigidity, largely independent of the management of wildlife for other purposes and, by and large, satisfactory. Significantly (for what I have to say later) it is based on longstanding cooperative arrangements between the government and the entrepreneur.

Similarly, our present provisions for Indian and Inuit use of wildlife are the result of traditional native dependence combined with imperial policies toward aboriginal people, modified in some cases by treaties. Predator control policies owe much to the influence of agricultural interests, especially the livestock industry. The great thrust of our generation appears to be in habitat management; a result, undoubtedly, of the impact on wildlife habitat of modern industrial activities. So our wildlife policy evolves.

Wildlife has always had important economic significance in Canada. During our early history the fur trade dominated the economy. Wildlife still supports a major wild fur industry, a big game guiding and outfitting industry, and an important source of subsistence for native people.

However, in modern times the most dramatic growth has been in recreational uses of wildlife; hunting, bird-watching and other non-consumptive activities. These relatively new demands associated with recreational aesthetic and environmental values are the most important uses of wildlife today, and they are the uses that preoccupy wildlife managers. And it is in respect of these uses that our present policies appear weakest.

A study published by the Canadian Wildlife Service a few weeks ago estimates the direct benefits enjoyed by Canadians from wildlife-related recreational activities in 1981 amounted to \$0.8 billion.<sup>1</sup> This is over and above the \$4.2 billion that they spent on their recreation; it is an estimate of the additional amount they would have been willing to pay for the recreation that they actually enjoyed without charge.<sup>2</sup>

Such statistics are sometimes intended to impress people with their size and hence importance. But \$0.8 billion strikes me as remarkably small for the direct value attributable to resources which are so prevalent and widely appreciated in Canada. We spend more than this on liquor in British Columbia alone. True, this figure excludes commercial uses like trapping, subsistence values, and recreational values enjoyed by foreigners; but it is intended to include all the hunting, bird-watching and other non-consumptive forms of recreation of Canadians that are attributable to wildlife.

I want to suggest to you that the values we derive from our wildlife resources are too low, and they fall far short of their potential value to us. This is not because nature has been mean to us; indeed, nature has endowed us generously. But we have imposed on ourselves a framework of wildlife policies that prevent the potential benefits from being realized.

#### Policy Directions

In 1982, the federal and provincial ministers responsible for wildlife published *Guidelines for Wildlife Policy in Canada*.<sup>3</sup> This short document "... provides direction

for the development of wildlife policies and programs in the future." (p.2). It sets out what are called goals, principles and elements which all the governments have endorsed. Moreover they have agreed to consider implementing them, where they are consistent with their own policies. It commits the governments to evaluate the guidelines after five years; that means next year, so time is getting short.

*Guidelines for Wildlife Policy in Canada* is an impressive statement for several reasons. For one thing it recognises wildlife as components of integrated and interdependent ecosystems, and to this extent it takes a modern approach. For another, it apparently has the support of a wide range of non-governmental organizations and individuals, and draws on the 1980 World Conservation Strategy.<sup>4</sup> And, most remarkable, it is a statement about how natural resources should be managed that has been agreed upon by all provincial, territorial and federal governments in Canada.

The goals and principles enunciated in this document are very general. This is not surprising; if a statement of this sort is to enjoy broad support it must of necessity be general. Moreover, the policy objectives seem to me to be commendable as far as they go. Their shortcoming, in my opinion, is that they don't go far enough. Indeed, they seem to stop at a defensive effort to protect and preserve, rather than to enhance, and in my view this is not adequate in our modern circumstances.

Let me explain. The *Guidelines* begin with three broad goals, namely:

1. To maintain ecosystems
2. To preserve the diversity of species
3. To ensure that the uses of wildlife are sustainable

This suggests a holding operation. There is no parallel objective to *enhance* and *improve* wildlife resources, or to *develop* and *increase* the values we derive from them; only to maintain, preserve and sustain what we have. It certainly implies more modest ambitions than we have for fisheries and forest resources. And I want to suggest to you that it will not be enough.

#### Limitations of Defensive Policies

My argument rests on the following syllogism. An entirely defensive wildlife policy will inevitably lead to erosion of wildlife resources and the values we derive from



them. Erosion of Canada's wildlife resources is not in the public interest. Therefore the public interest demands that we embark on an aggressive policy of wildlife development and enhancement.

The first premise is obvious upon a little reflection. The best a defensive policy can do is to try to protect and preserve. But other interests will always threaten to impinge on animals or their habitat, and occasionally the competing interests will win. A hydro dam will flood a whitetail deer range; an old-growth forest that sustains woodland caribou will be logged; a prairie marsh will be drained for farming, and so on. Despite what some opponents say, the hydro utilities, the logging industry and the farmers are all legitimate public interest groups in this country, and sometimes the public interest is best served by accommodating them even at the expense of wildlife. In short, if wildlife policy aims only at protecting and defending what we have, and occasionally the public interest demands that conflicting interests prevail, the long-run result will be continued erosion of wildlife resources.

The second premise, that attrition of wildlife is not in the public interest, is probably acceptable to this audience but in the broader arena is more debatable. I believe it to be true, but not because the benefits we currently derive from wildlife are very significant; rather, because it is obvious to me that there exist enormous opportunities to create values from wildlife that we have hitherto been suppressing. And if we adopted a more open framework of public policy to accommodate these potential values, wildlife interests would easily be able to hold their own against what are now stronger, competing interests.

I might add that it is my clear impression from public hearings on related matters across Canada that Canadians want assurance that wildlife, as the most vital and fascinating part of our natural environment, will be well protected and managed, from the dramatic whooping crane to the mundane marmot.

My conclusion is that the public interest requires us to make some changes so that we can begin to realize the undeveloped, potential values of wildlife. This will take more than the public information programs advocated in the *Guidelines*. It calls for some policy changes to create economic incentives to husband wildlife comparable to those that drive competing interests and jeopardize wildlife.

#### Principles From the Past

Management of wildlife for recreational, consumptive and aesthetic values in Canada is based on deeply entrenched principles, each originally adopted for logical

reasons although they collectively leave us with a rather weak framework for managing resources today. The basic principles that provide the underpinning for non-commercial uses of wildlife are four-fold:

1. Ownership by the Crown.

Provincial governments have passed legislation to appropriate for the Crown the title to almost all wildlife, removing it from among the common law rights that go with property rights in land.

2. Common-property Management.

For recreational purposes such as hunting, users of wildlife are required to obtain licenses or permits, and they all have equal access to the resources on a common-property basis. This is consistent with the traditions of ocean fisheries, but not, significantly, with those of most other land-based resources owned by the Crown. This principle was presumably adopted for expedience once the principle of public ownership was in place, and more sophisticated systems of rights for users did not appear necessary at a time when pressures on the wild populations were light.

3. Prohibition of Sales of Game Products.

Apparently in an effort to find an administratively easy way of controlling the excesses of early market hunters, provincial governments have generally prohibited commercial use and trade in wildlife products such as venison.

4. Restriction of Private Management.

The combination of Crown title to all wildlife and prohibition of commercial uses of wildlife leads easily to restrictions on private game management and any other kind of wildlife husbandry. So virtually all wildlife in Canada consists of what is left of natural, wild stocks, managed entirely by governmental agencies.

These four principles underlie our present approach to wildlife management in Canada, and they have profound implications for the benefits we are able to derive from our resources. In my opinion, they are not well suited to modern conditions, and they do not augur well for either wildlife resources or the benefits we derive from them.

I think there is a popular view that these principles are somehow necessary for good wildlife management. But they are not; indeed a better case can be made that they are impediments. Note, first, that they are inconsistent with British and European traditions

governing game management. Second, they are most suitable for a frontier society where only natural wild stocks are relevant, where pressures on resources are light, and where simple and expedient regulatory measures are needed. They are not well suited for advanced societies where demands on the resources are heavy and husbanding is called for. Third, we find the best examples of wildlife management where these policies are not in place, as in Britain and Europe.

#### The Paradox of Plenty

I can explain the point I want to make by telling you how my interest in this issue was triggered. I grew up in the northern Okanagan valley on a "stump-farm", which is what we call a marginal farm in British Columbia because years after the land is cleared of timber there remains a vista of stumps, and these are often the most healthy-looking things in the fields. I developed all the values and perceptions you would expect from a parochial, rural background in western Canada, including attitudes toward game and how we use it. Our family lived off ten acres of land, and there were nine mouths to feed. We ate a lot of game in winter.

Then, after studying forestry in Vancouver, I won an opportunity to study abroad. I went abruptly from one extreme to the other; from the frontier of western Canada to the ancient city of Edinburgh in Scotland, where I studied and taught for some years at Edinburgh University.

Through the oldest part of Edinburgh there runs a little creek, the Water of Lieth, where I often noticed someone fishing. Surprisingly, it was very good fishing.

So, I began to wonder: how come, in this old city, there is still good fishing while there is no decent fishing left anywhere near Vancouver or any of the cities I knew in Canada? The answer was that for centuries someone had the fishing rights along that stream in Edinburgh. Those rights were legal and valuable, and the holder had a very keen interest in protecting them. He would make sure the stream was never over-fished because poor fishing would devastate the value of his fishing rights. He would certainly protect it, and poaching was a very serious offense. He would also sue anyone who impaired the productivity of the stream. So he managed it and cultivated it just as he would a piece of farmland and a herd of cattle on it, which I could understand.

Today, throughout Britain, good fishing can be found within easy reach of every city and town, and at a reasonable price. If you live in Grantown-on-Spey, for example,

you can join the local angling association for a weekly fee of about \$25 and enjoy the right to fish along seven miles of good fishing stream.<sup>5</sup> Hotels and local inns provide similar opportunities for guests, as do many estate owners and angling clubs that lease or own fishing rights. A remarkable standard of sport fishery management is maintained throughout Scotland and England and it is done with remarkably little effort on the part of the government.

There is a lesson for us here. And it is not just sportfishing in Britain that provides us with lessons. If you want the best bird shooting in the world you do not look to Canada (which has unmatched potential) but to Europe: those old, overpopulated countries somehow maintain the best hunting opportunities anywhere. Isn't it ironic that dedicated Canadian sportsmen pay handsomely to hunt deer in Chechoslovakia, wild boar in France, partridge in Spain, grouse in Scotland and pheasants in Denmark and Belgium? And isn't it telling that the wildlife in those countries is better managed and protected than anywhere else, and that the foreigners who offer these hunting opportunities make lots of money, while Canadian wildlife managers fight a rear-guard action against loggers, farmers, environmental purists, and governmental retrenchment?

Austria is less than one-tenth the size of British Columbia, and it is much more intensively populated and developed. Yet each year Austrians harvest nearly double the number of big game animals taken in the whole of British Columbia. The small game harvest is even more impressive. Thousands of professional managers are employed privately in husbanding wildlife. It represents very valuable assets. It provides highly coveted recreation for thousands of others. Consumers have access to venison, partridge and other delicacies in shops and restaurants everywhere and game supports a significant food industry. Landowners cultivate their wildlife and work hard to integrate it with forest and agricultural crops.

In both western and eastern Europe, game is well protected and managed, because it is valuable and people possess rights that enable them to protect those values. Just like Canadian ranchers protect and husband their cattle and farmers their chickens, neither of which we are ever likely to have to worry about as endangered species. But in Canada, the safest wildlife is that which happens to thrive on the disruption caused by more powerful interests, like mule deer that thrive on logging. Species that suffer from other pressures, like grizzly bears and woodland caribou, face a bleak future. To a large extent, wildlife here is at the mercy of activities that have more immediate economic impact.

## The Forest Analogy

Our most prolific and valuable natural resources in Canada are our forests. Most of these forests are owned by the Crown, yet we depend almost entirely on the private sector to utilize them. This reflects our preference in Canada for public ownership of natural resources on the one hand and, for private enterprise to produce things from them on the other. But while we like public ownership of these vast lands and resources, we are less keen about building up big bureaucracies to manage them, and this presents a conundrum. The solution has been found in licensing arrangements that muster the resources of the private sector to manage public resources.

My own work in forest policy has led me to the conclusion that these contractual arrangements between timber companies and the Crown are the key to good resource management. They provide the link between the public landlord and the private user, the contract that assigns rights and responsibilities to each. Thus my 1976 Royal Commission report on British Columbia's forest policy was titled *Timber Rights and Forest Policy*.

No other country has had such rich experience in licensing, leasing, and permitting arrangements for forests, and none has developed such sophisticated means of organizing private resources to not only use but also to manage public timber.

Our experience with various forms of forest tenure has, of course, been mixed. But the best managed public forests in most provinces are under forest management agreements or tree farm licences, managed by the licensees under the general surveillance of provincial forest services. Some management is exemplary, even by Scandinavian standards. But I emphasize that it is good management of the forest resource, for timber production; I cannot say the same about the management of other forest values, including wildlife. These licensees have no incentive to protect or enhance the Crown's fish and wildlife; which is often a costly nuisance to them. More alarmingly, almost nowhere in Canada does *anyone* have an incentive to manage fish and wildlife; many want it and enjoy it, but its management is relegated almost entirely to government agencies. And all these government agencies have to depend on are restrictions, regulations and penalties.

## Lessons From Forest Policy

We could undoubtedly adapt the experience from forest tenure arrangements to muster private resources for managing wildlife. Think of the possibilities. Local rod and gun clubs could be licensed to manage the wildlife in a few coherent areas on behalf of their

members, as they do in England and Scotland. This would not only be interesting and rewarding for them, it would help the government, as well, to have this additional manpower directed to population assessment, enforcement and enhancement under approved plans (just as private parties undertake forest management). And wouldn't it be marvellous to have this kind of direct public involvement in the actual management of wildlife?

Wouldn't it be sensible if a company that held a licence to manage the timber in an area could also obtain the right to manage and utilize the game? The principles of integrated resource management would then surely be adopted with more enthusiasm. And wouldn't it be reasonable to build on big game guiding and outfitting territories, to allow the licensee to manage and utilize the game for all purposes?

Wouldn't it be a nice reversal if ranchers could obtain rights to manage and utilize ungulates, which are now nothing but a threat to them? And wouldn't it be so much better if prairie farmers could farm ducks, and benefit from them commercially, instead of having to drain wetlands to advance their financial interests?

Wouldn't it be great if people could manage game and produce venison and other wild delicacies so that Canadians (outside Newfoundland) could enjoy this special cuisine just as Europeans do?

Finally, consider the interests of Canadians generally, who now foot hefty bills to manage and protect wildlife for the enjoyment of relatively few. Wouldn't it be nice for them to begin to realize some revenues from their valuable resources, like owners do in other countries?

Some people react emotionally or dogmatically to such ideas, so let me carefully emphasize what I am *not* proposing. First, I am *not* advocating privatization. Private ownership of wildlife can certainly produce good management, but it is a non-starter in Canada. Canadians are too fond of public ownership of natural resources to allow governments to alienate them. Anyway, that is not necessary. I am only suggesting licensing the management and use of public resources, in a way that is well accepted in Canada for Crown timber, water, rangeland and other renewable resources. Second, I am *not* suggesting that licensing arrangements for private-sector management will work for *all* wildlife. It doesn't seem to offer much promise for hummingbirds and lizards, but it does for most species of game and fur-bearing animals, which account for a very large share of the values at stake.



Third, I am *not* proposing that governments should abdicate their responsibilities for wildlife. Whether they contract out some rights and obligations under licences or not, they must remain ultimately responsible and accountable for how wildlife is managed, just as they are for the management of other Crown resources.

Fourth, I am not talking about game farming of the New Zealand type, where animals are fenced in, domesticated and utilized for meat and antlers. Rather, I am referring more to the European custom, where free-roaming wild animals are managed, husbanded and harvested. This is the model that best fits the Canadian experience in natural resource management.

Fifth, (in anticipation of a red herring) I do *not* advocate reserving wildlife for the rich. More wildlife, and better recreational opportunities, are capable of benefiting everyone who values these things. Those who are philosophically opposed to people benefiting economically from such resources, need to be persuaded that it is at least desirable to create the values, and then there are all sorts of ways of determining who should enjoy them, and of distributing the benefits acceptably through fees, taxes and so on.

Finally, I do *not* want to imply that private management is the only solution. I began this address by noting the great diversity of wildlife resources in Canada. The circumstances and needs of the people are also diverse. So is the form in which wildlife is appreciated and valued. Accordingly, wildlife policy in Canada should provide for diversity in the arrangements for managing and using the resources. Our arrangements are now too uniform everywhere to accommodate varying interests and to let innovation flower.

Biologists and ecologists ought to be the first to recognise that diversity promotes resilience, strength and adaptability. As a social scientist, I want to suggest that the same is true of social systems and institutions. If you have all the wildlife of Ontario, or Alberta, managed by one agency of one government, there will not be much variation, contrast, competition and innovation. Yet those are the things we need.

My suggestion is very modest; let's try a few experiments in contracting out wildlife management. Building on our rich Canadian experience in managing other natural resources owned by the Crown, governments could enter into agreements with private parties to enable them to manage and use the resources according to plans approved by the responsible wildlife authorities, and to enjoy the economic returns that they can realize from

these operations. If the experiments are successful, we might find new hope for wildlife management in Canada.

#### Conclusion

Where will our wildlife be 20 years from now? Will we be like the starving prospector who finally broke down and ate his dog; then, contemplating the pile of discarded remains, was overcome by anguish thinking about how his poor dog would have enjoyed the bones? Will we still be battling the timber companies and farmers and most other resource users to force them, against their economic interests, to practice integrated use and conserve wildlife? Will we still be generating doubtful statistics about how much value Canadians put on wildlife in an effort to persuade reluctant governments to spend more on its management? Will the only game to be found in Canadian restaurants still be imported from New Zealand? Will the best remaining hunting and fishing continue to decline as access improves and demand on them grows, so that the best will still be found in the older countries of Europe? I hope not. But I am unshakably convinced that, notwithstanding occasional successes, our wild fish and game will continue to lose ground as long as they are not supported by economic interests while the activities that encroach on them are. In other words, unless we change our policies.

From a political viewpoint, wildlife needs a broader constituency. It is now supported by hunters, who are regarded with some distaste by much of the public, and by wildlife managers who are mostly also bureaucrats and somewhat constrained as a lobby. There is, however, a much larger potential constituency, like that in Europe, that includes landowners, managers, gamekeepers, caterers, and especially consumers. But this calls for some policy changes.

In short, a little experimentation with ways of strengthening the economic support for wildlife is needed. A few carefully designed pilot projects in private commercial management will, I suspect, show much more promising results than continued hand-wringing about the need for more governmental funding.

I know that there are many people who are ready and willing to develop these opportunities; ranchers, timber companies, hunting clubs and others. But to bring it about will require some fresh thinking from three directions. First, the established hunting and fishing organizations, who have traditionally taken the position that all the game is the common property of all the people and there can be no special rights. This may be an appealing policy for a frontier society, but it is demonstrably self-defeating wherever

pressures on the resource, and of competing resource uses, are heavy. Fortunately, there are some signs of more open attitudes to different approaches within some of these groups.

The second group is the professional wildlife managers, most of whom are employed by the provincial and territorial regulatory agencies and who advise the policy-makers. There seems to be some inertia within these bureaucracies to innovative change in management regimes. The almost uniform approach toward governmental management of wildlife across this country seems to have left some convinced that it has some higher moral justification.<sup>7</sup>

The third group is the policy-makers, and particularly the provincial and territorial ministers responsible for wildlife. They must provide the leadership. Realistically, they cannot do much without support from both their constituencies of hunters and their bureaucrats. But they can help change stubborn attitudes and design changes in policy that will allow experimentation without generating widespread anxiety.

There are some hopeful developments. A burgeoning interest has suddenly developed in aquaculture, which involves arrangements for fish enterprises analagous to those I am advocating for wildlife. For some years, certain provinces have been issuing permits to raise bison, upland birds, and fur-bearing animals. Farmers and shooting clubs have been developing mutually advantageous arrangements in managing pheasants and other birds. Inuit organizations in the Northwest Territories are in the business of producing reindeer meat for southern markets. Newfoundland allows some sales through restaurants, and British Columbia permits the sale of some buffalo products. Both Alberta and British Columbia have recently proposed new provisions for game farming.<sup>8</sup> But generally, progress has been slow, and the outlook for wildlife, and the values in wildlife, is rather bleak under present arrangements in Canada.

My message is this. The reason our fish and game is threatened, and the reason they enjoy better hunting and fishing in other countries, has nothing to do with the meagerness of our natural resources. On the contrary, nature has been extraordinarily generous to us. Nor is it due to our ignorance about how to manage wildlife. Undoubtedly we have much to learn, but for the most part we know what is wrong and what needs to be done to improve. Our problem is our commitment to obsolete principles of common property non-market use.

All this leads me to conclude that it is timely for ministers responsible for wildlife in Canada to reassess the *Guidelines* they agreed upon in 1982. The three goals they enunciated then should be recognised as worthy of continuing support, but inadequate.

I suggest, therefore, that the forthcoming revision of the *Guidelines* retain the existing three objectives: to maintain ecosystems, to preserve the diversity of species, and to ensure sustainability of uses. But to these should be added three more, namely:

1. To ensure that wildlife policies recognise the full diversity of wildlife-related uses and values, and provide the variety of management arrangements needed to accommodate them.
2. To enable the fullest possible value of wildlife, in both marketable and non-marketable benefits, to be realized.
3. To develop institutional arrangements to encourage non-governmental groups contribute to wildlife management and enhancement.

You will note that whereas the existing goals are directed toward wildlife itself, mine focus on the relationship between wildlife and people. Obviously, public policy must be concerned with both.

There should, in my opinion, be an overriding objective to all of these. That is to provide for continuing experimentation in wildlife policies; this should apply to the full range of issues from how to control predators to how to design licensing systems. If this principle is established, inertia and resistance to innovation will be easier to overcome.

### Footnotes

1. Filion, F.L., A. Jacquemot and R. Reid. 1985. *The Importance of Wildlife to Canadians: An Executive Overview of the Recreational Economic Significance of Wildlife*. Canadian Wildlife Service. Ottawa. 19pp.
2. The sum of the estimated direct benefits and expenditures is thus \$5 billion. This is less than the \$7 billion estimated by the Canadian Wildlife Federation for years earlier. See Canadian Wildlife Federation. 1981. *Estimated Annual Economic Benefit Derived From Wildlife*. (unpublished manuscript).
3. Federal-Provincial Wildlife Conference. 1982. *Guidelines for Wildlife Policy in Canada*. Supply and Services Canada (cat. no. CW66-59/1983E). Ottawa. 14pp.
4. See International Union for the Conservation of Nature and Natural Resources. 1980. *World Conservation Strategy*. Gland, Switzerland.
5. Terry Anderson. 1982. The Market Process and Environmental Amenities, in *Natural Resources: Efficiency and Equity Through the Market Process*. The Fraser Institute. Vancouver, as reported in Michael A. Walker. 1985. *Strategies for Achieving Conservative Objectives*. Paper prepared for the Woodshock Conference sponsored by the Sierra Club of Canada. Toronto. October 18, 1985. 10pp.
6. Since 1965 it has been legal in Newfoundland to sell game to restaurants licensed to serve it.
7. For example, see Valerius Geist. 1985. *Wildlife Society Bulletin* 13(4). pp. 594-598.
8. The initial proposal for game ranching in British Columbia appeared seven years ago. See Government of British Columbia 1979. *Proposed Wildlife Plan for British Columbia*. Ministry of Environment. Victoria. A new discussion paper was released in 1981. Earlier this year, the Ministry released another short discussion paper on this subject: "Proposed Expansion of Game Farming" (undated, mimeo), 3pp. These publications, and parallel discussion papers in Alberta, seem to have generated a good deal of confusion about the government's intentions, however.
9. *Forestry and Wildlife Management in Canada*. 1985. Proceedings of a Symposium held at the University of British Columbia. Vancouver. May 7-10, 1984. The *Forestry Chronicle* (Special Edition), 122-202.

### NATIONAL WILDLIFE COLLOQUIUM

CHATEAU LAURIER, OTTAWA

MAY 7, 1986

A TIME FOR CHANGE

BY

J. BARRY TURNER, M.P.

OTTAWA-CARLETON

MR. CHAIRMAN,

ON MARCH 11, 1986, THE LIBERAL MEMBER FROM GANDER TWILLINGATE, GEORGE BAKER, SAID IN THE HOUSE OF COMMONS CONCERNING THE NIELSEN TASK FORCE REPORTS - AND I QUOTE:

We can look at another report on the environment. We see sections dealing with national parks and the weather services. There is a magnificent section dealing with the wildlife conservation programs, including migratory birds conservation, wildlife research and conservation and wildlife interpretation. After this study group began to study these programs the Government decimated the Canadian Wildlife Service. (Hansard, p. 11389)

DECIMATED IS A BIT STRONG, BUT THAT'S PART OF OPPOSITION RHETORIC. SERIOUSLY UNDERMINED ARE THE WORDS THAT I WOULD USE. THE GOVERNMENT CONTINUES TO RECEIVE CONSIDERABLE FLAK ON TV, ON RADIO, IN THE NEWSPAPERS, IN LETTERS, IN HOUSE QUESTIONS CONCERNING CUTS TO THE CWS.

AT THE PROFESSIONAL INSTITUTE OF THE PUBLIC SERVICE OF CANADA ANNUAL MEETING IN OTTAWA LAST NOVEMBER, ROD MURPHY THE NDP MEMBER FOR CHURCHILL, SPOKE OF THE "POORLY PLANNED AND SEEMINGLY INDISCRIMINATE PROGRAM CUTS TO WILDLIFE RESEARCH".

BUT LET ME BACKTRACK A LITTLE FURTHER BEFORE WE LOOK TOO FAR FORWARD. YOU HEARD A LITTLE BIT OF MY PAST IN THE INTRODUCTION. MY COLLEAGUES ARE SAYING THAT I'VE GONE FROM THE PLAINS OF AFRICA TO THE JUNGLES OF PARLIAMENT AND LITTLE HAS CHANGED.

THE NOVEMBER 1984 ECONOMIC STATEMENT HIT THE CANADIAN WILDLIFE SERVICE (CWS) HARD AND DEEP WITH 23% CUTS TO THE SERVICE. I DO NOT DISPUTE THAT! WE'VE BEEN HEARING ABOUT IT EVER SINCE. THE PERCEPTION QUICKLY GREW THAT THE CURRENT GOVERNMENT WAS ANTI-WILDLIFE RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT, ANTI-ENVIRONMENT, AND ANTI-CONSERVATION. THIS OF COURSE IS SIMPLY NOT TRUE! HOWEVER, PERCEPTIONS ARE REALITY IN POLITICAL LIFE AND I QUICKLY PERCEIVED THAT WE HAD NOT ONLY A POLITICAL PROBLEM BUT A FISCAL ONE AS WELL.

A GOOD BIOLOGIST FRIEND, A FORMER AFRICAN CUSO COLLEAGUE, AN OUTDOOR WRITER AND CURRENT OWNER OF FOLDING MOUNTAIN OUTFITTERS LIMITED IN TA TA CREEK, BRITISH COLUMBIA, MR. BOB JAMIESON, CALLED ME IN EARLY 1985 AFTER HE SAW A CUSO PUBLICATION THAT INDICATED THAT I WAS IN PARLIAMENT.

WE TALKED ABOUT THE IMPORTANCE OF WILDLIFE TO CANADIANS AND THE IMPORTANCE OF CANADIAN WILDLIFE TO AMERICANS. LET US REMEMBER THAT IN 1985, 1.6 MILLION AMERICANS CAME TO CANADA TO EITHER HUNT OF FISH.

BOB PLANTED A SEED IN MY MIND BASED ON THE SUCCESS OF THE 1937 FEDERAL AID IN WILDLIFE RESTORATION ACT OF THE U.S. CONGRESS, COMMONLY CALLED THE PITTMAN-ROBERTSON ACT AFTER ITS CO-SPONSORS. THIS ACT LEVIES A 10% EXCISE TAX ON SPORTING ARMS AND AMMUNITIONS THAT IS COLLECTED BY THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT AND EARMARKED FOR WILDLIFE RESEARCH AND HABITAT ACQUISITION AND DEVELOPMENT IN ALL FIFTY STATES. A SIMILAR ACT IN 1952 BY DINGNALL - JOHNSTON WAS APPLIED TO FISHING RELATED ITEMS AND CALLED THE FEDERAL AID IN SPORT FISH RESTORATION ACT. IN 1985 THESE TWO ACTS GENERATED APPROXIMATELY \$140 M. IN THE U.S. FOR WILDLIFE RESEARCH.

I THEN DECIDED TO PURSUE A CANADIAN VERSION AND TO MAKE IT WORK. AND I AM HERE TODAY NOT TO TELL YOU WHY THIS CAN NOT BE DONE, BUT TO ASK YOU ALL TO HELP ME TO GET IT DONE!

IN CLOSE COOPERATION WITH THE RESEARCH BRANCH OF THE LIBRARY OF PARLIAMENT, ESPECIALLY WITH RESEARCHERS, MARGARET YOUNG AND MARION WROBEL; WITH THE PROGRESSIVE CONSERVATIVE CAUCUS COMMITTEE ON RENEWABLE RESOURCES AND ENVIRONMENT, CHAIRED BY THE VERY CAPABLE AND KNOWLEDGEABLE OUTDOOR SPORTSMAN BOB BRISCO,

M.P., KOOTENAY WEST, B.C.; THE PARLIAMENTARY SECRETARY TO THE MINISTER OF ENVIRONMENT, DR. GARY GURBIN, M.P.; BRUCE GRAY, ONTARIO; WITH THE PRESENT MINISTER OF THE ENVIRONMENT, THE HONOURABLE TOM MCMILLAN, P.E.I., AND HIS PREDECESSOR THE HONOURABLE SUZANNE BLAIS-GRENIER, M.P. ROSEMONT, QUEBEC; WITH HONOURABLE JOHN FRASER, FORMER MINISTER OF FISHERIES; HONOURABLE DAVID CROMBIE, MINISTER OF INDIAN AND NORTHERN AFFAIRS; WITH THE CHIEF OF STAFF OF THE MINISTER OF FINANCE, TOM TRBOVICH, AND KEVIN LAMARQUE, LEGISLATIVE ASSISTANT TO THE HONOURABLE BARBARA MCDUGALL; WITH NON-GOVERNMENTAL PEOPLE SUCH AS MONTY HUMMEL FROM WWF(CANADA), MR. BILL THURLOW, PRESIDENT ENVIRONMENTAL CONTROL CONSULTANTS, OTTAWA; DR. JOHN TENER, RETIRED CWS EMPLOYEE AND OTHERS, WE HAVE COME A LONG WAY TOWARDS SETTING UP A CANADIAN EQUIVALENT TO WHAT HAVE BEEN TWO VERY SUCCESSFUL U.S. ACTS SINCE 1937 AND 1952 RESPECTIVELY. ON FEBRUARY 25, 1986 I SENT A MEMO TO ALL CONSERVATIVE MEMBERS, AND ON FEBRUARY 26 I MADE A PRESENTATION TO OUR NATIONAL CAUCUS THAT RECEIVED APPROVAL IN PRINCIPLE TO PROCEED THAT SAME AFTERNOON FROM A CABINET COMMITTEE.

SOMEONE SAID THAT GOOD IDEAS CAN FLOAT AROUND FOR A LONG TIME. WELL WE ARE STILL FLOATING.

I DO NOT PRETEND TO BE ABLE TO SUGGEST ALL THE MECHANICS INVOLVED IN SUCH A TAX PROGRAM. THIS WILL AND SHOULD BE THE RESPONSIBILITY OF PUBLIC SERVANTS TO WORK OUT. WHAT I AM NOW ABLE TO SAY WITH COMPLETE CONFIDENCE AND CONVICTION IS THAT THERE IS A POLITICAL WILL TO SEE THAT THIS HAPPENS - AND SOONER, RATHER THAN LATER.

I AM PROPOSING A SPECIAL EXCISE TAX TO BE COLLECTED BY THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT AT THE IMPORT AND MANUFACTURING LEVELS ONLY ON GOODS USED BY THE CONSUMPTIVE USERS OF WILDLIFE, i.e. HUNTERS AND FISHERMEN, ON GUNS, AMMUNITION, RODS, REELS, LURES, NETS, ETC. AND ON THE NON-CONSUMPTIVE USERS AS WELL, SUCH AS CANOEISTS, BACK-PACKERS, CAMPERS, BIRD WATCHERS, TO NAME A FEW.

I ALSO PROPOSE THAT IT BE CALLED THE NATIONAL WILDLIFE ACT (1986) AND THAT MONIES GENERATED BE TARGETED DIRECTLY FOR WILDLIFE RESEARCH AND HABITAT DEVELOPMENT IN CANADA IN COOPERATION BETWEEN FEDERAL AND PROVINCIAL JURISDICTIONS.

I AM FURTHER RECOMMENDING THAT THE NEWLY ESTABLISHED WILDLIFE HABITAT CANADA FOUNDATION (1984) MANAGE THESE FUNDS IN CLOSE COOPERATION WITH THE PRIORITIES OF THE FEDERAL AND PROVINCIAL GOVERNMENTS AND THOSE OF THE CANADIAN CONSERVATION COMMUNITY. THIS WOULD ENHANCE THE ROLE OF THE FOUNDATION AND ALLOW FOR MORE PRIVATE SECTOR, AND NGO INPUT INTO THE ONGOING RESEARCH NEEDS OF OUR WILDLIFE COMMUNITY.

THIS COULD CONCEIVABLY RAISE BETWEEN \$5.0 MILLION AND \$25.0 MILLION PER YEAR DEPENDING ON THE GOODS TAXED AND THE SIZE OF THE TAX ITSELF.

THE NIELSEN TASK FORCE MARCH 1986 REPORT ON THE ENVIRONMENT (PAGE 307) UNDERLINES THE THREE MAIN OBJECTIVES OF THE WHC FOUNDATION.

- a) To promote the conservation, restoration and enhancement of wildlife habitat in order to retain the diversity, distribution and abundance of wildlife (CATALYST).
- b) To provide a funding mechanism for the conservation, restoration and enhancement of wildlife habitat in Canada (SUPPORT).
- c) To foster co-ordination and leadership in the conservation, restoration and enhancement of wildlife habitat in Canada (WATCH-DOG).

THE SAME TASK FORCE REPORT STATES EARLIER ON PAGE 299 IN THE SECTION DEALING WITH WILDLIFE CONSERVATION PROGRAMS:

B. Level of Resources  
Maintain the current level of person-years and dollars allocated to the Canadian Wildlife Service (CWS) and that staff be directed to examine and list priority of existing projects, and projects terminated in November 1984, and if deemed appropriate and desirable, to reinstate suspended high-priority projects through internal reallocation of CWS resources.

Given the cutbacks to the Wildlife Service in November 1984, the subsequent loss or reduction of programs and the degree of public reaction, there would be serious negative impacts if further reductions were made.

IF IT IS THE GOVERNMENT'S INTENTION TO MAINTAIN THE CURRENT LEVEL OF THE CWS, AND I BELIEVE THIS WOULD BE WRONG, THEN WE MUST GENERATE NEW REVENUES AND SPEND THEM IN COOPERATION WITH THE NGO'S, UNIVERSITIES, PRIVATE BUSINESSES, AND THE PROVINCES THROUGH A MECHANISM LIKE THE WILDLIFE HABITAT CANADA FOUNDATION.

YOU HAVE ALL SEEN I AM SURE THE REPORT THE IMPORTANCE OF WILDLIFE TO CANADIANS THAT SAYS THAT 84% OF CANADIANS OVER THE AGE OF 14 DURING EACH CALENDER YEAR SOMEHOW PARTICIPATE IN A WILDLIFE RELATED ACTIVITY IN CANADA.

A MARCH 1986 DECIMA POLL OBSERVED THAT 83% OF CANADIANS ARE CONCERNED WITH OUR ENVIRONMENT. WE MUST THEREFORE ENHANCE OUR ENVIRONMENTAL RECORD, PARTICULARILY IN THE AREA OF WILDLIFE MANAGEMENT.

RECENTLY I WROTE TO OVER 1,200 PROVINCIAL, NATIONAL, INTERNATIONAL, PRIVATE, NGO, AND CONSULTING GROUPS ASKING FOR FEEDBACK ON THIS IDEA.

LET ME QUOTE SOME OF THE FEEDBACK THAT I HAVE RECEIVED GOING BACK FIRST TO THE HONOURABLE SUZANNE BLAIS-GRENIER IN A LETTER TO HER THEN PARLIAMENTARY SECRETARY, DR. GARY GURBIN:

- (i) I believe that if ever the time was right for Canada to implement a user pay system for wildlife, it is now. Representatives of both sportsmen and naturalist groups have discussed the concept with me and have indicated their support.
- (ii) A telex from the B.C. Wildlife Federation:  
The British Columbia Wildlife Federation Annual Convention April 11, 1986 gave overwhelming support to national wildlife funding initiative.
- (iii) Doug Fisher - Toronto Sun (March 10, 1986)  
Last week's government caucus was told the cabinet had approved a Turner-conceived and lobbied project to invigorate and expand wildlife management in Canada and the United States. There'll soon be details from both sides of the border.  
Lorne Whitty - The Sunday Herald (April 6, 1986)  
This is a plan that has worked well, has a proven track record and could benefit us. I feel Turner could have good support from the region's outdoorsmen.  
Grant Hopkins - The Citizen, Ottawa (May 1, 1986)  
The new funds raised would be directed at protecting a wide range of essential habitat in Canada and a variety of research projects, two key areas neglected in past years. Game and non-game birds and animals would benefit.
- (iv) IN SOME LETTERS:  
Bob Jamieson - TaTa Creek, B.C.  
The tax should be as widely based as possible so that all users of wildlife are included. We do not feel that these funds should be used to fund federal wildlife responsibilities specifically. If fishing equipment is included under the tax, these funds should perhaps be administered separately since fish and wildlife resources are administered separately now in at least some provinces.



Hon. Leo S. Gasner, former B.C. Judge, Cranbrook, B.C.

Our members would like to see some means whereby the "non-consumptive" users, such as photographers, hikers, backpackers, and climbers could be required to contribute to fish and wildlife (not restricted to game species) as well as to their habitats.

Don Huff from the Federation of Ontario Naturalists has expressed strong verbal support to me.

John MacDonald, Dunrobin, Ontario

Although I have no interest at all in fishing, hunting, and only a small amount in the "non-consumptive", there is a part of the proposal I like - "Jobs". Any action that can raise funds to create jobs, without limiting (in this case) the participation as a result of the level or mechanism of the funding, is worthy and commendable.

Jim Renney, Cranbrook, B.C.

Remember, this would be a user pay tax. How can anyone turn that down? I am willing to do my part. Tax me!

G. Hardy, Ottawa, Ontario

I feel it is a worthwhile project, and the Ottawa Carleton Sport Fishing and Conservation Association should throw its support behind Mr. Turner, and perhaps it should be put on the agenda for our next meeting.

THE NATIONAL COUNCIL OF WOMEN, INCORPORATED BY AN ACT OF PARLIAMENT IN 1893, PRESENTED THEIR ANNUAL BRIEF TO THE GOVERNMENT IN JANUARY 1986, THAT HAD AN EMERGENCY RESOLUTION INDICATING THEIR CONCERN WITH BUDGET CUTS TO ENVIRONMENTAL AND WILDLIFE RESEARCH PROGRAMS.

YOU HAVE ALL BEEN HEARING ABOUT SOME OF THE REFORMS OF GOVERNMENT PROCEDURES AND PROCESSES AND ABOUT THE REFORMS OF PARLIAMENT ITSELF AND THE SO CALLED ENHANCED ROLE FOR THE PRIVATE MEMBER SUCH AS MYSELF. WE ARE ALL SUPPOSE TO HAVE MORE SAY NOW IN THE DECISION MAKING PROCESS AS TO HOW OUR COUNTRY IS TO BE GOVERNED. HERE IS A TIMELY EXAMPLE AND AN OPPORTUNITY OF WHAT SHOULD BECOME A REALITY IF M.P. ROLES ARE ACTUALLY GOING TO BE ENHANCED. I HAVE BEEN PURSUING THIS PROJECT NOW FOR 17 MONTHS BECAUSE I BELIEVE IT WILL BE GOOD FOR ALL OF US.

YOU HAVE HEARD OUR DECISION MAKERS USE BUZZ WORDS LIKE "INNOVATIVE IDEAS", "NEW REVENUE SOURCES", "USER FEES", "LOWER OUR LOSSES", "MANAGE OUR AFFAIRS MORE EFFECTIVELY", "LIVE WITHIN OUR MEANS", AND MORE. WHAT WE NEED NOW IS YOUR INPUT TO MAKE THIS IDEA WORK AS EFFECTIVELY AS WE POSSIBLY CAN. LET'S NOT GET HUNG UP ON TOO MANY TECHNICAL, MECHANICAL, OR BUREAUCRATIC DETAILS, BUT RATHER LET'S AGREE TO THE CONCEPT IN GENERAL, SEE HOW WE CAN ALL WIN BY ITS ACCEPTANCE, AND THEN COLLECTIVELY WORK OUT THE DETAILS OF ITS NATIONAL AND PROVINCIAL IMPLEMENTATION.



THERE ARE SOME CONCERNS AND PROBLEMS OF COURSE - SUCH AS THOSE OF SUBSISTENCE HUNTERS, FUR TRAPPERS, SKEET AND TRAP SHOOTERS, GUN COLLECTORS AND OTHERS THAT MUST BE TAKEN INTO CONSIDERATION. THERE ARE EXCEPTIONS TO EVERY RULE BUT REMEMBER, 84% OF CANADIANS OVER 14 USE OUR ENVIRONMENTAL HABITAT, ONCE A YEAR SOMEHOW.

I MENTIONED THIS NEW PROPOSAL DURING AN APRIL 10, 1986 MEETING OF THE STANDING COMMITTEE ON ABORIGINAL AFFAIRS AND NORTHERN DEVELOPMENT, TO OUR WITNESS GEORGE ERASMUS AS WE TALKED ABOUT INDIGENIOUS SURVIVAL INTERNATIONAL AND THE PROBLEM OF THE ABORIGINAL TRAPPERS FEDERATION OF CANADA AND I RECEIVED A POSITIVE RESPONSE FROM MR. ERASMUS AND HIS COLLEAGUES. THAT WAS INDEED ENCOURAGING.

THE FEDERAL FINANCE DEPARTMENT HAS SOME CONCERNS ABOUT INTEGRATING THIS NEW IDEA INTO OUR PRESENT CUMBERSOME, CONFUSING TAX SYSTEM NOW AND IS LOOKING AT BROAD TAX REFORM IN CANADA. THE PROBLEMS WITH THE PRESENT FEDERAL SALES TAX SYSTEM ARE NUMEROUS, AS ANY MANUFACTURER OR EXPORTER WILL TELL YOU. THE PROPOSAL MENTIONED BY MR. WILSON IN THE RECENT BUDGET TO REFORM THE SYSTEM, WITH A GOAL OF A BROADER BASE WITH FEWER EXEMPTIONS AND A LOWER RATE, ALONG WITH THE GOAL OF RAISING ENOUGH REVENUE TO ELIMINATE THE INCOME SURTAXES AND TO CREATE A LARGER AND MORE COMPREHENSIVE LOW-INCOME CREDIT.

THIS COULD CONSTITUTE THE LARGEST PIECE OF TAX REFORM IN THE PAST TWENTY YEARS. THAT'S FINE - BUT WHEN, AND WHY NOT MOVE NOW AND REFORM OR INTEGRATE THIS NEW IDEA LATER? NOTHING IS CAST IN STONE. THIS PROPOSAL MAKES GOOD FISCAL AND GOOD POLITICAL SENSE TO DO NOW. LET'S NOT WAIT FOR THE COWS TO COME HOME BECAUSE IT IS GETTING LATE ALREADY. PRECEDENTS HAVE ALREADY BEEN SET WITH A CABLE TV TAX, AIRPORT TAX, GASOLINE TAX, SEINORAGE ON THE SALE OF OLYMPIC COINS WILL TARGET \$60.0 M. TOWARDS THE COSTS OF THE 1988 WINTER OLYMPICS IN CALGARY AND THE DUCK STAMPS INTRODUCED LAST YEAR IS IN ITSELF A PRECEDENT.

IN CONCLUSION, MR. CHAIRMAN, HERE IS AN IDEA TO FINALLY BRING TOGETHER THE CONSUMPTIVE USERS OF OUR WILDLIFE RESOURCE, HUNTING AND FISHING ORGANISATION, WITH THE NON-CONSUMPTIVE USERS SUCH AS THE CANADIAN WILDLIFE FEDERATION, DUCKS UNLIMITED, WORLD WILDLIFE FUND (CANADA), THE NATURE FEDERATION OF CANADA AND MANY OTHERS, IN A JOINT EFFORT TO PROTECT THESE RENEWABLE RESOURCES OF CANADA.

HRH THE PRINCE PHILLIP, SAID IN MAN'S WILDLIFE HERITAGE FACES EXTINCTION, WASHINGTON, D.C., NATIONAL GEOGRAPHIC MAGAZINE, VOL. 122, NO. 5, NOVEMBER 1962, P. 703.

The conservation of wildlife and wild places calls for specialist knowledge, trained manpower and money, and we look to other nations to cooperate in this important task, the success or failure of which not only affects the continent of Africa, but the rest of the world as well. ("Man's Wildlife Heritage faces Extinction", dans National Geographic Magazine, Washington D.C., vol. 122, N. 5, Nov. 1962, p. 703)

WE HAVE THE SPECIALIST KNOWLEDGE AND THE TRAINED MANPOWER.

WHAT WE ARE LACKING IS THE MONEY!

CHIEF GATSHA BUTHELEZI, CHIEF OF THE KWAZULU PEOPLE OF SOUTH AFRICA SAID YEARS AGO WHEN SPEAKING OF THE IMPORTANCE OF CONSERVATION:

"...it is the African who must be the target of education and propaganda schemes."

BUT I DARE SAY IN CANADA IF SOME OF OUR INDIGENOUS SPECIES ARE TO SURVIVE AND PROSPER, IT IS THE POLITICIAN WHO MUST BE THE TARGET OF EDUCATION AND PROPAGANDA SCHEMES. I INVITE ALL OF YOU TO ASSIST ME IN THIS IMPORTANT TASK.

IN FEBRUARY 1985, I ACCOMPANIED THE HONOURABLE DAVID CROMBIE TO THE QUEEN CHARLOTTE ISLANDS WHERE I SPOKE BRIEFLY WITH THE COUNCIL OF THE HAIDA NATION AND REFERRED TO THE POWERFUL EXPRESSION ON A POSTER PRINTED BY THEM IN DESCRIBING THEIR DUU GUUSD TRIBAL PARK:

"Duu Guusd is not just a land we inherited from our ancestors, but one which we borrow from our grandchildren."

THE CHOICE FOR CANADIAN WILDLIFE CONSERVATION IS CLEAR. THE FEDERAL AND PROVINCIAL GOVERNMENTS CAN CONTINUE TO REDUCE WILDLIFE PROGRAMS AND RELY ON THE VOLUNTARY PRIVATE SECTOR, OR INNOVATIVE PROGRAMS TO GENERATE REVENUES FROM WILDLIFE USERS CAN BE IMPLEMENTED TO FUND ENHANCED, FEDERAL, PROVINCIAL AND PRIVATE SECTOR WILDLIFE RESOURCES AND DEVELOPMENT TO MEET OUR NATIONAL AND INTERNATIONAL WILDLIFE OBLIGATIONS.

I FOR ONE MR. CHAIRMAN PLEDGE MYSELF TO HOLD OUR WILDLIFE IN TRUST FOR MY CHILDREN AND FOR ALL FUTURE GENERATIONS OF CANADIANS.

THE MAASAI IN EAST AFRICA HAVE A SAYING:

"When two bull elephants fight, it is the grass that suffers".

LET'S NOT FIGHT. LET'S COOPERATE TO MAKE THE NATIONAL WILDLIFE ACT (1986) BECOME A REALITY.

THANK YOU.

DOING MORE WITH LESS:

WILDLIFE MANAGEMENT FINANCING

IN THE 1980S

KENNETH A. BRYNAERT

STEPHEN D. HAZELL

by K.A. Brynaert & S.D. Hazell

Summary

In the 1980s, fiscal restraint in program expenditures has become a persistent feature of budgeting processes of federal and provincial wildlife agencies, even as the need for increased support of habitat protection and wildlife management grows.

If governments are to do more with less, their role in managing wildlife resources, protecting wildlife habitat and enforcing wildlife and environmental protection laws must be rethought. Wildlife branches must explore opportunities for cooperative management initiatives with non-governmental organizations, and develop capacity to coordinate and supervise the conservation and management activities of volunteers, non-government organizations and other groups.

Volunteers, hunters and anglers can be enlisted to assist in the enforcement of wildlife laws and to conduct research and surveys. In British Columbia, hunters and anglers are involved in an anti-poaching program while in Ontario, volunteers undertake fish and wildlife conservation projects using government-supplied equipment and materials. The value of the work done under this program is about six times the cost to government.

Using volunteers increases the productivity of conservation officers and scientists. Volunteers who are involved in conservation and management also become more informed about the importance of wildlife conservation.

Non-governmental organizations can assist wildlife agencies in reducing costs and improving efficiency through privatization of certain government activities. NGOs can help by supplementing existing wildlife programs, administering specific projects on behalf of those agencies, or educating the public about conservation.

For example, the Wildlife Toxicology Fund, established in June, 1985 and administered by the World Wildlife Fund Canada, is using a three-year, \$3 million grant from the federal Department of the Environment and a one-year \$50,000 contribution towards administrative costs from Noranda Inc. to support high-calibre scientific research in wildlife toxicology.

A second example is the Freshwater Fisheries Review being conducted by the Canadian Wildlife Federation. The Review will loosely resemble a public inquiry and will recommend for the consideration of federal and provincial governments the goals and strategies required for the effective management and conservation of these fisheries.

The Canadian Wildlife Federation has devoted substantial staff and financial resources (\$400,000) and the federal government has contributed the services of a senior official for three years. By way of comparison, the recent Royal Commission on Seals and the Sealing Industry in Canada will cost at least \$2 million.

Charitable wildlife organizations are often able to administer conservation projects more inexpensively than government because they are able to raise funds from interested publics to defray costs and because administrative and salary costs tend to be lower.

A model for a privatized wildlife branch might be the Non-Governmental Organizations Program, administered by the Canadian International Development Agency (CIDA). The Program has had considerable success using CIDA matching grants to extract private funds for international development projects to international NGOs. In 1983-84, the program disbursed \$81 million to NGOs for some 3,000 projects in the Third World; these NGOs in the same year raised an additional \$150 million for their projects.

Limited deregulation of certain wildlife management laws in Canada may have salutary effects in reducing government expenditures and increasing the economic value of wildlife resources. Under the transferable commercial licencing schemes established in the Lake Winnipeg and the Great Lakes commercial fisheries, fishermen are entitled to sell licences together with quotas to other fishermen for whatever the market will bear. Under these schemes, government buy-back of licenses are unnecessary because marginally economic operators are entitled to sell their licence and quota.

A limited commercial harvest (currently prohibited) of species such as deer or moose would open up new markets (eg. restaurants) for wild game. The effect of developing a sustainable commercial harvest of wild game would likely be to increase the economic value of wildlife, which would assist in the conservation of lands that support such game species.

The wildlife of Canada is commonly thought of as an amenity provided as a benefit to Canadians. Although fees are charged to recreational anglers, hunters and park visitors, these are rarely market-valued. Clearly \$5 for a summer's fishing, \$20 for an autumn's hunting, or \$10 for a year of park visits is cheap by comparison to other outdoor recreations such as skiing and golf. The failure to price wildlife resources high enough to cover the costs of supplying services related to wildlife is depriving governments of revenue and may also be causing increased demand for these wildlife-related activities.

In addition, uses of wildlife habitat that destroy or degrade such habitat are only rarely charged fees for such use. Industries that dump pollutants into rivers and agricultural and urban developments of wild lands do not pay for impairing wildlife habitat. Implementation of the user pay principle could raise significant government revenue for wildlife conservation.

Income tax checkoff programs for wildlife also hold great promise to generate revenue from people interested in wildlife. In at least 32 U.S. states, taxpayers can donate a portion of their tax refund to wildlife conservation by checking a box on their tax form. Contributions under these wildlife checkoff programs are deductible from income tax payable the following year. The total wildlife checkoff funds collected in the first 20 states to have implemented the program was estimated at about \$6.4 million in 1982. Funds collected from such checkoff programs can easily be earmarked for wildlife conservation. A second advantage is that because checkoff programs are voluntary they will not be viewed as a general tax increase.

## DOING MORE WITH LESS:

### WILDLIFE MANAGEMENT FINANCING IN THE 1980S

#### INTRODUCTION

In the 1980s, fiscal restraint in program expenditures has become a persistent if not permanent feature of the budgeting and planning processes of federal and provincial governments, heralding a new political era for our nation.

The budgets and personnel of wildlife conservation and environmental protection programs are being reduced drastically. At the federal level, the November 1984 cutbacks to the Canadian Wildlife Service have been followed recently by the loss of 600 positions at Environment Canada, and 175 at the Department of Fisheries and Oceans. Wildlife and environment program reductions at the provincial level have also been significant.

Even as governments decrease budgets and personnel associated with habitat protection and wildlife management and enforcement, the need for increased levels of financial and personnel support for these activities grows. The problems, such as loss of wetlands on the prairies and elsewhere, acidification of eastern Canadian lakes and forests, and accumulation of toxic chemicals such as dioxins, heavy metals and pesticides in the tissues of wild animals and plants are increasing, not abating.

This portrayal of the problems is not as bleak as it may appear. Recent surveys(1) have clearly demonstrated that Canadians are extremely concerned about the quality of their environment and are willing to pay more to ensure that it is protected. With appropriate incentives and support, the public is prepared to assist with the work of wildlife conservation, both with their labour and with their pocketbooks.

The dilemma for government wildlife agencies, and for conservation organizations, then, is how to do more with less, and how to utilize all of the resources that are available. This Wildlife Colloquium is an excellent first step towards addressing this issue. The overall objectives must be to develop new institutional structures and arrangements that are adapted to the new fiscal realities, and to provide an understanding of the role of federal, provincial and territorial governments in assisting in the development of these structures and arrangements.

If we are to do more with less, governments, with the assistance of conservationists, must rethink the role of government agencies in managing wildlife resources,

protecting wildlife habitat and enforcing wildlife and environmental protection laws. Wildlife branches in particular must vigorously explore opportunities for cooperative management initiatives. To cope with the current fiscal realities, wildlife agencies must increasingly act as coordinators and supervisors of the conservation and management activities of a host of non-government organizations, private and Crown corporations, cooperatives, landowners and volunteers. In other words, less leg and arm work (eg. collecting data in the field) and more brain work (eg. information processing and analysis).

Wildlife agencies do not, and will not in the foreseeable future, have the financial capacity, the expertise or the personnel to accomplish all that is expected of them. Governments must, then, attempt to take advantage of all of the resources that individual Canadians, conservation organizations, community groups and businesses can offer towards furthering the goals of wildlife conservation.

If we are to do more with less, governments must make serious attempts to ensure that the users of wildlife resources pay for services provided. Wildlife is not just an aesthetic amenity but also a commodity, and our political and economic institutions have so far not valued it very highly.

Prices imposed by governments for benign consumptive (eg. hunting, fishing) and non-consumptive (eg. park-visiting) uses of wildlife should at least reflect the cost of providing services to those uses. Fees should also be charged to uses that degrade or destroy wildlife habitat (ie. mining and forest industries, agricultural and urban developments) and these should be at levels that reflect the genuine value of the resource that is being used. Approaches that augment the value of wildlife and wildlife habitat, such as permitting the transfer or sale of harvesting licences, are probably essential if we are to do more with less.

First principles for doing more with less might be as follows:

- decentralize or privatize habitat protection, information dissemination and aspects of management and enforcement activities;
- encourage the broadest participation among individual Canadians and organizations in these activities; and
- ensure that prices charged for the use of wildlife resources and wildlife habitat are commensurate with the cost of providing services for those uses.

It is important to recognize that the threats to wildlife and wildlife habitat are deep-seated and structural in nature;

our attempts to deal with these threats to date have been a mixed success at best. Suggesting ad hoc schemes to raise funds for wildlife may temporarily relieve symptoms but cannot cure the structural problems.

The balance of this paper is divided into two sections that attempt to expand on the principles and concepts that have been outlined above:

- Using existing government funds more effectively;
- Raising additional funds for wildlife management.

The first examines some of the attempts by governments to reduce expenditures by privatizing wildlife conservation and management activities, and by deregulating activities that commercially exploit wildlife resources. The second section deals with revenue generation in two areas: proper pricing for use of wildlife resources; and designated income taxes or tax checkoffs.

## USING EXISTING GOVERNMENT FUNDS MORE EFFECTIVELY

### Volunteers

The enthusiasm of individual Canadians for wildlife and nature has not been effectively harnessed by governments in the past. A recently published Canadian Wildlife Service survey (2) found that 84% of Canadians participated in wildlife-related activities in 1981 and that 80% considered the maintenance of abundant wildlife to be fairly or very important.

Volunteers, hunters and anglers can be enlisted to assist in the enforcement of wildlife laws and to conduct research and surveys. In British Columbia, for example, volunteer hunters and anglers are helping to fill the gaps in the enforcement of wildlife laws caused by the 1983 government cut-back of conservation officers from 121 to 109. Under the Observe, Record and Report program (ORR), volunteers place notices on vehicles they encounter on backroads in order to deter poachers. The notice reads: "Greetings fellow outdoorsmen. We hope you are enjoying your recreation. Please help us observe, record and report unethical and unlawful practices against wildlife, livestock and public or private property. Report violations, have a safe and successful outing". A copy of the notice, which also lists the time, date, location and description of the observed vehicle, is sent to the local conservation officer. If poaching occurs, the officer can refer to the notices and determine which hunters were in the area at the time. Volunteers have no powers of arrest but can testify in court against poachers. This is an important restriction because volunteers may not have the immunities from civil suits under public authorities protection statutes that conservation officers have.

Native and local hunters, fishermen and trappers can be used to assist wildlife biologists in conducting research and surveys on wildlife populations. This is happening to a certain extent in the Northwest Territories, where organizations such as the Caribou Management Board are using the services of Inuit caribou hunters to assess stocks and migration patterns. The experience and expertise of local people can be invaluable to biologists, by saving time and money on the ground. For a relatively small investment, volunteer hunters and fishermen can be trained to collect scientific data as part of their harvesting activities. The use of native people as field technicians and data collectors, as part of the overall management process, can also help to alleviate tension between the largely non-native wildlife biologists and native hunters and fishermen over appropriate conservation and management methods.



The Community Fisheries Involvement Program (CFIP) and the Community Wildlife Involvement Program (CWIP) sponsored by the Ontario Ministry of Natural Resources are joint ventures between the Ministry and volunteer conservationists to improve the province's fishery and wildlife resources. CFIP has been in operation 3 years; CWIP just 8 months. CFIP Projects include stream rehabilitation, fish stocking and the creation of spawning beds, while CWIP projects may involve the construction of bird-nesting islands or emergency deer feeders or creating wildlife openings in forests.

These programs are designed to provide a 'hands on' experience for volunteer naturalists, hunters, and anglers under the direction of MNR staff and using MNR-supplied equipment and materials. The cost of the CFIP program in the 1984-85 fiscal year was \$337,100; but the total value of the work performed by fishing enthusiasts and community groups was close to \$2 million.(3)

Volunteers may often be more effectively marshalled by non-government organizations than by governments - some individuals may be uncomfortable 'working for the government' when they already pay taxes. For example, the Manitoba and Saskatchewan Wildlife Federations had an excellent response from their members and other conservationists to their program to build and stock feeders for deer during the harsh winter of 1984-85. It is unlikely that a similar program administered by governments could have been initiated as quickly or generated the enthusiasm that the programs of these two wildlife organizations did. In at least some cases, then, programs that hope to attract the services of volunteers for wildlife may be more effective if administered by a non-governmental conservation organization than by government itself.

The use of volunteers has various benefits. First, there are the obvious benefits in that the productivity of paid conservation officers and research scientists can be increased, with resultant savings to governments. The second benefit is that volunteer-staffed projects involve consumptive and non-consumptive users of wildlife in conservation activities and the management and enforcement of wildlife laws.

This creates a greater community of interest between the government officials and the unpaid users of wildlife, and breaks down the 'us vs. them' syndrome in which the wildlife enforcement officers are viewed as 'the enemy' by some wildlife users. A third benefit is that volunteers are educated about the importance of wildlife conservation, thus creating a community of interest against breaches of wildlife laws.

### Non-governmental Conservation Organizations

The term 'privatization' is very much in vogue in government circles and sustains a variety of meanings. In this paper, privatization refers to a process whereby the administration, financing or staffing of certain government functions and services is transferred to or shared with private sector organizations such as conservation groups or businesses. The goal of privatization, of course, is to take advantage of the strengths and efficiencies of the private sector, where appropriate. Privatization, so defined, has considerable potential as a means to achieve specific wildlife management, conservation, and education goals efficiently and inexpensively. This is not to say that privatization is always appropriate or risk-free.

The federal and provincial governments share overall responsibility for wildlife conservation and environmental protection, and clearly must retain in-house a core of expertise in order to carry out those responsibilities. For example, wildlife branches must retain the capacity to conduct long-term wildlife research and monitoring because wildlife organizations, businesses, and universities usually must produce visible (and publishable) results quickly and thus cannot be expected to devote resources to these long-term activities on a continuing basis.

Having stated these caveats, a number of interesting privatization initiatives are being undertaken in various jurisdictions in Canada, including the following:

1. The Wildlife Toxicology Fund (World Wildlife Fund Canada)
2. The Zones d'exploitation controlées (Québec)
3. Freshwater Fisheries Review (Canadian Wildlife Federation)
4. Wildlife Habitat Canada
5. Non-Governmental Organizations Program (Canadian International Development Agency)

#### 1. The Wildlife Toxicology Fund (World Wildlife Fund Canada)

The Wildlife Toxicology Fund, established in June 1985, represents a unique partnership of private interests (World Wildlife Fund Canada, Noranda Inc.) and government (Environment Canada) cooperating to tackle the growing problem of toxic contamination of wildlife.

The Fund, administered by the World Wildlife Fund Canada, is using a three-year, \$3 million grant from the federal Department of the Environment and a one-year \$50,000 contribution towards administrative costs from Noranda Inc. to support high-calibre scientific research in wildlife toxicology.

Wildlife Toxicology Fund grants are awarded by an independent nine-member Research Advisory Board for projects that address priority areas of concern, such as the impact of agricultural and forestry chemicals on wildlife and the effects of toxic industrial pollutants on wildlife. By early 1986, the Fund had awarded grants of more than \$250,000 for research projects:

- determining the toxicity of petroleum on seabirds;
- determining the effect of acidity on the toxicity of heavy metals in aquatic ecosystems; and
- investigating the transfer of metals from aquatic insects to terrestrial wildlife;

among others. (4)

The partnership of a major resource company, a leading conservation organization and the federal government is a new approach, focusing on a specific set of environmental problems. Such cooperation is promising as it combines the capabilities of private enterprise and NGOs with those of government in reaching a common goal.

It is premature to comment on the success of the Fund, and it is perhaps not inappropriate to note that the Fund was established at a time when a former Minister of Environment was under considerable political pressure following the cutbacks to the Canadian Wildlife Service programs, many of whose research projects involved wildlife toxicology.

Whether the benefits (flexibility, cost-efficiency) from the Fund will ultimately outweigh the loss of scientific expertise that accompanied the CWS cuts is an open question; the Wildlife Toxicology Fund remains an interesting approach to reducing government expenditures.

## 2. Zones d'exploitation contrôlées (Québec)

One of the most sweeping examples of privatization of government services is the establishment of Zones d'exploitation contrôlées (ZECs) in Québec. The ZECs were created after the 1977 abolition of some 1,164 private hunting and fishing clubs, which had had exclusive hunting and fishing privileges on Crown lands, including some of the best hunting and fishing in the province.

After the private clubs were abolished, the provincial government was compelled to enforce wildlife regulations in the territories formerly occupied by the clubs. The Ministry of Tourism, Fish and Game (Ministère du Loisir, de la Chasse et de la Pêche) soon found that a force of 400 game wardens was unable to properly patrol the additional 41,600 square kilometres of newly-accessible lands. Instead of increasing expenditures on enforcement, the Ministry developed a plan that called for non-profit fish and game associations to manage these territories, called Zones d'exploitation contrôlées (ZECs). (5)

The ZEC associations operate under exclusive grants of land from the provincial government and provide access for fishing and hunting to the general public on payment of a membership fee and daily access charges. A ZEC membership provides Québécois with access to prime fish and game territories, and also the opportunity to become involved in the management of the province's wildlife resources.

Although the 55 ZECs established in 1978 initially received provincial grants for four years, 25 were bankrupt by 1981 and management of wildlife on these lands was transferred to the Ministry. Today there are 67 ZECs (covering 44,000 km<sup>2</sup>) with 50,000 members and directed by 650 unpaid administrators. Family membership fees for each ZEC association are fixed at \$25 by the Québec government. Each ZEC association sets the daily access and usage fees for its area, but these cannot exceed government-prescribed maximum fees. Examples of usage fees in ZECs are: \$10 per day for fishing, hunting and trapping and \$25 per day for big game hunting. In the 7 salmon ZECs, fees are \$35 per day in zones with no quotas and \$75 per day in zones with quotas. In addition, there are fees for access by vehicle, which are \$3 per vehicle for one person and \$5 per vehicle for two persons. (6)

The fees charged for hunting and fishing outside the ZECs are much lower (e.g. \$5.25 for a fishing licence, \$6.25 for a small game hunting licence, \$10 for a deer hunting licence). This difference in usage fees between ZECs and non-ZEC areas seems to have caused a substantial drop in the number of ZEC members, from 115,000 in 1980 to 50,000 in 1985. Some anglers explain this membership slide by saying that fishing in ZEC territories is simply too expensive.

The ZEC approach seems to be more politically acceptable than the former system of private clubs operating on public lands. However, the two-tier fee schedule for recreational use of wildlife resources in Québec may be causing overexploitation and inadequate conservation in ZEC and non-ZEC areas. Some ZEC associations are overexploiting their wildlife resources to raise revenue and to ensure that no deficits are incurred. Even though most ZEC associations are now financially stable, it cannot yet be said that they are



effectively managing the wildlife in their areas. The lower hunting and fishing fees in non-ZEC areas may be leading to increased demand and resulting stress on resources. Finally, the government's hands-off approach to wildlife management in the ZECs is viewed by some as an abdication of its duties to the people and wildlife of the province.

### 3. Freshwater Fisheries Review (Canadian Wildlife Federation)

In 1984, the Canadian Wildlife Federation (CWF) decided to take on one of the most widespread conservation challenges in Canada -- the slow but steady collapse of our freshwater fisheries. In that year, the CWF launched Phase I of a three-year national review of this 'creeping crisis'. Phase I, which is being conducted by a leading fisheries biologist and a senior official from the Department of Fisheries and Oceans (seconded to CWF), will document and describe the status of these fisheries and the management regime of these fisheries. Phase II will commence in late 1986 and will loosely resemble a Royal Commission with submissions received from, and interviews conducted with, interested parties from across the country. Phase II of this national review will recommend for the consideration of federal and provincial governments the goals and strategies required for the effective management of the fisheries.

The Canadian Wildlife Federation has devoted substantial staff and financial resources (\$400,000) to the review, which is being conducted independently of the federal and provincial governments. The federal government, however, is contributing the services of the senior DFO official who is coordinating the review. By way of comparison, the recent Royal Commission on Seals and the Sealing Industry in Canada was originally budgeted for \$2 million and will probably cost the federal government considerably more by the time the Commission submits its final report in mid-1986. The Royal Commission on the Economic Union and Development Prospects for Canada (Macdonald Commission) cost Canadian taxpayers about \$9 million.

Direct comparisons of costs and benefits of these three initiatives is not attempted here. Nonetheless, it seems fair to suggest that these inquiries or public reviews may often be accomplished more cheaply if concerned private sector organizations can be persuaded to provide financial or personnel resources in support. Several advantages of having non-government organizations conducting a review such as the Freshwater Fisheries Review suggest themselves.

Charitable wildlife organizations such as CWF are able to raise funds from interested publics to defray costs associated with inquiries directed by NGOs. As indicated above, the administrative and salary costs of NGOs tend to be

lower than for governments, for various reasons; perhaps the most important is that NGOs tend to be more cost-conscious relying as they do on their members and supporters for funds, and not taxpayers generally.

Finally, credible NGOs may often be able to act as a catalyst for developing public support and allocation of funds for investigation of wildlife or environmental problems through an inquiry or review. In the case of the freshwater fisheries, governments and user and wildlife groups have been aware of the worsening problems in these fisheries for many years. Cooperative efforts to address these problems were stymied by federal-provincial jurisdictional issues, administrative roadblocks, inadequate communication and lack of focused public concern. The CWF was able to provide that focus; hopefully CWF will also be able to motivate governments to act on the recommendations of the review.

### 4. Wildlife Habitat Canada

Established in 1984, Wildlife Habitat Canada (WHC) is a charitable organization dedicated to conservation, restoration and enhancement of habitat in order to retain the diversity, distribution and abundance of wildlife in Canada. Although the projects of WHC primarily involve the acquisition of land or interests in land, WHC also funds habitat rehabilitation and research. Wetland protection was the main focus of the 1984-85 program. Initial funding for WHC was provided through a \$3 million Environment Canada grant, and revenue from the \$4 migratory bird stamp, which must be purchased by migratory bird hunters, also goes to WHC.

Charitable NGOs such as WHC are also able to use their tax-exempt status and rights to issue taxation receipts to encourage landowners to donate land interests to them. The donation of land to charity is financially attractive to donors in that although the gift is a deemed disposition under the Income Tax Act, owners of capital property now enjoy a \$500,000 lifetime exemption from capital gains tax. This means that a landowner could donate a property worth, say, \$100,000 to a wildlife charity and receive a tax receipt for this amount. In addition, under the rules introduced in the May 1985 budget, no capital gains tax is payable on much if not all of any increase in value of the property since acquisition by the donor.

Other papers to this Colloquium will discuss in greater detail the operations and benefits to wildlife habitat of Wildlife Habitat Canada. A suggestion by way of conclusion is that if WHC proves to be a success, similar institutions could be established that would have as their focus the protection and rehabilitation of fisheries or upland habitat.

## 5. Non-Governmental Organizations Program (Canadian International Development Agency)

A model for a privatized wildlife branch might be the Non-Governmental Organizations Program, administered by the Canadian International Development Agency (CIDA). A pioneering concept in 1968 - a program of cooperation between the government and private agencies working in the Third World - it has developed into a unique and productive partnership which, through the provision of CIDA's matching grants, has had a multiplier effect on Canada's total assistance effort and a greater impact in developing countries. In 1968, the first year of operation, the program disbursed \$5 million to 20 agencies for 50 projects. In 1983-84, NGOs received \$81 million for some 3,000 projects. Even more telling, in 1968 the NGOs raised an estimated \$5 million in donations from the private sector. In 1983, contributions totalled more than \$150 million.(7)

Some of the advantages to CIDA in using NGOs are the lower salary and administrative costs of NGOs suggested earlier. The NGOs are project-oriented and do not necessarily need to be permanently instituted and housed. As indicated, NGOs raise significant amounts of private funds and can be located in the particular country or region where the work is being carried out.

In conclusion, non-governmental organizations can greatly assist wildlife agencies in reducing costs and improving efficiency. Many NGOs have considerable expertise and fund-raising ability that has not yet been exploited. Privatization initiatives, such as those described above, can be beneficial to the government and the public but also the NGOs themselves. Such cooperative management programs provide focus and direction for the NGOs and help to ensure that the NGOs accomplish their own objectives.

A final caveat. Conservationists should carefully examine proposed cooperative management or other privatization schemes in order to make sure that governments are not simply transferring entire program responsibilities to the NGOs. It is appropriate for NGOs to assist governments and thereby increase the efficiency and productivity of wildlife agencies by:

- supplementing existing wildlife programs;
- administering specific projects on behalf of those agencies; and
- educating the public about conservation.

It is not appropriate for governments to transfer core wildlife management responsibilities such as long-term research to NGOs, and refer to this shuffle as a new initiative. Such ploys are an abdication of government duties and do not deserve support.

## Deregulation of Wildlife Management

Deregulation, like privatization, is a term that is associated with the current U.S. administration, and as such has a tendency to inflame political passions here in Canada. Nonetheless, limited deregulation of certain wildlife management laws in Canada may have salutary effects in reducing government expenditures and increasing the economic value of wildlife resources. Several such deregulation initiatives are explored below.

### Transferable Licences

One idea that attempts to introduce market forces into the area of licensing of use of wildlife resources is the transferable commercial licences established in the Lake Winnipeg and the Great Lakes commercial fisheries. Normally, commercial fishing licences are non-transferable; that is, a licence once issued to a particular fisherman cannot be sold to another.

Under a system of transferable commercial licences, the licenced fisherman is permitted to harvest a quota of fish of a particular species. He is entitled to sell his licence together with his quota to another fisherman for whatever the market will bear. This element of transferability creates marketable property rights, which are, in effect, owned by the fisherman. The Ontario and Manitoba transferable licencing schemes do however incorporate restrictions that attempt to prevent the concentration of licences (and quotas) in too few hands.

Transferable licensing schemes have one big advantage to governments. Often when there are too many fishing operators for the available fish stocks and profits and resource rents are dissipated, the government has no recourse save to 'buy back' licences in order to reduce exploitation and restore economic viability to the industry. However, under a transferable licensing scheme, no buy-backs are necessary because fishermen are entitled to purchase licences from each other and marginally economic operators can sell out their shares. Such a system should result in considerable savings to governments over the long run as well as offering the best hope for fishing industry profitability.

### Commercial Sale of Game

Under most federal and provincial wildlife laws, the purchase, sale or transfer of most recreationally harvested game fish, bird and mammal species are prohibited except under licence in a limited range of circumstances. Many non-hunters and non-anglers -- especially those living in urban

areas -- rarely have the opportunity to dine on meat from game species that have no existing licensed commercial harvest (eg. deer, moose, smallmouth bass). A limited commercial harvest of such species, would open up new markets (eg. restaurants) for wild game. The effect of developing a sustainable commercial harvest of wild game would likely be to increase the economic value of wildlife, which would assist in the conservation of lands that support such game species. This argument is developed further in the next section.

Arguments against the development of commercial harvesting licences include concerns about increased levels of poaching and about the sustainability of such harvests. Taking the second problem first, it is not disputed that evidence must be overwhelming that optimal populations must be sustainable if commercial harvesting is to be permitted in addition to the usual recreational take.

Admittedly, poaching of commercially harvested species such as salmon is often a problem for wildlife managers. But it is difficult to understand why salmon and beaver can be sold notwithstanding the poaching problems, but speckled trout and deer cannot be sold presumably because of the potential poaching problem. The difference in the legal treatment of commercial harvesting of different species may be rooted in historical policies that do not now reflect (if they ever did) modern scientific principles of wildlife management.

This is not an argument that advocates commercial harvests of this or that species; it is an argument that encourages governments to examine the possibility of licensing commercial harvests of game species. The revenue from commercial harvesting licences could be substantial and the economic benefits to native and rural people considerable.

## RAISING ADDITIONAL FUNDS FOR WILDLIFE MANAGEMENT

### Making the User Pay

The wildlife of Canada is commonly thought of as an amenity provided as a benefit to Canadians. Although fees are charged to recreational anglers, hunters and park visitors, these are rarely market-valued. That is, the fees charged do not meet the costs incurred by governments in providing services for these amenities. In addition, uses of wildlife habitat that destroy or degrade such habitat are only rarely charged fees for such use. Industries that dump pollutants into rivers and agricultural and urban developments do not pay for the economic detriment they cause by ruining or impairing wildlife habitat. Implementation of the user pay principle could raise significant government revenue for wildlife conservation.

One effect of providing free or underpriced services to the public is to increase demand for these services.

The result of distributing government services free (or at less than the marginal cost of supplying them) is to increase the apparent need to expand the supply of such services in order to avert shortages and to satisfy the frustrated demand. In short, the failure to impose correct prices on the public provision of goods and services which provide significant benefits to particular private individuals . . . leads inevitably to increased pressure through the political process from these individuals for more such goods and services.(8)

According to this analysis, the continuing destruction of wildlife resources and habitat may be a direct result of undercharging by public authorities for the use of wildlife. At the same time, 'wild' land uses are economically undervalued compared to other land uses such as industrial, agricultural and urban development. The result is the current situation of increasing demand by recreational wildlife users such as hunters, anglers and naturalists even as wildlife habitat is lost to competing land uses.

Tentative, limited steps have been taken to 'value' wildlife, that is to treat wildlife as a marketable commodity, rather than as an amenity. Fees (albeit inadequate) for hunting, angling and park-visiting are one such step. The introduction of transferable licences for commercial freshwater fishing is another.

But in the long-term, the solution is to implement structural changes that will attempt to ensure that charges for the use of wildlife resources are in line with the associated marginal costs.

Hunting and angling in Canada are extremely inexpensive recreations. Although most provinces require residents to purchase fishing licences, those that do charge a modest sum for a full season's fishing. The Government of Ontario has recently decided to institute a licensing regime for sport fishing; however, the fee will be only \$10 per season for adults under 65 and \$5 for senior citizens. Federal annual sport fishing licence fees for the tidal waters off British Columbia are only \$5 for residents.

Hunting is somewhat more expensive, but is still cheap, compared to similar forms of outdoor recreation such as alpine skiing. The federal migratory bird hunting licence is now \$7.50, which includes a new \$4 levy per licence introduced in August 1985.(9)

The cost of provincial hunting licences varies depending on the species to be hunted. For example, resident deer-hunting licences cost \$25 in Saskatchewan, \$16 in New Brunswick and \$15 in Ontario. Resident game bird licences cost \$10 in Saskatchewan, \$6 in New Brunswick and \$5 in Ontario. National Park entrance fees are also cheap. In 1983-84, day passes cost \$1, 4-day passes \$2, and annual passes \$10.

A recent Canadian Wildlife Service study(10) assessed the economic value of migratory game-bird hunting in Canada by examining the so-called 'consumer surpluses' associated with such hunting. Consumer surplus is defined as the difference between the amount of money people feel migrating game-bird hunting is worth (maximum willingness to pay) and the amount they have actually spent. The 'maximum willingness' figure calculated for 1975-76 was \$202, the actual expenditure figure, \$138. The consumer surplus, therefore, was \$69 per hunter. By the authors avowed conservative estimate, the total consumer surplus for migratory bird hunting for Canada was \$26.3 million. In other words, Canadian migratory bird hunters would have paid \$26.3 million more before they stopped hunting. The inference to be drawn is that migratory bird hunters are prepared to pay a great deal more to continue to hunt.

A second approach to this issue of valuing or pricing the recreational uses of wildlife is to compare such activities to two other recreations - alpine skiing and golf.

Skiing and golf, like hunting, angling, and wilderness hiking or canoeing, are outdoor activities requiring a considerable capital investment in equipment. The structure of the ski and golf resort industries is such that prices charged should roughly reflect the market value of the activity. The daily cost of skiing at resorts ranges between \$10 and \$25, with season's passes selling for about \$300. Golf costs about \$15 for a round and \$300 for a season's pass.

Clearly \$5 for a summer's fishing, \$20 for an autumn's hunting, or \$10 for a year of park visits is cheap by comparison. As indicated, the failure of Canadian governments to "price" wildlife resources high enough to cover the costs of supplying services related to wildlife is depriving these governments of revenue and may also be causing increased demand for these wildlife-related activities - which in the long-term may not be in the best interests of the animals and plants.

Charging more for hunting, fishing and park-visiting accomplishes several goals. First, it increases the amount of revenue flowing to federal and provincial treasuries that can be allocated to the conservation and management of wildlife resources. Second, increasing the fees paid by hunters, anglers and naturalists may have the beneficial effect of decreasing the demand for those resources. In the context of wildlife management, demand translates as ecological stress on the resource. Higher charges can reduce stress on wildlife resources that are threatened or otherwise need protection. A third goal achieved is that the activity can then be fairly evaluated in comparison with competing uses of the habitat.

However, if hunters, anglers and naturalists are to pay the marginal cost of government services associated with the conservation and management of those resources, so also should other more destructive users of wildlife resources. At present, industries, municipalities and government agencies are not charged fees for polluting air or water essential to wildlife, for consuming the water that they use or for converting wildlife habitat to other uses. Polluters may be subject to criminal prosecution for violation of environmental protection laws, but the sums levied by way of fines are not a significant source of revenue. Industrial polluters are often subject to government orders that restrict or control the polluting activity. These orders may require the particular industry to install pollution control devices that may be extremely expensive.

But it is unusual for industries such as pulp and paper mills, refineries, hydro-electric developments or other activities that degrade or destroy wildlife habitat to be charged regular fees for the privilege of using public resources, except through general corporate income and property taxation. Such resource users, whose activities impact directly on wildlife or its habitat, should be required to pay fees for the use of wildlife habitat, or at least to provide alternative wildlife habitat for the lands or waters that have been degraded or used.

The September 1985 report of the Inquiry on Federal Water Policy (Pearse Report) advocates that the cost of providing water to users in the Northwest Territories and Yukon Territory should be reflected in charges for the use of that



water.(11) The Report notes that the Northern Inland Waters Regulations (Section 10.(1)) currently sets out nominal rates for specific uses of water that require licences from one or the other territorial water boards, and recommends that:

the Department of Indian Affairs and Northern Development, in consultation with the territorial water boards, should review the fees charged for water used under water licences in the Territories and adopt a systematic procedure for determining water charges.

The user pay principle should be extended beyond that recommended by the Pearse Inquiry. As a first step towards the proper pricing of wildlife habitat, consumptive users of water in the provinces should be charged reasonable fees for such use. The easiest system to implement is probably to base fees on the number of litres consumed.

Ultimately, uses that degrade water and air quality should also be charged fees, as should those who destroy upland wildlife habitats.

The political difficulties in implementing user pay pricing systems are considerable. Certain of those who enjoy free or subsidized services such as hunting, fishing, park-visiting, will complain mightily when attempts are made to ensure that charges are roughly equivalent to costs incurred in providing services. Charges for the implementation of user pay schemes against industrial or other organizations that degrade or destroy wildlife habitat will also be protested. Nonetheless, attempts by government to impose correct pricing for the use of wildlife and wildlife habitat will yield tremendous revenues for governments and long-term benefits to renewable resources if the political will can be summoned.

The present federal government has indicated a philosophical disposition towards and some willingness to implement user fees. For example, the federal government plans to implement full cost-recovery fees for immigration visa applications at posts abroad.(9) In other areas charges are being imposed for many services or materials that were formally provided free of charge. For example, the National Capital Commission has announced that daily vehicle access fees of \$3 will be charged to Gatineau Park visitors. Fees for other park services are also being implemented.(12)

#### Income Tax Checkoff Programs

A more politically acceptable method for raising funds for wildlife may be the income tax checkoff programs. Such income tax checkoff programs for wildlife are extremely popular in the United States, having been adopted by thirty-two states since the first was introduced in Colorado in 1977.(13) Taxpayers donate a portion of their tax refund to

wildlife management in their state by checking a box on their state income tax form. Contributions under the wildlife checkoff program are deductible from income tax payable the following year. The study surveyed the first twenty states to collect wildlife checkoff funds and found that the range of total dollars collected in each state varied from a high of \$1,748,449 in New York (1982) to a low of \$74,500 in Alabama (1982). The total wildlife checkoff funds collected in the 20 states was estimated at about \$6.4 million. Most of these checkoff funds (95.9%) were budgeted for non-game programs. Some states were legally bound to spend checkoff funds only on non-game programs but a total of about 2.1% of the total amount spent was expended on the conservation of game species.

With modifications, the income tax checkoff programs established in the United States could be applied to Canada. However, there is a complicating factor in that the federal government collects provincial income tax on behalf of all provinces except Québec. Federal cooperation would be required if any province but Québec wanted to implement a checkoff program with respect to provincial income taxes.

An advantage of income tax checkoff programs is that collected funds can easily be earmarked for wildlife conservation and management activities. These funds would be less susceptible to being siphoned off for other government expenditures than a general tax increase in favour of wildlife. The other advantage of checkoff programs is that because they are voluntary they will not be viewed as just another tax increase.

A new earmarked income tax for wildlife is not recommended for several reasons. One disadvantage of such a tax is that costs are spread out over the entire population and thus are not borne by those who enjoy and use wildlife resources. In addition, it is unlikely that provincial governments and especially the federal government would seriously consider income tax increases for wildlife given the increases in personal and corporate income taxes, and sales and excise taxes in the February 1986 federal budget. Finally, there is extreme reluctance on the part of governments to earmark tax revenues for specific purposes. Earmarked taxes are not favoured because they increase complexity in a tax system that is already complex and because they limit the flexibility of government to change expenditure priorities to reflect changing circumstances.

## CONCLUSION

If government wildlife agencies are to do more with less, it is crucial that all conservationists, including wildlife managers develop a new understanding of the role of government that is appropriate to the new era of shrinking or static budgets. This paper has not simply enumerated or catalogued various suggestions for saving on expenditures or increasing revenues. We have suggested that all of us who are concerned about wildlife and wildlife habitat must assist the wildlife and environmental protection branches with the work of conservation in ways that are appropriate and that do not infringe on the core responsibilities of government.

The challenges for wildlife managers are bound to become more complex in the 1980s. Not only will they have to oversee the efforts of their own staff (eg. conservation officers), but they will also be called upon to work more closely with wildlife conservation organizations and volunteer groups. The distinction between government and non-government sectors may become more difficult to discern as links between sectors grow stronger - but this may be a positive development permitting volunteers and conservation organizations to become more involved with wildlife management and protection.

We have also suggested that those who use and enjoy wildlife should bear the costs of services essential to the conservation of wildlife. The implementation of the user pay principle will not be easy, but the current exigencies make user pay the best route to follow. To place an economic value on what most of us think of primarily in aesthetic terms or as beyond economic valuation is not an easy transition, but in our view is essential to the conservation of all of our renewable natural resources.

## LITERATURE CITED

1. Summary Research Report: Market Survey of Consumer Willingness to Purchase Environmental Quality. 1985. Thompson, Lightstone and Company Limited. Prepared for Environmental Protection Service, Environment Canada. 157 pp.
2. Fillion, F.L. and S.W. James. 1985. The Importance of Wildlife to Canadians. Canadian Wildlife Service. Ottawa, Ontario. 40 pp.
3. Minister of Natural Resources (Ontario). 1985. Annual Report 1984-85. Government of Ontario. Toronto, Ontario. 67 pp.
4. Working for Wildlife. Winter 1986. World Wildlife Fund Canada. Toronto, Ontario. 12 pp.
5. Gruenefeld, George. 1982. Zeroing in on "ZEC". The Atlantic Salmon Journal, 31(4): 10-12.
6. Zec Québec 1985. Répertoire - Code d'éthique. Fédération québécoise des gestionnaires de zec. Jonquière, Québec. 48 pp.
7. Annual Report 1983-84. Canadian International Development Agency (CIDA). 88 pp.
8. Bird, R.M. 1976. Charging for Public Services: a new look at an old idea. Canadian Tax Foundation, Toronto, Ontario.
9. Young, M. and M. Wrobel. May 1985. Sources of Revenue For Wildlife Support. Research Branch, Library of Parliament, Ottawa. 25 pp.
10. Fillion, F.L. and S.A.D. Parker. 1984. Human Dimensions of Migratory Game-bird Hunting in Canada. Occasional Paper Number 51. Canadian Wildlife Service. 34 pp.
11. Pearse, P.H., F. Bertrand, and J.W. MacLaren. September 1985. Currents of Change. Final Report: Inquiry on Federal Water Policy. 222 pp.
12. May, K. March 7, 1986. NCC introduces daily user fees in Gatineau Park. The Citizen. Ottawa, Ontario. B1.
13. Boggis, C.J. and M.S. Hamilton. 1984. Budgeting Wildlife Checkoff Funds: Twenty States' Priorities, Problems and Prospects. Transactions of the Forty-ninth North American Resources Conference. 222-231.

AN ALTERNATIVE VIEW OF  
NEW SOURCES OF FINANCE FOR WILDLIFE MANAGEMENT

Presented to the Colloquium on  
WILDLIFE CONSERVATION IN CANADA

May 7, 1986

David B. Perry  
Canadian Tax Foundation

This paper will reflect a different point of view from other papers presented at this colloquium since it approaches the topic from an outsider's perspective. I must, however insert several caveats at the beginning. I do not pretend to represent business interests or the view of the business community. The Canadian Tax Foundation is not a lobby or advocacy group - it is an independent research organization dedicated to providing information on taxation and all aspects of public finance. While my remarks do not reflect the views of the Foundation, I will be taking the same approach.

When discussing this paper with David Munro, we felt that the views of a disinterested observer of the process of setting government priorities and changing the tax structure would be useful. The groups represented here have a strong interest in the protection of the environment and the control, development, and preservation of wildlife. While my personal views may be in sympathy with yours, my professional concerns are with the more general picture of how resources are allocated among competing demands in both the private and public sectors, and how these resources are found. I feel that this perspective deserves consideration here.

There is no question that additional funds for wildlife conservation and research would be desirable. The flora and fauna and the vast wilderness areas of Canada are a basic part of our natural heritage; we owe it to past generations, and to future generations to ensure that this heritage is not dissipated. The questions being addressed today and tomorrow centre on this issue. But the context

within which we examine these questions must not be forgotten.

#### Scarcer Public Resources

In the post war period, we have seen a phenomenal growth in spending by all levels of government as federal, provincial, and local politicians and public servants struggled to provide the basic physical and social infrastructure demanded by the population. First roads, then schools, universities and other post-secondary institutions, hospitals, health care, and social services became the immediate priority. We have appropriated increasingly larger proportions of the nation's income and capital resources to the public sector to build the progressive, industrialized, and humane society which we now enjoy. These efforts have taken their toll on the financial strength of governments. The debt built up over the past four decades has limited the flexibility of the federal and provincial governments. Current wisdom is now that these two levels have to retrench, to limit the growth in their expenditures, and to reduce the cost of their debt. Two questions bedevil the budgetary planners.

The first question centres on the appropriate size of the public sector. In the early years of the post war period, there was a school of thought in public finance circles, especially at the theoretical level, that held that when the public sector spending reached the equivalent of 25 per cent of Gross National Product, the economic and social order of the country would collapse. This obviously did not happen, but it has not deterred those who have simply moved the point of no return higher. There appears to be evidence that as this much-watched ratio rises the



character of the economy changes. Whether this change is for the better or worse is not certain, but the change does take place.

Whatever the merits of this concern over the size of the public sector, we have to deal with the realities of the current political situation, which dictate downsizing of the public sector, through expenditure restraint and privatization. The avowed aim of federal and provincial ministers of finance and treasurers is to constrain or reduce the relative size of the public sector.

The second problem confronting the budget planners is more practical. Given the size of the public debt, interest has become a major part of the budget for both federal and provincial governments. With this large and growing fixed commitment, it becomes increasingly difficult to find the room to manoeuvre to adjust fiscal policy; to adjust spending to reflect urgent priorities and to adjust tax burdens to reflect economic imperatives.

Thus, it is refreshing to see a group such as this take these general concerns into account and seek other ways of accomplishing their objectives. The economic and political realities are obviously the reasons for this meeting. It now remains to be seen how effective the proposals are, how closely do they follow the dictum to avoid a drain on government resources, and what effect they will have on the public finances and the tax system. With two exceptions, the suggestions do not propose the "privatization" of wildlife management. This function will remain in the public sector, making up a part, albeit a small part, of

the ratio mentioned above. Thus the constraints on public sector expenditure growth in relation to the economy remain for wildlife management.

This paper will examine the main proposals for alternative financing of wildlife expenditures as set out in the paper presented by Mr. Brynaert and Mr. Hazell. Specifically, it will examine the question of voluntary labour to replace or augment that of public servants, the use of non-governmental organizations to supplant or expand governmental agencies, user fees, and earmarked taxes and voluntary check-offs.

#### Volunteers

The use of volunteers to perform what would otherwise be a public sector function takes us back to the early days of local government in Canada, when "day labour" was used to maintain local roads. In those times, the device was used to relieve or eliminate taxes, and there was not the same element of voluntarism explicit in the examples and suggestions presented earlier.

The idea is very appealing: those who have a direct interest (as users) or a deep concern about conservation, enforcement of hunting and fishing laws, or maintaining, improving or developing new wildlife facilities can take part in the activities that further their own interests and concerns. As a way of carrying out public functions, however, it is obviously inequitable that some contribute while all benefit, with no regard for either the amount of benefit or the ability to pay - that is, the ability to perform the services. If those treated the most inequitably do not object in principle or about the specifics, then it is an inequity that can be ignored.

There was one problem associated with volunteer help that was not touched on in the other papers. The volunteer resources will vary widely from region to region and from province to province. What may be a reasonable solution for one part of the country or one activity may be impossible for another location or another activity.

Volunteers are not really free, and it would be essential to maintain a careful scrutiny of the governmental resources, - manpower, material, and financial - devoted to these volunteer programs. Volunteers' time is limited, their experience, skills, and strength uneven, and they must be treated fairly and generously. Their enthusiasm may lag, and the work may lose its attraction so that the voluntary programs may eventually run out of willing bodies. For essential services, then, volunteers must be seen as a temporary solution, and the cost of their help carefully monitored. There has been some pressure in recent years to recognize the expenses incurred by volunteers themselves by granting special income tax concessions; if the volunteer programs led to increased tax expenditures in this area, the suggestion would not meet with governmental approval.

This raises a point that will also be applicable to the non-governmental agencies. There is implicit in these proposals, the contribution of manpower, materials, and sometimes money by government. The proposals are thus not costless, only less costly than governments performing the work themselves. Any proposals of this sort presented to treasury boards or ministries of finance must, therefore, present all the government costs anticipated, the benefits to be gained, and, above all, the importance of the

project. If the real benefits to the province or nation are not worth the minimal costs involved with volunteers, the project should not be undertaken, even if it is cheap.

Non-governmental Organizations

The logical extension of the volunteer argument leads naturally to the use of non-governmental organizations to carry out functions that government cannot afford to do. The examples quoted include the secondment of civil servants to NGO projects, and frequently government grants as well. Thus, this route also has a cost to beleaguered public treasuries and the caveats mentioned earlier still apply. The involvement of private sector corporations raises two concerns. The first is that their contributions, either in cash or kind, will be tax deductible, just as the on-going contributions to NGOs are. That is, through the tax system, the federal and provincial governments will be underwriting about one-half of the costs. These tax expenditures are incidious in that they are never separately identified and never considered as part of the cost to the public sector, yet they are costs, just as surely as the direct spending. Unlike direct spending, however, they are not subject to annual review, nor do are they subject to limitation by government on the amount involved - there are no caps or annual appropriations. The federal government is now in the middle of a major program of tax reform, and one of the key changes is the reduction of tax expenditures. The increased use of charitable organizations to raise tax-deductible private money, no matter how good the cause, is not in keeping with the current trend to limit the use of tax expenditures. For many years, the public and

government had fooled themselves into thinking that assistance provided through the tax system was costless and harmless. In recent years, both have come to realize the costs and dangers involved in using the tax system to accomplish "desirable goals".

This raises another point brought out in the other papers presented at this colloquium. The acquisition of land for wildlife habitats can be prohibitively expensive for the NGOs involved in this aspect of wildlife conservation. The ability to deduct gifts of suitable land from income tax is seen as a means of overcoming the problem, but it gives rise to yet more tax expenditures. The alternative minimum income tax proposed by the federal government in December of 1985 specifically singled out gifts, other than gifts to the Crown, as items which should be limited in their application. This was done not only because of the revenue loss through the deduction of such gifts, but also because of these deductions, and others, can be used to reduce drastically or eliminate personal income taxes payable by those in higher income classes. This situation has caused a crisis of faith for some taxpayers and has eroded the perception of the strength of the ability-to-pay principle in the income tax system. Do not expect a completely sympathetic response from the federal Department of Finance to this proposal.

The second reservation that could be raised about these cooperative ventures with private enterprise concerns impartiality. I am not casting aspersions on the principles or motives of companies that participate in such endeavours, but the problem may arise when results of research activities are released. The critics may seize

on the perceived interests of the corporate partner and this could destroy the results. The advantage of government or academic research, and particularly royal commissions, is not in the size of the budget, but rather in the assurance to all, supporters and critics alike, that the conclusions were arrived at with no influence from outside parties.

The cooperative ventures seem to be built on the assumption that the staffs of the NGOs are at least as productive as their government counterparts, run a leaner organization, and are paid substantially less. It occurred to me that the premise of the cooperative venture is that everyone will take advantage of the dedication of the NGO staffs, a feature that seems unfair in the short run and unwise in the long run, as these altruistic souls burn themselves out or get lured away to higher paying jobs. Perhaps I am just worried that the idea will catch on in the public finance area.

#### User Fees

The proposals for new or increased user fees are welcome news from the perspective of a public finance analyst, and they tie in with the recent policy initiatives of both federal and provincial governments. Many of the activities of concern to this forum are those which provide a definite benefit to sections of the community that avail themselves of the facilities. A number of user fees are already being used, such as licence fees for hunting and fishing and public park entrance fees. In the past, these have been often used as control devices and have not been related to the cost of the services provided. There should be some room for higher rates without a general public outcry.

The main arguments in favour of user fees will be presented at this gathering, so I will not dwell at length on their strengths. I would, however, commend to your attention a publication by the Foundation entitled Charging for Public Services, written by Richard Bird.

The main point is that the allocation of resources, under a full user-pay and revenue-dependent system, would be determined by market forces instead of the governmental decision-making process. This would allow the administrators of these functions to adjust their spending to meet demand, with no concern for competing needs for public funds. A user-pay system, as described in these discussions, however, presupposes that the functions would be revenue-dependent - that is, that the revenue raised would be completely at the disposal of the programs in question. If the fees and charges are somehow interpreted as general revenue, the administrators would still have to submit to the general expenditure review, and the link between spending and the return would not exist.

The user-pay principle applies the price system discipline to public goods. As Richard Bird points out, this may be a two-edged sword. On the one hand it would provide the activity with the necessary revenue, and this may have advantages for the advocates of the spending and for the efficient allocation of resources. On the other hand, the users would face the real costs and there is no guarantee that they would consume as much as was the case when the good was subsidized. Wildlife may be a special case; game licences and public parks may still be attractive when they are priced to recover all costs, and with additional funding they may become even more

attractive. There is a risk, however, that with higher prices, there may be significantly fewer users, with the result that fewer resources are available for these important functions. Before user fees are recommended as the solution to the underfunding of wildlife activities, you must be reasonably certain that a strong market exists.

Under a user-pay system, the operations will be subject to market disciplines, and expenditures will be determined on the basis of perceived demand. Expenditures which may have little short-term return in terms of increased revenue may be deferred or dropped. Those elements of wildlife spending that represent true public goods, not of direct benefit to users, should be funded from general revenues. The user-pay financing may obscure these elements and lead to their underfunding, much the situation that exists at present.

There are three further points to be considered here. The rights of our native peoples to natural resources have been guaranteed by ancient treaties. Are the federal and provincial governments in a position, legally, to collect user fees from Indian and Inuit hunters and fishermen? If not, then the perfect user-pay system would require that the federal government contribute equivalent fees on their behalf, otherwise the programs would be underfunded or the users (as opposed to the population as a whole) would be subsidizing native users. The second point to be noted here is the use of subsidies to provide equal access to our game and parks, regardless of income. This should not be a problem for this assembly, since the answer is to augment income rather than to provide indiscriminant subsidies. Finally, the activities under review may produce external

benefits, either in terms of an enhanced environment or a strong tourist industry. In theory, these external benefits should be financed from general revenues, not from the users.

#### Taxation

I would like to comment on the proposals for new tax revenues for wildlife management. The proposals all involve earmarking of specific excise taxes for these activities. Other papers have noted the disdain with which tax policy analysts treat earmarking. This comes from past experience. In the 1950's, about one-half of all state revenue in the U.S. was earmarked for one purpose or another. The state legislators and budget planners were thus severely limited in their fiscal policy options - one-half of their budgets was off limits.

The proposals for special taxes for wildlife management would obviously not present such a threat, but the precedent is one that most finance departments would like to avoid. The treatment of earmarked taxes leaves something lacking from the perspective of an analyst of government activities. In the federal and provincial accounts most earmarked taxes and their related expenditures are kept separate, and it is often difficult to determine the tax revenue and the spending, thus making it almost impossible to judge the overall tax burden and the extent of government influence.

If these two quibbles were the only criticisms of the principle of earmarking, accommodations could be devised. Earmarked taxes, however, may be a risky way to raise money for wildlife. Excise taxes as proposed in other papers may be either specific or ad valorem, that is expressed as so

much per unit or as a percentage of the price. The specific taxes grow only as the volume of sales, and ad valorem taxes grow as sale values grow. In the first case, revenue will not keep pace with inflation in salaries, goods and services purchased for wildlife management, and the resources will dwindle rapidly. If ad valorem taxes are used, the rate of increase in funds will probably be sufficient to maintain existing levels of service, but there will no funds for increased or improved services. User charges, on the other hand, can adjust automatically for growth and improvement.

The proposals seem to involve excise taxes much like those already in the federal sales tax structure, which is based on manufacturers' selling prices and collected at that level. The forthcoming discussion paper on the reform of the federal sales tax will almost certainly recommend a modified form of value-added tax, a business transfer tax levied on all stages of production and distribution. The new tax will have only one rate, and must do so in order to accommodate the crediting of BTT already paid. There is no room in the new system for a multitude of rates on special goods. Thus the proposed taxes would have to have their own administration and would probably cost as much to collect as they would raise. In this case, the cost of wildlife management would be shifted to Revenue Canada and corporate tax departments. The only excise taxes that might be expected to remain when the new tax goes into effect in the next eighteen months to two years are those on gasoline, alcohol and tobacco products, where there are only a few taxable companies and each has a history of being carefully controlled by Revenue Canada, Customs and Excise. Special

taxes on enumerated goods could be incorporated into the retail sales taxes of the nine provinces using this source, but the problems of distributing the proceeds between provinces would, I suspect, be insurmountable.

The examples of excise taxes raise some questions about their appropriateness for wildlife management. Hunting and fishing gear would seem logical, but the tax would not be levied on out-of-province purchases, thus relieving tourists of any payment for their enjoyment. Other goods that are of more general use such as camera equipment and film and four-wheel drive vehicles may be poor targets for special taxes, because there would be many purchasers who would have no connection with wildlife. The rural residents who require four-wheel drive vehicles to navigate country roads, and the camera buffs who concentrate on architecture or portraits may not appreciate making a contribution to something that they may never enjoy.

The personal income tax check-off has fewer drawbacks. It is a voluntary tax, and cannot be interpreted as changing the tax structure or imposing unfair tax burdens. It will not, however, have a high rate of growth, since it will only grow as the number of taxpayers willing to "donate" grows. Annual rate changes would probably be self-defeating. It is also susceptible to changes in public attitudes. This past April, many taxpayers found themselves getting smaller refunds or paying larger settlements of personal income tax than they were used to or had expected. Most people seem to consider themselves as middle class taxpayers and as such they smarting from what they felt were undue impositions on them resulting from the past two federal budgets. They would probably not

have been favourably disposed to a further voluntary contribution to the federal government; no matter how worthy the cause.

#### Conclusion

The initiatives taken at this colloquium are a refreshing change from the usual approach taken by such special interest groups, and a number of sound proposals have been presented to put wildlife management on a more self-sufficient basis.

The danger is that one or another proposal will be adopted that will tie this function to a source of revenue that will prove inadequate in the long run. The suggestions for change involve long term solutions; they do not present ideas that are untried but they do require a new approach to financing public sector activities. Each proposal has inherent strengths and weaknesses; taken individually, each could cause instability in the financing of wildlife management. Using a number of them in combination could augment the resources available for this function, and remove the potential instability of excess reliance on one source, whether it is general government revenue or a new, earmarked source of revenue. I would only caution against the extensive use of tax expenditures or special sales taxes. In both cases, the hidden costs may be too great to justify the gain.

The use of volunteers and NGOs would involve a shift from the public to the private sector, thus easing the dilemma of a rising expenditure-to-GNP ratio. The other proposals do not shift spending and thus run the risk of defeat as public opinion focusses on this less than perfect



measure. Thus the user charge and tax proposals may face

a. heavier going and require extensive public education.

BACKGROUND AND COMMENTS ON COOPERATIVE  
RESEARCH UNITS

by Robert A. Jantzen

for the

Colloquium on Wildlife Conservation in Canada  
Ottawa, May 7 and 8, 1986

## Background and Comments on Cooperative Research Units

Robert A. Jantzen

### ABSTRACT

The cooperative wildlife and fisheries research unit program began in 1932. It is one function of the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service. The cooperative program involves state wildlife agencies, universities and a private, non profit conservation organization as components of each cooperative unit. There will be 36 units in 32 states by the end of FY 1986. The USFWS program budget in FY 86 is 4.665 million dollars. Staffing requirements are currently 86 professional positions. Units are located on campus at universities and federal employees are faculty members. States provide direct funding support to the unit(s) in their state which is usually used for stipends to graduate students. The U.S. program is successful and can be used to develop a similar program in other countries. It is a decentralized program by its nature. A leadership role must be exercised at the national level but there has to be strong participatory commitment by all cooperators at each unit. Annual formal coordination meetings are useful if there is good participation at such meetings by policy level personnel from the cooperating entities. Unit leader positions must be filled carefully with personnel competent in administrative skills as well as scientific and technical skills. Conscious effort should be given to prevent research units (people) from intruding into the policy arena at the local or regional level. Units are effective and efficient but they must be managed.

## Background and Comments on Cooperative Research Units

Robert A. Jantzen

In these days of restricted tax dollars there are several handy targets for budget-cutters in government. Most of us working in the wildlife arena have come to recognize a few traditional items when administrations attempt to stem the flow of red ink; land or habitat acquisition and research are usually at the top of the priority list for cost-cutting measures. One often wonders if those priorities are not established by decision factors that are inversely proportional to the budget analyst's knowledge and understanding of the programs and missions of wildlife agencies. Nevertheless, it is a fact of real life and one with which we must deal in administering a comprehensive wildlife program.

It is most heartening that the organizers of this colloquium have included the topic of cooperative wildlife research in the exchange of ideas and strategies; and certainly speaks well for the thoughtfulness of the government leaders who are sponsoring the meeting. Wildlife research must be an integral part of any comprehensive management of the wildlife resource. Axiomatic as

that may seem, there are examples of political environments that recognize research as an after thought or as a second class citizen in the total program effort. The beneficial aspects of such an approach however, is to focus the administrator's attention on efficiencies and force deeper thought for ways to quantify research results in real terms easily understood by those in charge of the exchequer. Research cannot survive in isolation but rather must be and must be recognized as a full partner in the overall effort.

My purpose here is to present some insights/perceptions of the U.S. cooperative wildlife and fisheries research program after having experiences with it at both the state and federal level. I am cognizant that if any similar program is attempted in Canada it may very well differ from the U.S. because of the social, legal and fiscal differences that exist. Still, generic similarities are entirely possible and it is from that position I shall address my remarks.

The Cooperative Research Units were begun in 1935 at a time when wildlife management was in its infancy. J.N. "Ding" Darling, a nationally recognized political cartoonist who was the environmental conscience of the U.S. in the dust bowl days of the depression, organized the first unit at Iowa State University in Ames, Iowa in 1932 as a private/state effort. Subsequently, as head of the U.S. Bureau of Biological Survey, the forerunner of

the Fish and Wildlife Service, he led the effort to establish the national system of units in 1935.

The needs then were similar to those of the present: trained people to manage a public trust on a scientific, factual basis; investigating and understanding the complexities of natural systems and man's interaction with them, and; maintenance/improvement of "state of the art" tools with which to protect and manage wildlife resources, or, information transfer.

The common denominator of land-grant colleges was chosen as the criteria for locating the units. They provided the regional aspect while also supplying the academic and research environment for graduate students. State wildlife agencies were brought in as partners and, because money was short then as it is now, private sector involvement was sought. That help came from the Wildlife Management Institute, as it is known today. The WMI is still a member of the formal agreement which is drawn with each university, state, and the federal government in establishing or modifying a cooperative unit.

A cooperative unit is usually initiated by university administrators. In some instances state fish and wildlife agencies will make the initial request but for the most part they will let university personnel take the lead and then join as partners in the lobbying effort. The WMI is involved also at the outset and their counsel and support is a vital ingredient.

There are three kinds of units administered by the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service; a Cooperative Wildlife Research Unit; a Cooperative Fisheries Research Unit; and a combined Wildlife and Fisheries Research Unit.

A formal contractual arrangement is drawn between the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, the university, the state wildlife agency and, in the case of a wildlife research or combined research unit, the Wildlife Management Institute. At a Fisheries unit the WMI does not participate but the remaining three do.

The U.S. FWS provides the professional staffing with career employees of the federal government. In the case of a single unit this consists of a unit leader and assistant leader. At a combined unit there are two assistant leaders one for each major field in addition to the unit leader. Federal costs approximate \$50,000 year per professional position. A new unit coming on line will need about \$50,000 additional for one-time equipment purchases.

The university provides the space and support facilities for the unit on an in-kind basis. An important point here is that the unit staff join the faculty of the university, therefore they must have the credentials and be acceptable to the university on that basis even though they are not paid by the university. The State Wildlife Agency is asked to provide funding support directly to the unit. Usually these moneys are used for stipends

to the graduate students associated with the unit. Because of the faculty affiliation unit personnel have some classroom responsibilities but not to the degree that full-time university faculty have.

A coordination committee is established with representation from the signators of the agreement. This includes management representation from the central office of the USFWS. The committee meets annually to review unit progress, chart new starts, and recommend necessary mid-course corrections.

The unit's purpose is threefold: to attract, guide, and train scientists in wildlife and fisheries work by providing the opportunity to take an advanced degree; to accomplish needed research identified at the local or regional level; and to publish and transfer research results for management purposes.

The advantages of regional cooperative work of this nature are numerous. The synergistic effect forms a "critical mass" quickly and research efforts and results tend to multiply rapidly. The availability of other disciplines and expertise at the academic levels is very efficient. Many local needs are met without having to rely solely on full-time paid research staff and many of the federal government specific needs can be met also on a contractual basis. For example, the USFWS research program employs full time research scientists but also regularly contract with cooperative research units to provide specific research

which may stand alone or be fitted into a larger-overall effort on a national scale. Other federal agencies such as the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers and the Environmental Protection Agency as well as State and local governmental entities are using the cooperative units for a wide variety of environmental research needs.

Work produced at the university level often has a degree of credibility that could not be obtained if done on an "in-house" basis. Not that the research would be any less valid but the perception of it might color the results in the eyes of critics. One has only to look at the controversy surrounding the lead/steel shot issue in the U.S. for an example.

By the end of FY 86 there will be 36 units in 32 states; 2 states with wildlife units, 5 states with fisheries units, 21 states with combined units, and 4 states with separate fish and wildlife units on different campuses.

Over the last 51 years the U.S. program has graduated thousands of students who have entered the governmental and private sector at all levels. Many of the students as well as the unit personnel are nationally and internationally known. Research results have been made available in a variety of publications. Among the most notable are the journals of the professional societies. The program has succeeded and it unquestionably has powerful professional and political support. A similar program could succeed in Canada.

What have we learned from our experience that could be useful? I believe there are several things that one should consider or be aware of in developing a program of this nature.

The program should stem from an initiative at the national level. The responsible federal wildlife agency should be given clear authority to take the leadership for establishing cooperative units and guiding them. That authority should be on the basis of law. The unit program in the U.S. had been in existence for 25 years before Congress recognized it, per se, in the statutes. That cornerstone should be laid first. The law should clearly contemplate, even encourage, the participation of the private sector as well as universities and provincial/local governments. It should also be permissive rather than mandatory in nature. However, limitations of the federal involvement could be considered. For example, the U.S. law limits USFWS involvement to assignment of technical personnel, their equipment and incidental expenses (primarily travel) of the Federal personnel.

There should be a clear commitment on the part of the lead agency to make a decentralized unit program understand it is in fact a part of the total national program of that agency. There was a time in the U.S. when the units were not given the management attention they deserved. Consequently the universities or state wildlife agencies tended to capture the unit personnel. National direction deserves national attention.

There needs to be private sector involvement with national recognition. The U.S. law prohibits cooperative agreements involving the profit side of the private sector. I'm not sure the line needs to be drawn that finely but if it does there are non-profit organizations of national stature to lead the way. The Canadian Wildlife Federation would be a principal organization to approach, in my mind.

The provincial wildlife agencies should be involved from the beginning, as should the universities. A strategy-planning meeting involving all the candidate cooperators may be the most efficient way to explain and debate the program and chart a course for legislation to be introduced. Provinces, like states, may have varied reactions to such a proposal. The creation of a unit in a province might be welcomed by some and viewed as a threat to their own research institution by others. Those viewpoints have to be explored. Participation by the states with U.S. is varied, even now. One state carries no full-time research effort at all, preferring to contract with and support the unit for its research needs. Others use the unit hardly at all even though there is financial support coming from the state agency. Most fall between the two extremes. The provinces should support the unit philosophically as well as monetarily else there is a danger of resentment which could be very damaging to the program.

Personnel who are candidates for unit leader positions must be selected carefully and in concert with the other cooperators. A unit leader should have administrative potential if not experience as well as the necessary academic and scientific credentials. Candidates should realize that the success of generating outside funding and project activity will fall largely on their shoulders. Management and communication skills are very important to establish the link between academia, local and regional entities in the government, the private sector, and the national program. In start-up staffing there might be a very natural inclination to assign individuals who presently do not fit well in the current organization to new jobs opening up with a new initiative. If that is the only or over-riding reason for placement, the individual may not work out in the new position, either.

There should be a conscious effort to keep the cooperative unit in the research arena. Interjection of unit personnel into policy issues at the local/regional level is unwarranted and counter productive. The unit can be extremely valuable in providing factual biological information obtained through their research efforts. That is their raison d'etre. But once such information is delivered they shouldn't stay for tea, nor should they be invited to do so.

Placement of aquatic and terrestrial responsibilities at the national level of government differs between the U.S. and Canada.



The USFWS has fresh and brackish water organisms in its portfolio as well as terrestrial wildlife species. Although the Canadian Wildlife Service does not have responsibility for aquatic animals it does have a responsibility for aquatic habitats.

In thinking through a cooperative research system some thought should be given to a combined land and water research capability at a unit. The U.S. program began with wildlife research units. Because of their success and other needs, fisheries research units sprang up in the 1960's and 70's. Sometimes these would be on the same campus, sometimes on different campuses in the same state. In 1973 the Service began establishing combined units when new units were instituted. This system has worked well and has the immediate effect of a 25% saving in technical personnel costs. More recently, for budgetary purposes the Service has been renegotiating cooperative agreements with state agencies and schools to combine two existing units into one. This has worked fairly well but is not without difficulty. The sticky problems arise when a fisheries unit is on one campus and the wildlife unit is on another campus in the same state. Nobody wants to lose faculty and programs to a rival school. Because of this the USFWS will probably always have separate wildlife and fisheries units in a few states. In developing a cooperative system as a new start care should be taken to design a total research capability at one location in a province. The efficiencies are apparent and the

administrative problems of going back to restructure in later years can be avoided.

The USFWS looked at the possibility of regionalizing the cooperative units on an ecological/geographical basis as an additional cost-saving measure, e.g., the arid Southwest, Pacific Northwest, central plains, etc. The Service concluded that approach was not feasible. The State boundaries and the political/fiscal restraints at the state level have to be respected.

The annual planning meeting of the cooperators is critical for any such arrangement to work well. There should be a strong commitment from the university administration and the director's office of the provincial wildlife agency to participate in those meetings. Concomittantly, there should be high level representation at the meeting from the central office of the lead agency. Mutually approved research projects satisfy the cooperators, give the unit a good sense of direction and prevent unilateral research agendas from springing up in a vacuum.

The system has been very beneficial in the U.S. and I believe it can be successfully used as a generic model in other parts of the free world. Like any other system made up of those wonderful creatures called people though, it must be nurtured, it must be managed, and it must be recognized.

The publication "50 Years of Achievement - The Cooperative Research Unit Program in Fisheries and Wildlife 1935-1985" published by the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, 1984 provides information on the U.S. program. I reference it as recommended reading. Copies are readily available from the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service. Department of the Interior, Washington, DC 20240.

**Cooperative Arrangements for Wildlife Management**

A Paper prepared for the Colloquium on  
Wildlife Conservation in Canada  
May 7, 8, 1986, Ottawa

James H.C. Walker  
Linda J. Foubister

May, 1986

## Cooperative Arrangements for Wildlife Management

A Paper prepared for the Colloquium on Wildlife Conservation  
in Canada, May 7-8, 1986, Ottawa

Thank you for the opportunity to speak at this colloquium. My topic is "Cooperative Arrangements for Wildlife Management." When this paper was begun, it was difficult to know how to best address what is essentially a straightforward and potentially repetitive subject. Certainly, there are a multitude of cooperative arrangements between different levels of government across the country for the management of wildlife. There are also examples, albeit fewer, of similar arrangements between government and the private sector, and between government and wildlife organizations. However, it is questionable whether it would serve any purpose to this Colloquium to simply list and comment on these various administrative arrangements, other than to provoke those agencies who would inevitably be omitted from the list. One also has to ask what useful conclusions, other than details about administration or platitudes about cooperation, could be drawn from the exercise? We thus chose to concentrate on a few high profile examples of such arrangements in Canada today and point out the advantages and disadvantages of each type. Moving forward rapidly from these examples, most of our time will be spent on exploring what type of new cooperative approaches could result in greatest gains for wildlife. We would like to express our appreciation to the government staff of various provinces and territories who provided us with information on cooperative arrangements in their jurisdiction.

For the purposes of this talk, the term "cooperative arrangements" refers to formal or informal arrangements between provincial or territorial government agencies, the federal government, non-government organizations, or the general public, for the management of the wildlife resource.

As mentioned at the outset, there are a great number and variety of cooperative arrangements for wildlife management in Canada. However, there appear to be two basic reasons for the establishment of such arrangements. The primary reason is overlapping jurisdictions. The Canada Act (1867) assigned the jurisdiction of property and natural resources to the provinces, whereas transboundary issues fell within the federal responsibility. A number of wildlife species, such as waterfowl and caribou, cross provincial borders in their migrations, necessitating joint arrangements for their management. Probably the first cooperative agreement of any note was the Migratory Bird Convention of 1916, between Canada, United States and Mexico. Another aspect of overlapping jurisdiction is the protection of threatened or endangered species. In these cases, both federal and provincial agencies cooperate in attempting to reintroduce species which are rare or extirpated in one part of the country, utilizing stocks from areas where the animals are more abundant.

The second reason for establishing cooperative arrangements is to achieve mutual objectives or group consensus about the management of wildlife. Such arrangements are often between the management agency and public groups. An example of this is the construction of the Liard Highway in the Northwest Territories which resulted in concerns about the impact of increased access on the moose population. A cooperative arrangement between the territorial government and native organizations, not subject to territorial hunting restrictions, provided for a no-hunting corridor of 1 km along the highway. As a result, there was no major change in the distribution and density of moose following the construction of the highway.

Such agreements have been concluded at every level of government and with a variety of wildlife related entities or special interest groups. Some arrangements are with foreign governments. The International Union for Conservation of Nature (I.U.C.N.), consisting of the governments of Canada, U.S.A., Greenland, Norway and the U.S.S.R., has an informal arrangement for the management of polar bear populations which focuses on tagging studies and data exchange. The Canadian government, through the Canadian Wildlife Service, is involved in joint arrangements with a number of provinces with respect to migratory waterfowl. Similar arrangements exist between provinces. The Western Raptor Committee attempts to exploit a cooperative approach among the wildlife agencies of British Columbia, Alberta, Saskatchewan, Manitoba, Yukon, and Northwest Territories, as well as the Canadian Wildlife Service, for the management of sensitive raptor populations. Wildlife agencies may have arrangements with other resource agencies within the same province. In British Columbia, the Wildlife Branch has a protocol agreement with the Ministry of Forests, describing cooperative action on prescribed fire for the enhancement of wildlife habitat. Non-government wildlife organizations such as Ducks Unlimited, the Nature Trust, and the Canadian Wildlife Federation, with the cooperation of Wildlife Habitat Canada, have entered into a number of arrangements for wildlife management with many provinces, aimed at the acquisition of key habitats. In the broadest sense, national Wildlife Week could be regarded as an informal agreement between wildlife agencies and the general public. In some provinces, this event involves small displays, school promotions, festivals, contests, and is sponsored by a number of agencies, such as the Manitoba government, the Canadian government, Ducks Unlimited, naturalist groups and others. Cooperative arrangements exist between wildlife agencies and specific user groups. The Trapper General Agreement between the Ontario Minister of Natural Resources and the Ontario Trappers' Association serves to promote both the trapping industry and humane trapping methods.

Agreements are also concluded with groups with a special cultural interest. The Northwest Territories, Yukon, and Manitoba have cooperative arrangements with various native groups. Following resolution of a native land claim, the Inuvialut Game Council was established to provide advice on the management of wildlife.

Representatives from both the Northwest Territories Wildlife Management Division and the Inuvialut people sit on the Council. Finally, at the individual level, arrangements exist between wildlife agencies and private citizens, but such arrangements are few and they generally center around the use of land for wildlife. For example, Ontario's Wildlife Extension Landowner Agreement encourages landowners to permit public access to wildlife resources on their properties, in return for assistance in wildlife management.

What specifically do these cooperative arrangements attempt to achieve? The objectives fall within five categories:

1) protection of endangered species, 2) joint management of wildlife populations, 3) inventory, 4) compensation for damage by wildlife, 5) funding for habitat management, particularly wetland management. Examples of each type of arrangement will be highlighted, but note that no attempt is made to produce a complete list. The intent is to show the variety of such arrangements currently in place.

#### 1. Protection of Endangered Species

The Committee on the Status of Endangered Wildlife in Canada (COSEWIC) involves an 8-year arrangement among 10 provinces, 2 territories, 3 non-government organizations and 4 federal agencies. Its role was to report on the status of various wildlife species whose future was questionable or perceived to be so. The Committee has designated the status of 98 species in Canada, and it has examined many more species which were not in jeopardy. Its success can be attributed to the very specific mandate of the Committee and the dedication of its members.

The protection of endangered or threatened species often involves reintroduction of species into historic habitats. A cooperative arrangement between British Columbia and the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service was formed to coordinate management of the Selkirk caribou herd and to re-establish caribou in the U.S.

A number of provinces are involved in arrangements to re-establish wood bison to historic ranges, in cooperation with the Canadian Wildlife Service. The goal of these arrangements is to establish five free-roaming populations of wood bison in Canada, and in Alberta, Manitoba and the Yukon, plans exist for their release to the wild. In both Alberta and Manitoba, native groups are also involved in the reintroduction programs.

Alberta and Saskatchewan have arrangements with the Canadian Wildlife Service to re-establish swift foxes. The University of Calgary is involved in the Alberta arrangement and provides grants for research on swift foxes.

The Saskatchewan government is involved in a cooperative arrangement with the University of Saskatchewan and the Canadian Wildlife Service to establish/breeding populations/of peregrine falcons in Regina and Saskatoon. All provinces and territories cooperated, to some degree, in the development of a Peregrine Recovery Plan whose objective is to re-establish breeding populations of peregrines in jurisdictions where they no longer occur.

#### 2. Joint Management of Wildlife Species

The Porcupine Caribou herd, a migratory population of barren ground caribou, is jointly managed by the governments of Yukon, Northwest Territories, and Canada and by the user groups. The arrangement was initiated in 1985, so it is premature to discuss any results. Discussions are underway to involve Alaska in joint management, since the caribou's range includes this state. Another arrangement to manage migratory caribou exists for the Beverly-Kaminuriak herd of barren ground caribou. The management board for this population includes the governments of Northwest Territories, Saskatchewan, Manitoba and Canada, as well as user groups. In the five years this arrangement has been operative, a number of successes have been identified. The arrangement allowed the users to have input in the management of the caribou, provided education and information to the users and heightened public awareness of the caribou population and recognition of its traditional use. Finally, it generated community support for the management programs. The major disadvantage was that any decision-making was a very slow process, but in retrospect, the participants felt the community support justified the time commitment.

In British Columbia, the federal and provincial government identified responsibilities for marine mammal management and exchange of information. The arrangement, initiated in 1983, has been useful in encouraging liaison between the two governments.

A number of provinces have management arrangements between wildlife agencies and specific user groups. Four years ago, the government of the Northwest Territories formed an arrangement with the Clyde River and Broughton Island Hunters and Trappers Association to reduce the harvest of polar bears on Northeast Baffin Island. Initially, it was difficult to establish this arrangement because hunters and trappers found it difficult to understand the research findings. Once this problem was clarified, agreement was reached. The arrangement in the Northwest Territories to prevent the harvest of moose along the Liard Highway has been mentioned previously. The arrangement resulted in the maintenance of moose populations. However, there were problems with enforcement.

### 3. Inventory

There are a number of cooperative arrangements to collect inventory information. Manitoba's Northern Flood Agreement, involving the governments of Manitoba and Canada, together with five northern Manitoba Indian bands, was set up to inventory moose habitat. The Alberta government, the Canadian Wildlife Service, and the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, has an arrangement to inventory waterfowl in Alberta each year and this count has been the basis of accurate predictions of fall migrations. Finally, following a land claim settlement, the Yukon government, Canadian government, and native groups are cooperating in a program to inventory wildlife and the harvest of fur on the Yukon coast in preparation for joint management. This arrangement has only been in effect for one year.

### 4. Compensation for Damage by Wildlife

Arrangements to jointly fund programs to compensate farmers for crop damage due to waterfowl exist in the prairie provinces, with the responsibility for funding shared between the provincial and federal governments.

### 5. Funding for Habitat Enhancement

The activities of Wildlife Habitat Canada in funding land acquisition and enhancement within each province has led to a number of "joint ventures" with provincial wildlife agencies, Ducks Unlimited and Nature Trust. In two provinces, this cooperation has been formalized in a written agreement. The key factor in these agreements is to gain access to special purpose funds and to explore acquisition possibilities that are denied to individual agencies. The 17,000 acre Creston Valley Wildlife Management Area in British Columbia is an example of a long-term cooperative program directed both at the enhancement of habitat and public education. It was initiated in 1968 between Canadian Wildlife Service and the government of British Columbia, with participation by Ducks Unlimited and is partial compensation for a hydro development. While its primary role is habitat improvement for waterfowl, it also serves an extensive public interpretation need, hosting about 60,000 people per year.

The above examples of cooperative funding are largely the result of various agencies attempting to capitalize on a positive initiative by bringing in more players, thereby broadening the funding base and dispersing the benefits more widely. However, recent funding restrictions in many jurisdictions have made such cooperative arrangements more of a management necessity than a convenience - "Necessity is the Mother of Invention." Some of them are as much a compensatory reaction to the reduction of funding levels in government, as they are a reflection of the cooperative or entrepreneurial spirit.

As agency capability decreases, innovative arrangements can be fostered that will accomplish the same tasks. In British Columbia, this had led to the privatization of many functions normally associated with the traditional role of government in wildlife management. The training and certification of hunters is now handled entirely by the private sector. A more experimental case is the control of problem wildlife. This activity annually places an enormous drain of manpower and money on the Wildlife Branch. In the last few years over some of the province, the task has been contracted out to private bear and cougar hunters, paying them on a call-out basis, or letting them retain the hides. This simple delegation of a function long associated with wildlife officers has raised the hackles of some purists, but it has resulted in a reduction in costs and a freeing up of manpower for other tasks. The possibility is also being explored of extending this use of private individuals to predator control projects. Programs such as aerial wolf control are not only expensive but controversial and the use of agreements with private trappers may accomplish the desired level of reduction and hopefully minimize the attendant controversy.

This has been a brief and admittedly superficial outline of a few high-profile, cooperative arrangements between different levels of government and other parties with an interest in wildlife. As I mentioned at the outset, few generalizations can be made. It would appear that the successful cooperative agreements have specific terms of reference, specified goals, definite time deadlines and committed funding for the life of the agreement. This is not an earth-shattering conclusion, - it is simply a good business arrangement between partners. The outstanding and obvious advantages of such arrangements are:

- 1) By combining money and manpower, they enable initiatives to be undertaken that would be difficult or impossible for a single partner. That is, they access more than one level of manpower and funding.
- 2) There is more accountability for results, since each party has the opportunity to review and comment on the activities of the other. One tends to keep the other honest.
- 3) They result in specialist expertise being made available to more than one jurisdiction.  
... and an advantage that is often overlooked ...
- 4) The cooperation of a provincial or territorial entity with a federal body on a specific project implies priority for that species or activity, which at least suggests a consensus of where we are going with wildlife in this country.



The disadvantages are equally obvious:

- 1) Single party interests must often be compromised or modified to accommodate objectives that will satisfy all parties.
- 2) The priority of one partner may change, or his capability to support the arrangement may change, but there is a commitment that must be met, possibly to the detriment of new priorities.
- 3) Due to the nature of the bureaucratic system and the inevitable development of loyalties to pet projects, long-term arrangements may be continued beyond their useful life, to serve vested personal interests.
- 4) Decision-making is often a ponderous process, due to the necessity to achieve consensus of several different masters.

In summary then, across the country where jurisdictions overlap, interests coincide, or money and manpower dictate, we have a large number of cooperative arrangements for wildlife management. These arrangements make the money go farther and they may use existing resources more efficiently. But in so doing, they solve only part of the dilemma that the manager faces. In a word, they may make our use of existing resources more efficient, but they do not create new resources or funding sources for wildlife management.

There can be no question that we must be more efficient with what we have and these arrangements help to stretch available dollars. But the major challenge is to entrepreneur new ways to solicit support for wildlife management. If we are unwilling to be innovative in our approach to new initiatives, we have two options. Make do with what we have, or ask the governments, both federal and provincial, for more money. In these times it is questionable whether any jurisdiction will receive the quantum leap in funding that is needed to halt the declines in wildlife that are occurring. As a matter of fact, it is doubtful whether money alone will lead to improved conditions for wildlife without the acceptance of new concepts of resource management and new approaches by wildlife managers.

I personally believe that wildlife should be managed by the government, but one must view the present situation objectively. Current wildlife programs are inadequately supported and there is little evidence that significant infusions of government support are likely. The options would appear to be obvious. Continue to manage with the diminishing resources we have, or explore outside of government and recruit private interests or organizations that could themselves take over certain aspects of wildlife management. We have been eager in the past to involve the private sector in funding certain aspects of our activities, such as research and inventory, but we extended the hand of cooperation cautiously. We were always careful to retain total control over the "management" aspect of wildlife. We have long-standing biases, some of them

well-founded, against letting the private sector actually manage animals, but the time may be ripe for some hard choices. Why not, for example, delegate management responsibility on a trial basis to forest companies with good track records for environmental practice? Why not develop an agreement with private companies and let them protect, manage, regulate and enhance as they see fit, with only broad guidelines from government? In areas where such private interests have some form of tenure, management of the wildlife could become part of their land use responsibility. Not to simply do inventory, or research or monitoring and report back to us, but manage the populations on their land under written agreement with the wildlife agency.

The concept of assigning some responsibility to the private sector has some precedent in that responsibility for monitoring and surveillance on pipeline projects has been delegated to the proponent in several cases in the past few years. The object was to reduce human and monetary costs to the resource agencies while maintaining habitat protection standards and operational efficiency.

The development of cooperative agreements for actual wildlife management with the private sector would probably be met with considerable reservation, if not resistance, by the various resource agencies in the country. Fear of public criticism, anticipated reduced levels of protection, and worst of all "loss of management control" are commonly expressed concerns. On the other hand, significant benefits could be anticipated - reduced need for agency involvement, increased opportunities for on-site enhancement, more continuity of long-term management, improved communication between the two sectors and a general broadening of ecological appreciation and accountability by private companies.

This trial concept would necessitate early consultation with the public on the idea itself, and public involvement in a visible appraisal of the management plans proposed by the company and agreed to by the agency. The public and indeed, the resource agencies themselves, would have to be convinced that such a move would better serve the aims and objectives of resource management than the existing system. Standards to be met by the company would have to be determined. To maintain public credibility, there would have to be visible objectives to which a company would be held accountable.

This concept does not imply a blanket privatization of our responsibilities as wildlife managers. The question is simply, "Can we extend the concept of cooperative agreements to the private sector to achieve benefits for wildlife?" We are speaking only of those special cases where it is obvious that a private entity may be able to do as good a job as a government agency. Agencies would still retain management authority over all species, but the delegation of responsibility for management by the private sector may be an option for those species which are in no immediate trouble, respond well to habitat manipulation and



enhancement, and which are in high public demand. If we can free ourselves to some degree from the continued need to manage and regulate the easy ones, we will have more time as wildlife managers to spend on those species that pose more difficult problems.

Of course there would be costs associated with this approach. For some private interests such as coastal forest companies, increased flexibility in forest planning due to reduced involvement of agency personnel may be sufficient incentive. For others, there is no doubt that they would have to receive some more direct benefit, probably in the form of part of the revenues or fees that now go to the Crown. There may indeed be increased costs to the hunter and more emphasis on user pay. But in the cold hard light of day in the 1980's, isn't this to be expected?

The delegation of management responsibility to interests outside government is a delicate subject in a country where Crown management of wildlife is a long tradition. But it seems a logical extension of the concept of developing cooperative agreements for the long-term benefit of wildlife. Governments, and wildlife managers at both the provincial and federal level cannot have it both ways. If funding increases for wildlife are not forthcoming, can we afford to fall back self righteously on our "mandate to manage", and reject the opportunity for others, who may, for a price, help us out of the dilemma of increasing demand and decreasing supplies of wildlife?

**A COOPERATIVE WILDLIFE HABITAT  
CONSERVATION PROGRAM**

for the  
Colloquium on Wildlife Conservation in Canada  
Ottawa, May 7 and 8, 1986

David J. Neave  
Wildlife Habitat Canada

## A Cooperative Wildlife Habitat Conservation Program

by David J. Neave

### Summary

The evolution of wildlife habitat programs in Canada has been a function of three factors: land ownership patterns, the great variety of agencies involved, including other resource sectors, and an unclear differentiation of responsibilities.

Only recently have community, regional and national habitat goals started to evolve but without the benefit of direct legislative protection. Habitat information and extension programs are diffuse. As a major landowner, the Crown's emphasis remains focussed on mitigative measures associated with land developments and by land-use planning. Land acquisition and habitat goals crystalize, there have developed a stronger cooperative approach partially due to the large expenditures by non-government wildlife agencies and industry relative to those of government wildlife agencies.

To influence landowners who have property rights and equally responsibilities, tangible benefits for habitat conservation must be provided. Ideas presented in this paper include: property tax recognition, compensation and mortgage relief. To obtain broad Canadian support, financial measures recommended include: a "conservation share" approach, an income tax check-off proposal and an expansion of the Canadian Wildlife Habitat Conservation Stamp Program. To encourage greater collaboration among sectors, proposals include: a pro-active industry approach and the use of direct financial returns associated with habitat projects.

Canada's wildlife resources are the envy of the world. Our challenge is to develop cooperative programs that will maintain this country's status by directly and positively influencing the landowner to participate in habitat conservation.

## **A COOPERATIVE WILDLIFE HABITAT CONSERVATION PROGRAM**

Wildlife conservation has come a long way from the era when laws were first proclaimed for the protection of Royal game. Today, conservation enjoys almost universal public support and while responsibility for wildlife remains with the Crown; responsibility for conserving the base, the habitat, is often elusive. Initiatives in this vital area are often shared by private and public agencies and ultimately by landowners themselves.

This paper highlights significant contributions to wildlife habitat conservation by private and public agencies, identifies current needs and examines new opportunities, including innovative funding mechanisms, to enhance Canadian habitat conservation efforts.

### WILDLIFE HABITAT CONSERVATION IN CANADA

Due to the diverse nature of land tenure in Canada, habitat conservation programs have tended to be as varied as the resources they are designed to benefit. The traditional approach on Crown lands has been to create reserves, place prohibitions on conflicting land uses and, more recently, implement integrated plans permitting other resource development that is compatible with habitat conservation. Conservation efforts on private land, on the other hand, have generally involved land acquisition and habitat enhancement projects carried out with the permission of landowners as well as cooperative extension/education projects involving both public and private wildlife agencies.

Legislative authority in wildlife management is based on the premise that the property in wild animals is vested in the Crown in the right of the Province and Territory. The management of lands and other natural resources is also a basic provincial responsibility. It is clear, then, that the principal responsibility for wildlife habitat management rests with the provincial government. While there are many similarities among provinces, wildlife agencies have emphasized different habitat program elements. In the past few years, their emphasis in habitat programs appears to have shifted from protection and development to a more balanced program, identifying goals, establishing broader ecological inventories and emphasizing multi-agency planning. More recently, a number of non-government wildlife organizations have entered into long-term cooperative agreements to assist in habitat management.

The federal government responsibility has been primarily related to migratory birds due to an international migratory birds treaty. While a national wildlife area program has been established along with several joint federal-provincial wildlife areas, the Canadian Wildlife Service is recognized more for the long term research and management of migratory birds. Direct habitat management responsibility is limited except for areas of federal lands primarily in northern Canada. Federal leadership in the International Biological Program and the strong National Park system have marked significant steps towards the broader conservation of ecosystems in Canada.

## THE NEED FOR COOPERATION IN WILDLIFE HABITAT CONSERVATION

As a whole, Canada lacks community, regional and national wildlife habitat goals that are visible and supported by government policy. With the adoption of a more holistic resource management philosophy, and with more innovative planning, there appears to be an opportunity to enhance wildlife habitat conservation. However, without establishing goals that can align all wildlife interests and that can be made complimentary to other resource interests, many efforts will falter or be counter-productive. There must be a political determination of what is to be achieved, by what means and at what cost. Implementation of these goals through a straight forward regional planning structure and an alignment of agencies would greatly enhance conservation. The adoption and implementation of the North American Waterfowl Management Plan, with defined habitat goals, will be a significant step towards this more coordinated, cooperative wildlife habitat conservation program.

The situation arising from the lack of clear goals and policies is compounded by the fact that there is little legislative protection of wildlife habitat in Canada. Currently, a considerable portion of wildlife conservation action is administered by using other government agencies' legislation that obliquely refer to wildlife. Problems of administration, compliance, enforcement, technological expertise and conflicting policies between agencies have made habitat conservation a difficult, often antagonistic rather than cooperative process.

Roles and responsibilities within the national and regional framework must be clarified. This will foster cooperation and complementary programs between and among wildlife organizations as well as in association with recreational and other resource sectors. The role of municipalities in wildlife management has been largely ignored, although their direct impact on habitat conservation is extensive. Municipalities must be encouraged to adopt broad conservation principles and to integrate these into their local land-use plans and subsequent by-laws. They must be able to promote and assist wildlife projects involving private citizens, organizations and businesses, and encourage the principle of private stewardship of resources by private landowners and those licensed to use public lands. Volunteers should also be encouraged to participate in local community habitat programs. In Canada, volunteers currently exceed the number of employees of all levels of government.

Habitat information needs to be collectively assembled within an ecological framework that is useful for all interests. Deficiencies are not necessarily due to insufficient data, but rather to the lack of interpretative capability and to the scattered and relatively inaccessible nature of existing information. The development, use and maintenance of a good inventory is essential for any effective long-term conservation program. Habitat information also needs to be further integrated into broader extension and local educational programs.

Habitat development is an essential and relatively successful aspect of wildlife habitat conservation. However, the creation, enhancement and rehabilitation of wildlife habitat is but one component of a comprehensive approach. Too often, independent development projects are not fully planned to help meet broader habitat program objectives.

Habitat protection efforts should be evaluated based on the current heavy effort by government agencies in this one program element. There should be greater integration of wildlife habitat objectives into development plans of other primary resource sectors in a positive and complementary fashion. Current referral processes that allow wildlife agencies to examine resource development plans should be improved by introducing more sophisticated data retrieval processes, and by establishing effective extension programs. However, the most significant modification would be influencing industry to propose habitat enhancement initiatives as a component of development. Heavy machinery on an industrial site could easily rejuvenate moose range or stabilize water levels for furbearers. Wildlife interests outside of government should also be able to contribute to this essential habitat protection element.

Additional funding of wildlife habitat management programs is often perceived as the solution to habitat programs. However, a recent estimate of the annual cost of habitat programs in Canada by governments and non-government organizations exceeded \$100 million. This value did not include the additional costs of mitigation and compensation borne by industry and other resource users, or the loss of Crown revenues. If these factors were included, the estimate for maintenance of the resource base could conceivably increase to an annual figure exceeding \$250 million. Industries, for instance, have spent millions of dollars in attempting to mitigate the adverse impacts of resource developments on wildlife habitat. An examination of this collective expenditure should be one step in assessing funding opportunities. A realignment of these expenditures to meet definitive goals and the collective support of all agencies would be very effective in fostering the required cooperation between industry and landowners.

It is becoming increasingly apparent that socio-economic benefits derived from the wildlife resource far exceed current costs of maintaining that resource base. It is economically worthwhile when appropriate to increase the level of financial support for wildlife habitat conservation in Canada. While ecological, behavioural and physiological studies have done much to provide the kind of evidence that is basic to the future of wildlife and its habitat, appropriate methodologies for evaluating the socio-economic values are inadequate and lack acceptance. As emphasis on artificially contrived sanctuaries increases, so too does the need for better understanding of the need for and benefits of a rich and diverse landscape. Scientific knowledge must be amalgamated with the social and economic values of all wildlife consumers including the broader interests of soil and water conservation.

### Influence Property Rights and Responsibilities

Ironically, the problems and opportunities in wildlife habitat are very similar to other resource sectors. Intensification of agricultural and forestry practices, and continuing urban expansion are all having a major impact on the remaining wildlife habitat. However, similar land-use pressures face forestry and agriculture. Resolving these land-use issues is surely to society's benefit and with finesse will lead to greater cooperation among resource sectors. There already appears to be a willingness to change. Landowners are questioning the value of maximizing resource production at high costs without suitable markets.

Fundamental to these land use conflicts are the property rights associated with various types of public and private land tenure. Crown land, for example, can be designated for such diverse uses as parks, wildlife refuges, coal leases or timber exploitation. Under these designations, the public relinquishes certain rights such as hunting, fishing or camping opportunities or even rights to free access to the designated areas.

On private or deeded lands, the public enjoys few, if any, property rights. Landowners, however, acquire broad discretionary rights to enjoy the fruits of the land and to profit from it. They are restricted only by a framework of legislation designed to protect the interests of other property owners and the Canadian public-at-large. At the same time, property owners may surrender certain property rights in the form of easements, rights of way, liens and mortgages, thus trading certain rights for more valuable benefits.

While the rights associated with land ownership are easily established and defined, landowner responsibility for proper stewardship of the land has not been as evident. Land ownership in most jurisdictions conveys certain obligations to protect the public interest, observe certain environmental standards and even adhere to certain minimum maintenance standards. There is, however, little recognition by society for landowners to practice sound land and water management as a condition of tenure.

This is the major impediment to the development of an effective, universal wildlife habitat conservation program. New ideas are needed to influence property rights and responsibilities by providing landowners with tangible benefits to be derived from practicing sound land management including measures to conserve, enhance or develop wildlife habitat.

In the past, habitat conservation objectives have been achieved primarily through direct land acquisition based on the principle that fee simple land ownership permits strong management control. However, with rising land prices, declining acquisition budgets and a greater need to conserve habitat on private lands, a number of other means of promoting habitat conservation have evolved. Conservation easements, purchase and transfer of property rights, leasing, acquisition of rights-of-way, are but a few of the tools that are being developed primarily in the United States.

Some of the more innovative ideas being proposed in the Canadian conservation community include concepts such as mortgage relief, conservation easements and property tax reductions to landowners willing to commit themselves to sound land management practices. Other suggestions include amendments to existing government loan and grant programs to encourage a higher commitment to land stewardship awareness by business, industry, agriculture and forestry as a condition of eligibility. Yet others involve imposition of development fees and mitigation programs to encourage alternatives that retain the wildlife habitat values of a given area.

The following describes specific opportunities to encourage greater landowner involvement in wildlife habitat conservation :

#### a) Landowner subsidies

The idea that landowners who agree to embark on habitat conservation programs should enjoy a measure of property tax relief has received wide support from conservation groups, organized sportsmen and farmers. While proponents of the idea agree that the concept would encourage voluntary conservation initiatives, a number of different philosophies on how such subsidies would encourage better land use practices have developed across Canada.

In the prairies, property tax was historically low for wetland areas on agricultural land. However, the Wheat Board Quota System, federal and provincial drainage subsidies and agricultural incentive programs have encouraged drainage and cultivation of wetlands and natural areas. In an attempt to preserve remaining prairie sloughs, wildlife agencies in Alberta, Manitoba and Saskatchewan have initiated a series of comprehensive wetland pilot programs. These provide economic incentives for private landowners based on property tax rebates to preserve and enhance wetlands on individual properties.

In exchange for tax rebates, payments for retention easements, and provision of various items such as fencing, herbicides, seed, and fertilizer to improve upland habitat, landowners agree not to drain or fill existing wetlands and will manage upland areas fully or partially for waterfowl production. Thus, in return for limiting agricultural use of marginal lands and for undertaking conservation farming techniques, landowners are entitled to various financial benefits.

There are many similar opportunities, such as an itemized property tax statement separately showing wetland assessments and in Ontario, the expansion of the landowner's entitlement to existing agricultural and woodlot rebate programs to include wetlands and other natural areas. Similarly, a recent tax bill in the United States proposes the use of tax credits for conservation practices. Owners of wetlands and critical habitat for endangered species would be entitled to a 15% tax credit if they successfully undertake specified actions that improve the property's value for conservation. In addition, the bill would expand current tax incentives for persons wishing to donate land to government agencies or non-profit organizations.

#### b) Compensation as an element of mitigation

While compensation measures have been clearly established for protection of certain Crown resources, such as timber, coal, natural gas and petroleum, there has been little incentive for users to compensate for losses of Canadian wildlife habitat. Where on-site mitigation is inappropriate or insufficient for protection of wildlife habitat on a particular resource development project, compensation in recognition of the damage to or loss of public resources and amenities should be advocated. Whether paid in cash or in kind, compensation could be an effective mechanism to offset public resource losses that may occur as a result of a development and could provide a new funding source for wildlife habitat programs.

c) Mortgage Relief

Since interest on debt is a major farm input and a particular concern to farmers who financed the acquisition of additional land and equipment during the late 1970's, a program to provide mortgage relief would be well-received by many who are willing to dedicate land to habitat conservation. This technique has been used extensively in agricultural development through farm credit corporations on the prairies.

A recent review by Prism Consultants examined the feasibility of providing mortgage relief to a recent purchaser of agricultural land in exchange for an agreement to not significantly change the existing land use. Mortgage relief was viewed as a potentially effective vehicle for habitat retention on private land. After an examination of current mortgage relief programs and discussions with individuals familiar with the management of mortgage and habitat programs, the study indicated very clearly that in principle, mortgage relief can be employed as part of a habitat retention program.

Maximize Canadian Financial Support

In Canada, unlike the United States, all taxpayers shoulder the responsibility of wildlife management through the appropriation of general revenue funds. There is, however, growing pressure to have those who benefit from a specific Crown resource make additional contributions to the maintenance and management of that resource.

Traditionally, hunters have sponsored many wildlife management programs. Many continue to do so through their support of non-government conservation agencies. However, with attention being focussed on the "user pay" principle, wildlife interests are seeking ways to encourage those who derive benefits from wildlife to make additional contributions to sustain the resource.

The application of surcharges on wildlife-related activities is already generating considerable revenue for conservation efforts. The proposed excise tax on certain outdoor equipment, and the adoption of fees for access to wildlife areas have already been adequately reviewed. New mechanisms should also be devised to encourage voluntary contributions from conservationists. The development of an income tax checkoff program, a wildlife habitat conservation lottery, and a conservation share would provide a broader base of Canadians actively participating in the support of wildlife habitat conservation.

The following section outlines specific opportunities for further consideration:

a) An expansion of the Canadian Wildlife Habitat Conservation Stamp

Canada's Wildlife Habitat Conservation Stamp, initiated by Wildlife Habitat Canada and Environment Canada in 1985, is a major source of conservation funding. Since August 1985, Canadian migratory bird

hunters have been required to affix a \$4 stamp to their permits. Stamp proceeds have been channelled to habitat conservation projects administered by Wildlife Habitat Canada. In conjunction with the sale of art prints and medallions, this program will net between 4 and 5 million dollars in its first year. This concept is very similar to the successful United States Duck Stamp program and to provincial surcharges on hunting and fishing licences.

However, the program's effectiveness will largely depend upon the continued strong support of Canadians. The active participation of many members of the Habitat Coalition is an example of this support as many groups sold both the stamp and art prints to raise funds for cooperative habitat programs. To encourage further support, the stamp could be used for additional conservation programs, for future conservation programs or as a requirement for the purchase of specific large outdoor products. In the latter example, the stamp could be a unique alternative to the United States concept of a surcharge for a "Non-Game Wildlife Trust Fund" on motor vehicle registration forms.

b) A Conservation "Share" approach

Wildlife Habitat Canada is currently examining a Canadian Wildlife Habitat Conservation Share proposal which would encourage Canadians to create a capital fund for conservation programs. The proposal calls for issuing shares of \$25 or \$50 value which could be redeemable upon request. These share purchases would create a large capital fund possibly as high as 25 million dollars from which interest-free loans could be made to qualified non-government agencies for conservation purposes. Interest earned by the fund would be reinvested in conservation projects.

Many participants would regard their share purchases as donations to the fund, but could enjoy benefits such as access to otherwise restricted wildlife areas, regular progress reports on funded projects and the opportunity to designate their share capital to specific projects rather than a general development account.

The experience of non-government agencies such as Ducks Unlimited Canada reinforces the value of citizen involvement in conservation projects. This approach has been very successful for community and government programs in acquiring both citizen involvement and financial participation. Wildlife Habitat Canada could capitalize on this willingness by creating, promoting and administering a "conservation share" program which, in turn, would benefit other habitat conservation organizations.

c) An Income Tax Checkoff proposal

Income tax checkoff programs are practiced in roughly two thirds of the United States and in 1984 raised approximately \$9 million for non-game programs. Individuals and corporations donate at the time of filing their State income tax returns by checking-off a portion or all of their eligible refund for habitat conservation purposes. Where no refund is due, taxpayers may still contribute by adding an amount to



their tax payment, (indicating that this is a contribution). All donations are tax deductible for the following year as a charitable contribution on federal and state tax returns. On a national scale, it was estimated that donations averaged around \$5.30, and were made by 4.2% of the people filing returns. The voluntary income tax checkoff is a convenient form of donation that could be offered to corporations and to millions of Canadians. Revenue would be collected by Revenue Canada, and channelled back to the province of origin either directly into Provincial Trust Funds or through other mechanisms such as Wildlife Habitat Canada.

#### Encourage greater collaboration

While the funding opportunities identified in this presentation are necessary to enhance the Canadian habitat conservation program, the cooperation of many individuals and organizations is vital to achieve a cohesive, goal orientated and cost-effective program.

Wildlife professionals have no patent on effective conservation achievements. It's a field that accomodates people from all walks of life: farmers, teachers, students, professionals, tradespeople, public and private decision-makers and expeditors. Success in this conservation endeavour will require programs that capitalize on the wealth of diverse experience available within the wildlife conservation community; that foster greater understanding of the relationship between land development and habitat conservation, that reinforce the recognition that wildlife conservation is an economically sound goal and that encourage support, confidence and commitment from all levels of government. Most of all it depends on the support of landowners.

Two specific opportunities exist to meet this challenge :

#### a) Encouraging industry to be proactive in habitat issues

Many resource industries would be willing to provide additional funds to carry out extensive mitigative and rehabilitative programs in order to enter sensitive wildlife areas. Government agencies may not be able to accept such funds, non-government organization may be able to play a useful role in receiving these funds and channeling them into appropriate conservation initiatives.

#### b) Encouraging a financial return on wildlife habitat initiatives

Many habitat projects could provide an economic return from either long term management or from the development of other programs. Access fees to private lands for hunting purposes are the only common example of economic return to landowners although there are some other exceptional examples. The example of La Société Duvetnor, acquiring islands on the Saint Lawrence River for conservation purposes and obtaining a return

from the sale of eiderdown is well known. More recently the agreements to acquire Ward Ranch in Alberta was developed as a cooperative investment to ensure the revenue from surface and sub-surface rights are reinvested for future wildlife programs. This approach should not only become widely adopted but is necessary to emphasize and support the multiple-use concept in land management. Future funding of habitat initiatives should include this approach.

#### CONCLUSION

This presentation has identified the job that faces the conservation community to ensure a place for wildlife in a society that equates development with progress, that holds private landownership a fundamental right while demanding access to its outdoor heritage and that measures the success of an endeavour by its profitability.

In order to promote both private and public conservation action, habitat managers must find more flexible tools to modify the variety of rights and responsibilities associated with the land base in Canada. Tools that are often commonly used by other resource sectors. The eight tools recommended here for further review are innovative and are based on economics, cooperation and strong local involvement.

Private landowners need to be provided financial incentives rather than disincentives, for the implementation of conservation practices on their land. The necessary funding for such initiatives can be generated through a number of options that attempt to maximize collective economic benefits from the wildlife resource. However, the return from the great variety of current habitat users and from additional expenditures can only be maximized within a more comprehensive program.

Canada's wildlife resources are the envy of the world. The challenge rests with us, collectively, to ensure that these resources remain an integral fabric of society as well as a treasured part of our heritage. Each day, resource allocation decisions that affect the future of habitats are made for both crown and privately-owned land. They are made largely on the basis of the most profitable, albeit short-term, strategy to the landowner. Each day, opportunities for conservation of wildlife habitat can be found or lost.



SHARING FUNDS FOR  
WILDLIFE MANAGEMENT

by F.A.G. Carter

for the

Colloquium on Wildlife Conservation in Canada  
Ottawa, May 7 and 8, 1986

## S U M M A R Y

### Sharing Funds For Wildlife Management by F.A.G. Carter

An impressive array of federal-provincial programs has been developed in Canada and a high degree of cooperation between governments is normal in many fields. The broad picture of sharing between the two levels of government and of federal contributions to provincial and territorial programs is nevertheless very inconsistent. Formulas for cost sharing vary, 50:50 or something like it is the most common, although the sorts of agreements and the degree of flexibility in implementation that they allow also vary. There are cost-shared programs, such as the Canada Assistance Plan, Medicare and the General Development Agreements, that are national and there are also regional programs, such as PFRA. It is clear that the whole system has become very important to Canadians.

Cost sharing programs have given rise to much controversy, sometimes based on interpretations of the Constitution, sometimes on concerns about loss of flexibility in budgeting and sometimes on competition for "tax room".

Nevertheless, the majority of cost-shared programs have been considered successful by both levels of government. Whether a particular cost-shared program is deemed a success or a failure usually depends on by whom the judgment is made. A program may be seen as a success by the federal government and a failure by provinces or vice versa. A program considered a success by some provinces may be considered unsatisfactory by others.

Nine lessons may be drawn from a review of experience with federal-provincial cost-sharing programs. They are:

- (1) there is no automatic formula for sharing costs
- (2) it should be made clear whether a program is national or regional
- (3) it is important to be prepared for controversy and to try to respect sensitivities
- (4) it is important to make clear the effects of shared cost programs and associated taxes on the spending flexibility and access to "tax room" of all governments concerned
- (5) shared cost programs may be tempting targets for cutbacks
- (6) national programs based on solid cooperation among governments are most likely to remain secure

- (7) credit must be given where credit is due
- (8) a group of ministers with a strong common purpose can achieve success against considerable odds
- (9) nothing is permanent, but formal intergovernmental agreements and enabling legislation help.

Applying the lessons noted above to the possibility of creating new arrangements for wildlife conservation in Canada, the following conclusions are suggested:

(1) the first essential is that governments should know what they want to achieve. If major new sources of funds are to be tapped, it is highly unlikely that the public would be supportive if the proceeds were used merely to support a level of activity that is ongoing; something major, imaginative, appealing and enduring is required if new taxes are to be imposed.

(2) funds should be allocated equitably, i.e., so that there is a reasonable relationship between sources and expenditures in respect of the place of residence and the particular interest of those being taxed.

(3) if the federal government does not try to dictate conditions to the provinces, constitutional problems are unlikely to prove difficult in the wildlife field; it may therefore be possible to agree on a mix of program components, which would enable compliance with (2) above. Such a mix could include, for example, some elements related to migratory birds, others to sport fisheries, and/or broadly applicable environmental research.

(4) develop the constituency, ensure that credit is given where credit is due and work out cost-effective, politically acceptable plans for implementation. Foster the permanence of arrangements by establishing appropriate procedures, institutions and legislation.

## SHARING FUNDS FOR WILDLIFE MANAGEMENT

A PAPER FOR THE CONSIDERATION OF THE COLLOQUIUM ON  
WILDLIFE MANAGEMENT TO BE HELD AT OTTAWA - MAY 1986

F.A.G. Carter

### Introduction

Those who have laboured long on the preparations for this Colloquium have probably not had time to step back to appreciate the unusual nature of their creation. They have worked to bring together the representatives of the federal and provincial governments and of many non-governmental organizations covering a full range of interests in the field of wildlife. Success in that regard alone would hardly be unique: governmental and private representatives in Canada have, on different occasions over past years, come together to discuss policy issues in various fields of human activity. In probably no other instance, however, has such a full range of spokesmen undertaken to discuss not just policy issues, but those two subjects so dear and so privy to each government alone: what additional taxes might be raised, and how the proceeds might be shared.

That the Colloquium should even try to do this is a tribute to the open-mindedness of all those taking part. It is also a recognition that the very nature of wildlife and its universal appeal inspire confidence that reasonable solutions can be worked out, in open and frank discussion, by reasonable people dedicated to a common cause.

In asking that this paper be prepared, those responsible expressed the desire that the paper provide a background on the subject of sharing publicly-raised funds among the orders of government in Canada, and that it suggest principles for sharing that might be applicable to the particular circumstances of wildlife management. The paper was to take it for granted that additional funds would be available for sharing, derived probably from a new federal excise tax on equipment and material employed by wildlife "users", and possibly from other sources.

In my own contemplation of what the paper might say, the first point that came to mind was that real life Canada - and real political life in particular - is rarely neat and tidy. It is not difficult to write platitudes to cover any situation, and principles expressed in governmental statements over the years have often, sadly enough, been little more than that. Presumably what is wanted here is something more concrete: principles which, if adopted, would have a real influence over whatever might be done subsequently. But, such precision may be impossible without an in-depth knowledge of all the nuances of whatever arrangements may finally be agreed upon - for example, the degree of pain that may be suffered by the government that collects the new taxes that may be proposed. Nevertheless, it may be possible to draw some general lessons from the wider history of federal-provincial cooperation in joint endeavours over the years.

The broad picture of sharing between the orders of government in Canada and of federal contributions to the provincial and territorial governments is, it can be argued, one of glorious inconsistency. This has probably never been

expressed better than by Robert MacGregor Dawson in his classic study "The Government of Canada". He wrote, a generation ago, "The world of Dominion-provincial finance has for much of its history an air of grotesque unreality, untrammelled by logic and the ordinary restrictions and meanings of words..." "The history of the subsidies demonstrates not only that final and unalterable agreements can be and are subject to frequent revision, but that population figures can be invented when the actual ones prove unsuitable; that debt allowance can be made for debts which have never existed; that natural resources can be returned and enjoyed and at the same time compensated for on a basis of their original alienation; and that when a subsidy is increased in order to equalize the treatment among the provinces, further adjustments become immediately necessary in order to overcome the injustices which have been occasioned by the very act of equalization."

While Dawson wrote, to some extent, with tongue in cheek, his basic purpose was always to enhance the understanding of his students and readers. And what he wrote in the passage cited, he would write again with just as much conviction and with, perhaps, still better examples, if he were around today. The situation can perhaps be summed up in a single sentence: "where the political will exists, the way is found". It is found, often enough, despite the initial opposition of some of the actors, despite apparent constitutional roadblocks, and despite precedents pointing in the opposite direction. Overcoming these obstacles, however, has produced a wide variety of arrangements, each one tailored, presumably, to make agreement possible. Over the years, some have succeeded, and others have fallen by the wayside, victims of changing needs, changing governments, or because some governments had entered into the arrangement with too great reluctance in the first place.

### The Extent and Variety of Federal-Provincial Cooperation on Programs

A quick reading of the annual inventory of federal-provincial programs and activities published by the Federal-Provincial Relations Office will confirm at once just how wide the variety really is. The inventory gives but little indication, however, of the long battles that have been involved in the birth and development of many of the programs described, or the way in which the whole concept of joint programs has been subject to serious challenge over the past twenty years or more. Every government bears the scars of those battles and every new proposal for federal-provincial cooperation is viewed by federal and provincial cabinets not only on its intrinsic merits, but against the accumulated baggage of past experience across many fields of governmental activity.

Despite all the difficulties, an impressive array of joint programs has been developed and a high degree of intergovernmental cooperation is the norm in many fields. Federal cash transfers to the provinces for 1985-86 are now estimated by the federal government at \$20.2 billion and the value of federal tax transfers at \$6.9 billion. The total - some \$27.1 billion - represents 19.4% of the federal main estimates of \$102.5 billion for 1985-86. In terms of total provincial revenues for 1985-86, the major federal transfers (respecting equalization, welfare assistance, health, and post-secondary education) are expected to represent more than 40% in the Atlantic provinces, over 30% in Quebec and Manitoba, and from 20 to 25% in British Columbia, Saskatchewan and Ontario. Only in Alberta with its massive resource revenues does the percentage drop to 13. In the Yukon and Northwest Territories,

something close to 70% of their governments' total revenues comes from federal sources.

Among the hundreds of federal programs in question, there are some that have become, for Canadians generally, an important part of our very way of life. Some provinces, for example, are much less wealthy than others: in the last fiscal year some \$5 billion in federal cash went, with no strings attached, to help six provinces provide a reasonable standard of services without resort to unreasonable levels of taxation. Canadians feel a sense of responsibility for less fortunate Canadians wherever they are across Canada: some \$3.5 billion in federal cash went to support provincial welfare networks through the Canada Assistance Plan.

Moreover, the vast majority of Canadians want protection against the high cost of illness: some \$4.5 billion in federal cash went to support provincial medicare and hospitalization, and about \$1 billion more for extended health care. In addition, Canadians generally recognize the importance of post-secondary education to the national economy: close to \$2 billion in federal cash went to support provincial efforts in that field. And, as mentioned earlier, these federal "contributions" were reinforced by some \$7 billion in tax point transfers, largely associated with "Established Program Financing" which cover both health and post-secondary education.

The recitation of such a list could, in some circumstances, be taken as no more than propaganda for whatever federal government happened to be in power at a given time. Certainly the bare recitation, as we shall see later, ignores the controversies that were involved in bringing so many of the arrangements to their present state. It ignores, too, the lingering concerns that some provincial governments may have about the whole concept of shared-cost programs. For the moment, however, the list is intended to serve as nothing more than a reminder of the scale and importance of federal-provincial cooperative programming in the fabric of Canadian life, and a reminder that proposals for any new kind of cooperation in any field will always be seen, by the governments concerned, against the backdrop of the large and fundamental programs already in place.

Apart from these very large nation-wide programs, there is an almost bewildering variety of arrangements in almost every field of government endeavour. The most common - almost traditional - practice is to share costs 50-50. This is the arrangement that is used to share welfare costs under the Canada Assistance Plan, and for many years this was also the basis for federal contributions in the fields of health and post-secondary education. Even today, federal contributions to the health and post-secondary sectors are based, in a theoretical way, on what had been, at one time, a 50-50 system. A number of smaller programs including Native Court Workers, Crop Insurance, Legal Aid, and Agricultural Development, use 50-50 as a base in one way or another. Railway grade separation contributions involve a complex formula, but one revolving essentially around the 50-50 idea.

But there are many other financial arrangements too. National housing programs have shifted about over the years but have provided, on occasion, for federal contributions of 75% of capital cost of joint housing projects, and 75% of operating losses. They have provided as high as 90% towards the cost of land assembly. Under the Air Transportation Program, 100% has been offered to cover approved airport infrastructure expenditures by public bodies

including municipalities. National Training Programs, by and large, reimburse the provinces for all the operating costs they incur under the agreements with the federal government. The provincial governments that use the RCMP as provincial police (all but Ontario and Quebec) pay about 60% of the cost, though that percentage will rise to 70% by 1990-91. In the Student Loans program, provinces issue and administer the loans, but the federal government pays for all the losses arising from cases of non-repayment.

It is also significant that while the bulk of federal monies for shared-cost programs is paid out on the larger (and some smaller) nation-wide programs, the number of non-nation-wide programs is far larger. In some cases the latter are not nation-wide for the simple reason that the subject they deal with is specific to a particular region. Federal help for interprovincial ferries is an example. In other cases, such programs are deliberately aimed at a single region. Prairie Farm Rehabilitation programs are one example, another is the Primary Highway Strengthening program applicable only in the Atlantic provinces and aimed at bringing their main routes up to the standard prevailing in the rest of Canada.

One major national program involves the General Development Agreements under which all sorts of industrial or infrastructure projects are undertaken across the country. These agreements are common in their basic goals and objectives, but the details, including the sharing arrangements, are spelled out in a series of subsidiary agreements that can and do vary considerably from one province, or one field of activity, to another. Beyond that are a host of federal agreements on specific subjects with specific provinces including, of course, a number of agreements in the wildlife field. In some cases such single-province agreements are a reflection of a basic federal goal: the Canada-Manitoba Accord on the enhancement of environmental quality would be an example. In other cases, such agreements reflect a more local federal need or objective in which the provincial government happens to be concerned: the Welland Canal Crossing Agreements with Ontario would be an example.

It would seem clear from all of this that a complex structure for federal-provincial cooperation on a great variety of programs has developed over the years. It would also seem clear that the "system" has come to be of great importance not just to governments, but to Canadians generally. For anyone looking to expand its scope, the system would seem to provide, at least on the surface, precedents for doing almost anything in any field of governmental endeavour. Before proceeding to think about such possibilities, however, it would seem wise to examine some of the controversies that the evolution of the system has provoked, and some of the difficulties - both perceptual and actual - that have had to be overcome.

#### Fundamental Controversies over Shared-Cost Programs

Shared-cost programs were relatively insignificant in the life of Canada until after the Second World War. At the war's close the federal government had both the money and the inclination to continue the leadership role it had exercised during the period of conflict. It was highly conscious too of the social unrest of the 1930's, and influenced by the new interest in social policy exemplified by the "Cradle to the Grave" philosophy of the Beveridge report in the United Kingdom.



As a result, a whole series of national health grants came into being in 1948. In 1949, the federal government offered to help build the Trans-Canada Highway, paying 50% across the board and 90% for extremely high-cost stretches, such as through the Fraser Canyon. (It is notable that Quebec rejected the principle of such help at the time, and only took part many years later.) A new group of vocational training grants came on the scene in 1950, a forest inventory program in 1951, assistance to the needy aged in 1952. Various other programs to help child health, the disabled and the unemployed, continued to appear in the years leading up to 1958, when the massive program of hospital insurance came into force.

This spate of programs - and specially the introduction of hospital insurance against considerable opposition - gave rise to much questioning in government circles, both federal and provincial, of the wisdom of shared-cost arrangements. A number of provinces including Quebec believed that it was wrong in principle for the federal government to tax citizens, presumably for federal purposes, and then to spend that money for programs which came within the legislative jurisdiction of the provinces. Federal supporters of the shared-cost approach noted that, under the Constitution, the federal government could tax and spend for any purpose whatever and that it was perfectly reasonable, when the national interest (as determined by Parliament) so demanded, to use the spending power to persuade provincial governments to legislate on matters important to the country, but outside Parliament's legislative jurisdiction.

Opponents of this view argued that the federal government, rather than giving provinces funds with strings attached, should reduce taxes to permit provinces to occupy the "tax room" thus made available, leaving provinces free, in those circumstances, to determine their own priorities. And, if highways took precedence over social policy, or vice versa, then so be it; Canada is a federation, and not a unitary state. By no means all provinces felt this way however. Some expressed such views selectively, depending on whether they agreed with the purpose of any given federal program. The poorer provinces, generally, were leery of the "tax room" idea, knowing that a given level of tax, for them, produced a lot less revenue than it would produce in the richer provinces. Some provinces argued for a compromise between "tax room" on the one hand, and shared programs with many strings, on the other. The compromise would involve block grants, leaving the provinces free to decide how to spend the money, albeit within some defined sector of activity and for some generally defined purpose within the sector.

Despite the growing controversy, further federal programs were offered in 1960 (training), in 1961 (crop insurance and rural redevelopment - the ARDA program), in 1962 (fitness and amateur sport), in 1963 (the municipal development fund) and in 1964 (interest on student loans). These were followed in quick succession by three blockbusters: the Canada Assistance Plan, which was a major consolidation of and improvement to a maze of individual shared-cost programs, came in 1966; Medicare arrived the same year; and the Post-Secondary Education program appeared in 1967. Each, of course, had been preceded by months and even years of often acrimonious discussions with the provinces on what needed to be done and on what, if any, role the federal government should play (the controversy was a good deal less, it might be noted, over the Canada Assistance Plan).

Even within the federal cabinet there was an open difference of view between those ministers who pressed for new programs and those, including the Minister of Finance, Mitchell Sharp, who, in the midst of adding new programs, were looking for ways to transfer greater responsibility to the provinces for raising taxes to support the programs already in place. Obviously the Quebec situation was much in mind: whether to attract Quebecers by still better programs from Ottawa, or to satisfy the aspirations of other Quebecers for greater decision-making freedom for their provincial government.

The strong feelings of the government of Quebec on the question were undoubtedly an important factor leading to Quebec demands for a fundamental review of the Canadian Constitution. The federal government, with considerable reluctance, called the First Ministers together in 1967 to begin such a process, and intensive discussions continued until the failed attempt of the "Victoria Charter" in 1971. During the discussions - which ranged over many aspects of the Constitution - the federal government offered, tentatively, to have restrictions placed on its future use of the spending power for shared-cost programs, in effect requiring the assent of the provinces in a majority of the regions before a program could begin. In the event, and for a variety of reasons, the proposal did not make it to the final discussions at Victoria.

Something similar was again placed on the table by the federal government, along with many other proposals, during renewed constitutional negotiations in 1978-79. No overall agreement was reached, however, and when the federal government made its final moves to patriate the Constitution in 1980-81, no proposal of this kind was included. This does not mean that the subject is dead: it will surface again, automatically, in any renewed constitutional discussions with Quebec, particularly the question as to whether a province that does not take part (that "opts out" as the saying goes) should receive compensation for its share of the federal tax "pie" otherwise foregone, and, not only Quebec is interested. All the points made against shared-cost programs during the critical 1960's could be made equally well tomorrow, and undoubtedly will be if the federal government should attempt to move into any new provincial field of endeavour in any significant way.

It is useful to remember the Medicare case in that regard: the Ontario government was strongly opposed in principle, believing that private insurance was preferable. Yet that government could not remain outside the plan (which a majority of Ontarians wanted, so the polls said) and face the prospect politically of Ontario residents paying taxes to the federal government to help finance a program which they could not enjoy because their provincial government had refused to take part. Behind all the controversies are such basic issues as who takes responsibility for the taxes collected, whether those taxes are to be used for appropriate purposes under the Constitution, and whether those who pay are to receive something appropriate in return.

Governments remain extremely sensitive on these matters. For example, in the figures given earlier on federal contributions to the provinces, it was mentioned that the federal government, in 1985-86, will be contributing some \$20 billion in cash transfers and some \$7 billion in tax transfers. In all its statements of such contributions, and in all its descriptions of its role,

the federal government is careful to include the tax transfers, to try to ensure that Canadians will appreciate fully the magnitude of federal generosity. Of special significance in that regard is Established Program Financing which came on the scene in 1977.

EPF, as it is called, was brought in by the federal government in response to provincial pressures for greater flexibility, and partly to suit the federal government's own purposes. It amounted to a massive reassembly of its hospital and medical insurance and its post-secondary education programs.

Before EPF, the federal government had been paying, very roughly speaking, half the provincial costs of operating each of these programs. Hospital insurance involved detailed conditions, medical insurance involved only key principles to be observed, and post-secondary education required only that the money be spent in that field. With EPF, the three programs were rolled into a single package with only key principles to apply to the first two, and a vague consultative mechanism to the third. Federal contributions were no longer to be tied to provincial expenditures, but were to be escalated each year, from the pre-1977 level, roughly in line with the economic growth of the country. Moreover, federal contributions thenceforward were to come about one half from cash, and one half from the value of "tax room" made available.

Today, even eight years later, it is not unreasonable for the Canadian government - or for Parliament - to say yes, we are still giving, or making available, all this money to the provinces, and to bask in whatever credit can be obtained. In reality, however, the federal government - and Parliament - gained the advantage in 1977 of reducing taxes substantially, and since that time it is the provincial governments who have had to raise those taxes and take the blame for them. Federal "leverage" is certainly reduced to the level of its cash contributions, because there is no practical way in which the tax room can be retrieved. In any event, it is 'Alice in Wonderland' for the taxpayers as both orders of government can quote, with more or less equal justice, vastly different figures on their respective contributions to these vital programs.

The shared-cost program front has, in practice, been relatively quiet these past few years. EPF removed some major causes for provincial complaint (though more recent federal moves to eliminate extra billing and, at the same time, to cut back federal contributions on the health front did stir the pot again). Mostly, the federal government has been too strapped for funds to mount extensive new programs, and anything offered has tended to be both relatively minor and non-controversial. Nevertheless, any new move on the shared-cost front has to be weighed against the history just described.

#### Success and Failure in Shared-Cost Programming

It is perhaps useful to think about these words "success and failure", and their potential meanings when applied to shared-cost programs. For avid provincial rights supporters, any shared-cost program is probably a failure because it is bound to run counter to their concept of how a federation should function. For the Government of Ontario, when it was being pulled inexorably into medicare, any program that was about to take the medical insurance business out of private hands was probably viewed as a failure. For the

federal government, the post-secondary arrangements under Established Program Financing soon came to be viewed as a failure because the provinces had not given Ottawa the hoped-for voice in policy, and because the provinces had been able to cut far back on the share they were putting in. The old Roads to Resources Program of the Diefenbaker years - probably for the first and only time in history - offered the same amount to each province. For Prince Edward Island, the program was a roaring success; for other provinces, less so.

While there may not be battles over policy fundamentals, the battles over financial resources associated with shared-cost programs are frequent, and perhaps will be an inevitable fact of Canadian life as long as financial resources can become more limited from time to time, and as long as government experts are not able to predict with much accuracy the financial effects of agreements entered into. The ink was hardly dry on the post-secondary education arrangements of 1967 for example, when it became apparent to the federal government that costs - quite apart from inflation - were going to rise at rates far higher than federal advisers, and federal ministers themselves, had been able to foresee. The cries from the provinces of "breach of faith" were pretty heart-rending as the federal government set about unilaterally placing some sort of cap on the level of its commitments.

Similar episodes have happened often enough - the famous Revenue Guarantee battle of the 1970's and the more recent federal attempts to place limits on EPF are other examples. These conflicts over the financial aspects of programs already underway have probably done more to inhibit federal-provincial cooperation than anything else, and have certainly placed a damper on new or more extensive shared-cost programming. Nevertheless, given today's circumstances in which low revenues and high deficits are faced by all governments, no shared-program is likely to be immune from potential cuts. And, if programs have to suffer, it may be on the basis of some across-the-board formula, or it may be on the basis of the program's lack of popularity with governments, or on the basis of its lack of strong support from the public.

If a program is strongly supported by most federal ministers - by the cabinet - it is likely to survive in the tough times. If a program has a strong public following, it is also likely to survive. If a program brings to the federal government adequate public credit for its contributions (often requiring provincial cooperation) it is likely to survive. If there is strong provincial government support for a program, it is likely to survive. Another situation is less obvious, and is worth a few words.

The Canada Assistance Plan - the country's principle backstop for the very poor - is a major program involving quite detailed requirements spelled out in federal legislation, yet it was conceived in harmony by federal and provincial ministers working together. Other aspects of social policy - the Old Age Assistance and Guaranteed Income Supplement, for example, and Family Allowances - were the subject of major public rows, particularly in the 1960's and early 1970's. Yet CAP, in the same period, was moving forward largely in sweetness and light, criticized by some of the poor as not giving enough and by some better-off Canadians as overgenerous, but supported firmly by governments.

One can speculate that what was really in operation was a group of dedicated federal-provincial ministers "against the rest". Each knew how tough it was to persuade his or her cabinet colleagues to give priority to the poor; by banding together as a federal-provincial team they had a chance to succeed for the benefit of their "clientèle", and they did. It could be argued, similarly, that the two small but not unimportant federal-provincial programs of legal aid and compensation to victims of violent crime were put together in 1972 and 1973 at the personal initiative of the then Ministers of Justice and Attorneys General. These programs, like CAP, were born in a period of intense federal-provincial conflict, yet the common interest of the ministers concerned overcame all the obstacles.

In a kind of back-handed fashion, the experience of the National Housing Program reinforces the possibility that federal and provincial ministers can, in a unique way, contribute as a group to the success or failure of an enterprise. The earlier policies under the National Housing Act stressed federal-provincial cooperation in the carrying out of a variety of programs for less well-off Canadians. For years these programs were a considerable success. Because of their cost, however, and because the federal government received little credit, there was an important shift in later years towards the federal government doing things on its own, and working directly with client groups. Federal-provincial cooperation became minimal. When, finally, the federal government decided to make drastic reductions in CMHC's whole housing effort, there were few provincial voices to protest. This, of course, is a gross oversimplification, but probably not far off the mark.

There are then many factors that can contribute to the success or failure of any federal-provincial program, or that can help to ensure the continuance of a good program even in the face of adverse circumstances. The section that follows attempts to restate these factors in the form of "lessons" that may have broad application.

#### Lessons to be Drawn from the Shared-Cost Programming Experience

There are lessons that may be drawn from each of the three preceding sections of this paper:

##### (a) from the Extent and Variety of Programs

The first lesson is that there is no automatic formula for sharing costs. While 50-50 is the most common, this reflects, more often than not, the lack of any rationale that would justify other figures. Each case seems to have been worked out on its merits, with the anxiety of the federal government - or of the provincial governments - to achieve particular objectives being reflected in the barter. In many cases, the low revenues of some provincial governments have been taken specially into account.

The second lesson is that the federal government has made a fairly clear distinction between national programs on the one hand and regional or provincial or local programs on the other. Even when national programs allow for some local flexibility, there is a strong

common thread, and all areas are likely to benefit at least to some degree. Programs designed to achieve some goal in one or two parts of the country (but a goal that is not applicable to the other parts) are openly advertised for what they are. It is much harder in such a case for the "left-out" areas to complain, than if they were to receive an apparently unfair share from a national program. Whatever is done has to appear to be fair.

##### (b) from Fundamental Controversies over Programs

The third lesson is that the whole concept of federal-provincial shared-cost programs under the Constitution has been and is likely to go on being controversial, whether or not a particular program is controversial. One individual program will have a better chance of survival if it respects to the greatest degree possible the constitutional sensitivities of all governments concerned.

The fourth lesson is that governments are extremely sensitive to the effects that shared-cost programs may have not only on their spending plans, but on their access to "tax room" and on their capacity to introduce new taxes of their own for any purpose. Not all shared-cost programs have an obvious link to the taxing side, but when they do, they will have a better chance of survival if all governments feel comfortable with the arrangements worked out, and do not have to face strong criticism from opposition parties, the press or the public.

##### (c) from Success and Failure in Programming

The fifth lesson is that shared-cost programs are always tempting targets for federal cutbacks: the blame tends to stick to the government delivering the program. Generally, programs which are controversial between major segments of the public, or controversial between regions, or controversial within provincial governments even though they take part, or within the federal government itself, can be attacked most easily.

The sixth lesson is the corollary of the fifth: the program that is built upon solid intergovernmental cooperation, that is designed for continuing appeal to a major segment of the Canadian public without being too controversial with others, and that is designed to serve all parts of the country if it is a national program, will clearly have a better chance of surviving than one ignoring these factors.

The seventh lesson is that governments have a right to receive credit for the things they do; after all, they do bear the pain of imposing taxes and the criticism when programs go sour. A program that does not permit such credit fairly and reasonably will always be vulnerable.

The eighth lesson is that a group of determined federal, provincial and territorial ministers working together towards a common goal can achieve success against considerable odds.



The ninth lesson is that nothing is permanent. Nevertheless, it is worthwhile to try to give a good program the greatest degree of permanency that can be achieved. Towards that end, formal intergovernmental agreements can help. Such agreements supplemented by federal legislation is better, and supplemented by legislation passed by both Parliament and the legislatures is better still.

What remains to be seen is the extent to which these lessons may be applicable to the major new initiatives that are now being contemplated in the field of wildlife.

#### Applying the Lessons to the Wildlife Field

If the first lesson above is right, then no sharing formula beyond a vague 50-50 can be worked out before knowing what kind of program is to be mounted. Admittedly, the federal offer of a more generous, or a less generous, formula could well influence governments in their decision on whether to take part in any program, so a kind of chicken and egg situation could be said to exist. However, a quick reading of the other lessons above will soon indicate that the sharing formula is but one of many aspects that have to be considered in the design and establishment of any successful federal-provincial program. The essential, then, is surely for governments to know what they want to achieve, and the modalities - including trade-offs on cost-sharing - follow along.

Yet even a decision on what is wanted runs into another chicken and egg situation - what each government wants has to be tailored in practical fashion to the concerns of the other governments and the public. And, it should be argued here, tailored to the long Canadian experience, both good and bad, in the domain of shared-cost programs. Perhaps the best place to start is with the great hope of those participating in the Colloquium that a new day can be made to dawn for wildlife in Canada, that some new and major initiative using new and major sources of special funds can be brought to reality.

In that regard, a first observation can readily be made: it would be hard to persuade governments and the public to support the concept of major new sources for funds if the monies were to be used simply for the continuing operations and research that are already being carried on by government wildlife organizations using normal appropriations from Parliament and the legislatures. Even if governments could be persuaded to develop new, untapped sources of funding to cover work of a kind that is considered "normal", the temptation would be overwhelming over time to cut back on normal appropriations, and to leave the governmental wildlife services more and more dependent on the special sources; and perhaps little better off than they were before such sources became available.

Clearly, something major, something imaginative and appealing, something requiring special, sustained effort over a considerable period is essential if the idea of special funding sources is to be accepted and if those sources are to remain dedicated to the initiatives for which they are to be established.

A second observation, growing from the thought just expressed, may also have a bearing on the kind of new initiative that may be chosen. The Colloquium will

be looking at the question of funding sources in another full paper devoted to that purpose. At the risk of some duplication, however, it is perhaps worth noting here that the kind of special source or sources of funds that may be adopted could have a considerable impact on both the short- and long-term acceptability of the federal-provincial initiative that the funds are used to finance.

If, after observing all the niceties called for by the fourth lesson above and at long last reaching agreement with all governments concerned, a tax is applied, let us say, to all who buy any equipment for use in the great outdoors and the program to be mounted brings advantages, let us say, to prairie residents only, then the tax would tend to be unpopular in the rest of the country and pressure would grow to drop the tax or widen the program. By the same token, the same kind of "fairness" problem could arise if the new tax, in some way or other, was made to hit say waterfowl hunters only, while the funds were used to bring advantages to all sorts of other groups who also enjoyed wildlife.

These kinds of problems are, of course, to be expected if "dedicated" tax sources are used. By and large, governments have avoided such taxes, most probably on grounds that their widespread use would take away governmental flexibility to redistribute funds between programs to meet changing priorities. There is another point, however. The federal government, because the revelation could be divisive across Canada, has steadfastly avoided publishing regional and provincial breakdowns of revenue sources, using the argument that the calculations can never be done accurately. Such an argument would hardly hold water, however, on a single dedicated tax source. The figures on such a tax would undoubtedly become public and direct comparisons would then be made with the geographical breakdown on the expenditure side.

If dedicated tax sources are to be used, there is a serious argument that, from the outset, the program chosen for support should be one in which the expenditures patterns across Canada will not differ too sharply from revenue patterns. The pertinence of the second lesson above (on the question of national programs) needs no further emphasis.

This leads us to the third lesson and what it means in the wildlife field, i.e. the question of the Constitution. Apart from jurisdiction over the fisheries (including authority to legislate concerning fish habitat) the Parliament of Canada has no specific legislative jurisdiction to deal with wildlife, except for the important question of migratory birds. In that case, Parliament inherited its constitutional authority because the British Government signed the 1916 Migratory Birds Convention with the U.S.A. on Canada's behalf. This is an unusual kind of authority in that under today's Constitution, Canada's entry into an international treaty touching a field of provincial jurisdiction would not bring with it any legislative authority in that field, and the treaty could be implemented only with provincial cooperation.

In addition to its specific authority over fish and birds, however, the federal government has at its disposal another broad constitutional power which enables it to carry on research as it sees fit, and to spend money for anything it wishes - including expenditures designed to persuade provinces to

do things within their own jurisdiction. This is the controversial "spending power" discussed earlier. Its use for research has not caused too many conflicts although the argument has been made from time to time, particularly by Quebec, that federal research should be limited to subjects of federal jurisdiction (an argument that has always been strongly rejected by Ottawa). The wider use of the power as a "persuader" has been the cause, as already noted, of frequent and heated debates over the years.

In the circumstances, a new wildlife initiative tied, for example, to migratory birds, would come within Parliament's jurisdiction, and would not be as subject to criticism as an initiative based on the spending power alone. On the other hand, if the provincial ministers concerned are in solid agreement concerning an initiative that did require use of the spending power, they could probably overcome any objections that might be raised by their respective cabinet colleagues. As long as the federal government is not trying to dictate conditions to the provinces, constitutional questions are unlikely to be a problem in the wildlife field. To put it another way, if the eight lesson (about ministers working as a group) is well applied, then the requirements of the third lesson (on the constitutional aspect) will be much easier to meet.

The fifth lesson and the sixth lesson are really two sides of the same coin: the greater the degree of enthusiasm and agreement that is achieved among governments on all aspects of whatever new initiative may be chosen, and the greater the enthusiasm and agreement among concerned Canadians across the country, the more chance the initiative will have, over the long haul, to fulfil the hopes of its sponsors. The initiative has to be thought of not only in terms of its initial appeal, but also in terms of its capacity to sustain interest and support. After all, spending programs are subject to annual scrutiny in Parliament and the legislatures. And, while taxes generally are not reviewed unless they are to be altered, it is hard to imagine that Parliament would countenance the indefinite continuance of a dedicated tax without some periodic review of what was being achieved with the proceeds and whether the tax was still needed. Hence it has to be borne in mind that even dedicated taxes can be cut at budget-time, unless the opposition to such cuts is ever present and ever strong.

The seventh lesson (credit to governments) has a bearing, not necessarily on the choice of the initiative, but very much on the manner in which the initiative is carried out. If the initiative should be of such a nature that its execution would be entirely in provincial hands, with the federal government cast only in the role of a behind-the-scenes banker and no more, it is hard to imagine the government, or Parliament itself, remaining happy for long, even if such a role were accepted at the beginning.

Governments expect to receive reasonable credit for what they do, and the expectation is legitimate. "Credit" may be thought of as no more than being present at opening ceremonies for new facilities, but it has deeper aspects. One is the expectation that in shared programs both orders of government will give reasonable prominence, in all their public pronouncements, to the role of the other in the joint enterprise (in general, the practice has been far behind the expectations). The other is the expectation that the giver of funds will have at least some voice in the continuing and cooperative setting of policy and in assessing progress.

It will be noted that these two aspects can be covered quite adequately without the work itself having to be retained in federal hands. Some of the funds, for example, could be left entirely for use at provincial discretion within the broad objectives or conditions of the program, but some could also be held for allocation towards meeting particular national concerns, with decisions made, perhaps, by some permanent federal-provincial council, possibly along the lines provided for in the "Atlantic Accord" on offshore oil and gas resources.

Finally, the ninth lesson stresses the need to lend the maximum air of permanence to whatever new initiative is undertaken. The comments made earlier about that lesson indicated several practical steps that might be taken to "enshrine" the new initiative in the federal-provincial system.

#### Concluding Comment

How practical the nine lessons may be in the wildlife field can only be determined by applying them to definite proposals. For someone from outside the field to attempt to use the lessons in a theoretical way to rule out one kind of initiative or to support another would be to attempt the impossible. No new initiative is ever likely to reflect all the lessons perfectly. In real life, compromises have to be made by those who have to accept responsibility for the result. Because however, one kind of initiative - the enhancement of habitat for migratory waterfowl and especially for ducks and geese - has been openly discussed as the possible initiative, it may not be out of order to make a comment.

A major new initiative to support the enhancement of waterfowl habitat has obvious merits. It is a much needed endeavour. It could well be supported by a number of governments and be highly popular with many groups of interested Canadians. It would appear capable of responding to most of the "nine lessons". Problems might be encountered, however, with the second lesson (national programs serving nationwide) and with the fourth lesson (sensitivities on the tax side). If the pattern of revenues collected by province and region was far out of line with the pattern of expenditures, controversies would almost certainly erupt over time, even if it were possible to get the program going in the first place.

If this kind of difficulty is foreseen by the Colloquium, it is possible that an answer might be found in choosing a two-pronged initiative, one aimed at waterfowl habitat and the other aimed at some other important aspect of wildlife management, the expenditure pattern of which would help to bring about a better overall balance between the revenues and expenditures in the different parts of Canada. If there is nothing suitable within the responsibilities of the Canadian Wildlife Service for the "second prong", it is perhaps not impossible to think of a joint endeavour involving other parts of Environment Canada, or involving the federal department of Fisheries and Oceans, bearing in mind that fish and game are commonly housed in the same department by the governments of the provinces, and that they administer sports fishing under delegated authority from the Government of Canada.

HIGHLIGHTS OF THE OPEN DISCUSSION  
David A. Munro, Moderator

**David A. Munro:** There have been proposals for raising additional funds, through an excise tax, or taxes, through user fees, through systems which would ensure that somehow or other the community got an economic rent from wildlife. I'm using that term, rather than saying privatization. We have also talked about arrangements for doing things better, cooperative research, collaborative management, incentives for habitat management. Finally, we have been made aware of some of the difficulties that will face us, fiscal or financial, which have been outlined particularly by David Perry, and political difficulties alluded to by several people but perhaps most cogently by Frank Carter. Several people have suggested that the way ahead is in experimentation, pilot projects in which we try out some of these new ideas. I want to encourage discussion and comment, questions and answers, additional dialogue with the speakers that helps to develop how we feel about these particular points.

**Peter Pearse:** It might be helpful if there were someone here who represents a hunters, fishermen or environmental group, who could help to explain if there were broadly based support for some experimental projects, involving the private sector to contractual arrangements to take some responsibilities for wildlife management and use - what is the specific nature of the opposition that we could expect? The government of British Columbia conducted a poll on this matter and there seems to be a broadly based public receptiveness to delegating some responsibilities to the private sector. The opposition, if I recall correctly, came specifically from hunting groups. Could somebody help us to zero in on where that opposition is, how deeply ingrained it is and ways in which it might be allayed or reversed?

**Gregg Sheehy, Canadian Nature Federation:** Some of the opposition would come from people who are not represented here at all, and that is the animal rights movement. I can see considerable opposition to commercial marketing of wild meats not marketed in Canada before. I know that there is opposition to the concept of a slaughter house in northern Quebec for the George River caribou herd. I know there would be opposition to the predator control programs which you can assume would be involved in game ranching. Those are the two main sources of opposition that I see.

**Honourable Vincent Kerrio:** We in Ontario attempted to do some contracting in our parks, where very possibly some contracting would be to the advantage of managing our parks. We ran into a great deal of opposition from the union, and we had to stop for the time being doing any more contracting. Now they had said that we were considering privatizing our parks, which in fact was not true; we wanted to expand the facility for the least amount of money. It brings into view people who have to be sold that we can better serve the public by drawing from the private sector some of the expertise that exists there to stretch our dollars. How could we properly address ourselves to that question?

**Peter Pearse:** It isn't a question of displacing public servants currently engaged in particular activities, it is rather a case of doing something new and in addition. So you would not, I hope, run the risk of stirring up the usual problems associated with displacing responsible public agencies.

Governments of provinces have, in a number of cases, done things suggested here, which have not caused great public outcry. For example, the government of British Columbia has for some years been licensing the commercial harvesting and sale of bison, and I understand that in Newfoundland there is now an arrangement under which Inuit, I believe, in the north, are commercially harvesting caribou and selling it in local markets. Newfoundland has allowed the regulated sale of venison in restaurants, and as far as I know, these particular incidents have never given rise to major outcries. The resistance in British Columbia and Alberta occurred where people feared that suddenly they weren't going to have the right to go hunting anymore or they were going to have to pay a thousand dollars to go hunting. I'm wondering whether it isn't a question of simply making sure that people understand the dimensions of the proposal and moving ahead with it on a clear understanding.

**Monte Hummel, World Wildlife Fund:** Usually at meetings of this kind somebody speaks up on behalf of the beleaguered taxpayer, so I thought I would do that. One reaction is, I already pay taxes. If you want more money, reshuffle your priorities, don't ask me for more. Second reaction is, If you want more, give me a choice, at the very least. So then you approach the check-off idea, that is a little less burdensome, or, Let me give to a non-government organization. It is true that we can raise money from some sources that government can't because there is a sense that there are some things that non-government organizations might be able to do better or more independently than government. The third principle is, the taxpayer is entitled to say, I'll give if somebody else does. I think we have reached the time when almost nobody should pay everything for anything anymore. We are really into matching funds, leverage, we'll give this provided you give that, and that applies to the public as well. Certainly the private sector, when they support our organization, ask, what is government doing in this area? Are they playing their role? And my last point would be that the pattern of giving to the government is quite different from that in the private sector. The bureaucratic approach looks for the same amount of money from everybody, whereas if you really appeal to people to give on a voluntary basis, you get 90% of your funds from 10% of your donors. This pattern has reinforced itself again and again in public campaigns for funds and should be kept in mind when appealing to the public for money.



**Bob Stewart, Federation of Ontario Naturalists:** Our organization lives almost entirely on members' donations for our various programs and when I heard of Mr. Turner's proposal before coming here, I thought, my goodness, how are we going to persuade taxpayers to kick in more money, even if it's for the activity they cherish the most? Yet the history of our organization is that our members do come through for very specific things, and I think Monte is absolutely right: when you are fund raising, if you are fund raising for something specific, you succeed.

Mr. Turner remarked quite clearly about his concerns regarding the cuts to the Canadian Wildlife Service and I think before we naturalists would be particularly supportive of increased taxes, we would want to see the federal government restore the disproportionate cuts made to CWS. A basic funding should be available to these programs. The new proposal may be perceived as mechanisms of governments sloughing off a cost that perhaps a better or wealthier component of society might well be able to finance on its own. Things must not only be fair but must be seen to be fair. If we are going to contribute more we should have clear policies from our provincial government. In Ontario, where wetlands are suddenly taxed as a municipal land rather than as agriculture, it's not possible for a landowner or farmer to protect those wetlands for wildlife with the kind of economic pressures that are against him. We have to have a policy to protect wetlands and we have to find a way of untaxing nature.

**W.J. Klassen, Deputy Minister, Renewable Resources, Yukon:** The Yukon doesn't have any agricultural base, at least nothing to compare it with the southern provinces, and so interested individuals are starting to look at the possibility of ranching or farming wildlife. I recognize that one raises that subject at some risk. One of the areas that has to be addressed with that in mind though is, how large is the potential market for the products from wildlife ranching? Is the market for red meat finite? And are we going to run into the difficulty that the Loring Brothers faced in Alaska, early in this century when they were able to land dressed reindeer carcasses in Seattle at substantially lower cost than long horn cattle from Texas and as a consequence ran into a lobby from the ranchers that resulted in legislation being passed which made it impossible for them to continue to operate? The suggestion has often been made that the meat from wildlife that most people assume is being wasted by non-resident hunters could be made available for consumption at least at the local level, where the present government is concerned about reducing the amount of cash that flows out of the territory.

On the subject of commercial harvesting of wildlife populations, consideration has to be given to the value of that individual animal, hunted for sport or recreation, subsistence or consumption by someone like myself who can quite well afford to buy the meat but really enjoys

the flavour of moose. I don't kill a moose every year, and so I spend a lot of money looking for that animal. As a consequence, each moose harvested is worth more than if the individual hunters bought beef. Wildlife ranching is of considerable interest up there now. There is at least one privately-owned elk herd, but it is being viewed at the moment more as farming rather than ranching on extensive acres.

**Gregg Sheehy, Canadian Nature Federation:** So far we have heard some really good ideas for overcoming some of the problems in research and conservation, but we haven't at all addressed the interpretation programs in Canada. As a member of the board of directors of Wildlife Habitat Canada, know that that organization is receiving many requests for funding to help support interpretation facilities. It would be really worthwhile for this group to make a recommendation for the development of a national wildlife interpretation plan, something that Habitat Canada can use to make its decisions on funding these proposals, and the provinces can make decisions as to whether or not to support such facilities or develop them. Environment Canada, through the Wildlife Service and through Parks Canada, has a legitimate role in helping to develop this kind of plan. Right now I think we have nothing to fill the gap for the five areas which were lost to the federal government. I recommend that we develop this interpretation plan or strategy.

**Art A. Smith, Prince Edward Island Fish and Wildlife:** As a wildlife director from the east, I share dual portfolios of sport fishing management as well as wildlife. Sport fishery and wildlife are not receiving the recognition within their own department for the habitat initiatives they would like to take, there may be an opportunity to marry here. Not only do we thus gain additional support for ecosystems, but you also have a greatly enhanced constituency to work with. There are examples right across the country, whether it is the fly fisher federation or the wildlife federation sponsoring stream enhancement programs. Too me they tie together. There may be an opportunity to look at that approach, to marry those two agencies right across the country.

**Stew Morrison, Ducks Unlimited:** I would like to comment on the excise tax proposal. In principle, we at Ducks Unlimited could certainly support it. There is also the principle of no taxation without representation. So being one of the groups interested in waterfowl, we would hope, when the ministers and their staffs put together the game plan as to what the extra funds would be used for, that waterfowl and the North American Waterfowl Plan were part of it.

**Hugh Monaghan, Director, Fish and Wildlife Branch, Department of Renewable Resources, Yukon:** I would like to comment on a few aspects of the Pearce paper with which I do strongly agree. Intensive management, which we are headed into in some areas, is clearly a function of demand. We have a resource out there, and unless people feel a strong vested interest in it, we may well lose that resource. This is particularly important in the

North, because in the North we have a strong reliance on renewable resources. We are not generally looking towards the importation of southern-based agriculture. We will probably, to a significant degree, as our deputy indicated, rely on the intensive management and in some cases farming of wildlife species. The intensity of management and the net benefit received from the resource is based on a demand which is variable, and our management regimes in the hinterland will be quite extensive. But there will be localized opportunities for intensive management which in southern Canada you would call farming. We should, with careful planning, lean towards that and optimize the benefits from it.

But I fear the suggestion made in your paper Dr. Pearse that we ought to seek an escalated level of demand in use to maximize return from the resource, because the marginal cost curb will often be there, and it will be driven up and make our cost of management inordinately high. I suggest enhancement where we see a clear opportunity, and move with caution, but not necessarily enhancement for the use of the resource, which in my opinion in some cases can be dangerous.

I also agree that in resource management programs government is often punitive, when in fact more positive incentives can be provided. We are looking at a contractual approach to regulating the outfitting industry. We are not yet convinced that it is necessarily the best route to go but we can enter into contracts with outfitters to give them terms and very specific criteria under which they will operate. We set out the biological regime in a manner that will meet our resource management requirements, but also permit them, as entrepreneurs, to plan well in advance and to run their operation in a manner which will give them a long term proper use of the area.

Contractual approaches can be used in other sectors. Tree farmers are now using them in B.C. In the wildlife area we can also look into this in intensive use areas. We have often found a policy that works in one area of Canada, tried to export it to others and dogmatically hung to consistency across the country. That has created some pretty serious problems for us both east to west and more particularly north to south. I do note with something more than mild interest in Mr. Carter's comments on Mr. Turner's paper, that he envisions the tax regime as going forward without provincial/territorial sharing and the provinces and territories having somewhat of a mild advisory role. We will return that comment to our minister, but I would expect that would be raised in other forums. The notion of economic rent is good, and that is where wildlifers could well focus in the future.

**Ken Brynaert, Canadian Wildlife Federation:** Art Smith suggested that there were opportunities for fisheries to take similar initiatives. This brings to mind the role of non-government organizations, who are not structured like governments, where cutting across agency lines is nigh to impossible. It is an opportunity for involvement of the public sector to do exactly that.

The Canadian Wildlife Federation has been talking to forestry, fisheries and agriculture, with the idea that this could be the first step towards a coordinated effort and integrated management plan for wildlife. If it can't be done from within government, maybe you can work from the outside in.

Regarding the commercial sale of game animals, to arrive at settlement with native people, their aspirations and land claims, accommodations will have to be made to allow for the commercial exploitation of our wildlife resources. In the Northwest Territories, Labrador and other parts of Canada there has been movement in that direction.

**Robert Jantzen, Former Director, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service:** I just have a comment on the Turner proposal and some of the comments made regarding that. If the proposal is patterned to a large degree after the system used in the United States; the states are the beneficiary of that program. By law they get 92% of all the funds taken in from an excise tax that targets certain segments but not all of the tax-paying public, and it is a matching program, whereby the states cannot qualify for the allocation to them unless they put up a dollar for every three that they get from the federal government. So there is a partnership arrangement built into the United States' system, it is aimed directly at regional and local management capabilities, and they do benefit from it.

**David A. Munro:** Barry Turner, people have interpreted your speech as implying that this would be a unilateral action by the federal government, but that beyond that they did not hear any indication of a mechanism for collaboration with the provinces or for any sort of cost or revenue sharing of the proceeds of your proposals. I wonder if you would like to comment on that.

**Barry Turner:** Well, that's not true. I tried to weave through my comments the importance of bringing together all jurisdictions involved here in sharing the revenues in cooperation with the non-governmental organizations, the ten provinces and two territories. I'm not sure how that was misinterpreted. I love the idea of a dollar for dollar match; I didn't realize that the United States manages the excise tax that it generates that way.

**Herman Schwenk, Alberta Fish and Wildlife Advisory Council:** I have one concern and that is with the so-called environmental groups or animal rights groups active within our society. Unless we very clearly address the negative aspects those groups create, we could be spinning our wheels considerably on this whole matter. They appear to have the philosophy that species protection is conservation, when in fact it is not. If you are going to manage wildlife in any way, then you have to manage the whole thing. There is no point in increasing habitat and management systems for increasing the number of ungulates, for example, if you don't do something about managing the predators.

**Nestor Romaniuk, Alberta Fish and Game Association:** I owe Dr. Pearse an answer. In Alberta the hunters are against game ranching. We had first agreed with the natives being given an opportunity for game ranching, and then private enterprise said, we all want a chunk of it, and that was fair. However, our questions were, where do they obtain their original stock, who gets it first and how much do they get, how much of it do they take out from the wild? We're here talking about the economy of wildlife and how much wildlife is worth, and as mentioned before, for one moose, I buy a licence, I have a special vehicle, I've got a gun, I need bullets, clothing and fuel. If I have game ranching, I don't need any of this. Government wouldn't get any of this. We are now subsidizing game farmers because they can't do anything with their meat. We are now working on a situation in Manitoba where 30 elk were imported with Blue Tongue. The elk were sent back; they wouldn't take them back on the other side of the border so they had to destroy them and the people were subsidized. Somebody mentioned today how much the guide and outfitters mean to the economy of our province and our country. If an American came and went to a game ranch and saw a big elk there or a big moose, we wouldn't need guide and outfitters anymore. Those are some of the reasons we are against game ranching.

**Jim Walker, Director, B.C. Fish and Wildlife:** One of the things that tight budgets and this concentration on money do is by default define what kind of wildlife resource we are going to have in Canada. I know that they have had the Pittman-Robertson Act in the States since I think someone said 1947 or 1937, they've also lost all of their grizzly bears, they have about 600 to 800 of them left in the continental United States. They have very few cougars left. When we talk about throwing money at the wildlife resource, it is important that we keep reminding the politicians and the decision makers that we also have to be concerned about land use decisions, because the money by itself doesn't do anything. All the money will do will allow us to crank out animals that technology allows us to duplicate somewhat artificially. We have to continually remind ourselves that we are supposed to be maintaining the diversity, and all the money in the world won't allow us to enhance things we don't know how to enhance. Some of the species, such as grizzly bears, only respond to areas where they are undisturbed. Everytime we state that wildlife needs more money, I agree with that but one should make certain that we talk about better land use decisions as well.

**Diane Griffin, Island Nature Trust:** In eastern Canada, so much of the land is privately owned; landowner cooperation is going to be required in preservation of wildlife habitat. Now as we all know many people don't really trust governments, whether federal or provincial, and hence other groups, such as Wildlife Habitat Canada and the Nature Conservancy of Canada have a major role to play. Certainly Nature Conservancy's problem is funding, and this is where Barry Turner's proposal can play a major role in providing the infrastructure for the organizations to cooperate and

hence generate more funds from other sources. I see a major spin-off effect from that proposal. Dr. Stewart brought up a good point, and that is on taxing nature. When we establish nature sanctuaries, one of the killers for us is that we have to pay taxes on it. Another thing that really hurts nature is when farmlands are taxed because they have wildlife habitat on them. Now this may not be a direct tax, it may be an incentive against maintaining wildlife habitat, as we have seen with the regulations relating to production of wheat and how much land you can have in wheat, and how much your quota is in relation to the amount of that land.

**Honourable Colin Maxwell, Minister of Parks and Renewable Resources:** In Regina, waiting to reach the legislature, is a new parks act, which is going to give me authority to declare reserve areas which we may not declare as parks right now. We will have five years to decide. For instance, the Athabaska Sand Dunes and the Great Sand Hill should be a protected area. The Clearwater River will be a protected area next week. Rural Development, Tourism, Small Business, Economic Development and Trade will have to go to my department if they want to do something on the 96 million acres of resource land I control over and above the parks, over and above the 20 million acres of natural forestry.

We also passed a critical wildlife habitat protection act. I believe it is the only one of its kind in the country. Currently 1.2 million acres are in the act and another 1.3 million acres are scheduled to be added. Eventually we are going to run over 3 million acres in that act, which means 3 million acres of habitat critical to wildlife will not be altered; it is Crown land and will not be sold or cleared, except by special dispensation through an Order-in-Council. We also have put the North American Waterfowl Management Plan on the Cabinet table and it has received approval. Saskatchewan is committed and Saskatchewan has also committed funding to it.

So who speaks for wildlife in any province? You can talk all you like about habitat; unless you reach your minister and your minister reaches your cabinet, you might just as well whistle in the wind. The minister of wildlife in each province has to take the leadership.

**Ed Begin, Saskatchewan Wildlife Federation:** This should be 1956, not 1986. The programs you are discussing right now should have been in place 30 years ago, 30 years ago, and to a great extent are in place in Saskatchewan today. Habitat programs are functioning cooperatively in Saskatchewan, because we are allies. The minister, the wildlife federation, the director of wildlife, all the people with resources to make this work are around the table making the decisions.



I suggest to the provinces around the table today that, if you don't now have a liaison officer in your organization who can function with the non-government organizations, to bring them to your side and give you the kind of support you need on a provincial basis to make your programs work, then that is the first thing you should do when you return.

**Sheila Woods, Canadian Arctic Resources Committee:** There is a missing element in the alliance the Saskatchewan Wildlife Federation representative was talking about, and that is the native people, who are the original users. I don't think enough efforts have been made on any side to involve the native people.

**Ralph Urban, Macmillan Bloedel and the Council of Forest Industries of British Columbia:** The forest industry of B.C. is very interested in this Colloquium. If the status quo remains, we will still have the same problems we are facing today; if there are changes, be they moderate or extreme, again we are affected. Presently in B.C. the forest industry in general does much related to wildlife and wildlife management. When companies develop plans, these are referred to various agencies for comment, and then guidelines are used to conserve or protect species and their habitat. Macmillan Bloedel and several other companies within the province have environmental groups on staff. These range in size from one or two up to seven or eight people, and involve fisheries, wildlife and soils professionals. Our company started its group about 13 years ago. The first half of that time was spent doing impact assessment and providing advice to loggers. In the latter half of these 13 years, they have become an intermediary between government agencies and loggers, and this is an important change. Instead of trying to justify logging, there are more interactions between our people and government agencies in relation to management of various wildlife species. Working plans are prepared every five years under the Tree Farm Licence Agreement and the plans provide principles and objectives for management over that five-year period.

In the mid-1950s, only one or two pages were related to resources other than timber. A full three quarters of our present management working plan is related to deer and habitat management. Wildlife management can lead to many frustrations. We wind up with time delays and confrontations and there is a public expectation that the company should manage without compensation. A forest company should not be expected to have expertise in all the various resource fields. The idea of voluntary assistance can only be considered a bridging mechanism until a long term solution is found.

We need new ideas, strategies and policies. Serious consideration should be given to ideas suggested by Peter Pearse and Jim Walker. Tom McMillan's statement that and, I quote "integrated resource management objectives are required" is a key, and I think an absolute minimum, as to what we require in the future for coordinated resource management. To become fully committed to unfettered management of resources other than

timber, the forest industry needs benefit incentives. Also, there is an intimate relationship between the forest land base and resource values other than timber. For this reason it would appear reasonable to fully involve the forest industry in discussions such as these in a more formal way. The economic climate is not good, and the industry is very sensitive to any suggestions that involve additional costs.

**Gary Glazier:** I've just joined the Nature Conservancy of Canada after spending several years in the oil industry, and I can assure you, talk about taxation and increasing tax loads to industry or consumers is likely to defeat what we are trying to achieve. The Environmental Studies Revolving Fund was brought into force about two years ago and resulted in a net decrease in industry and environmental work, because the attitude in companies now is, we're paying taxes for it, why should we do it. They see very little potential to receive credit for work they have done because it is done under the tax system. So I would caution you from increasing the tax load.

**Dal Hall, Canadian Forestry Association:** I hope we won't rediscover the wheel in talking about pilot plant programs or the Task Force: there are already examples of various things done by various groups across the country which have worked. For instance, the Agreement Forest is unique in Ontario. These areas are substantial, there is an Agreement Forest 30 miles from Ottawa. There is one even closer, an agreement between the National Capital Commission and the Ontario Ministry of Natural Resources. The lands are owned for the most part by the county and there is a people-identification with those lands. These Agreement Forests and the unique relationship between two levels of government, in this case county and provincial, have produced an excellent forest out of waste land. It has produced an excellent habitat for wildlife, which is enjoyed by the whole community, and this relationship is important.

Wildlife people have to talk to foresters, land managers and agriculturalists. May I strongly recommend that you include in that task force people besides the traditional groups represented around this table.

**Monte Hummel, World Wildlife Fund:** Within the Canadian Wildlife Service many field biologists are working to keep their research alive through cross appointments to universities, and they are hustling very hard. For every dollar that is put into their work by the Canadian Wildlife Service, they are raising three or four from other sources. There is an example of people who in times of restraint are stretching government-invested dollars to garner more from other sources. Another bouquet should go to my own organization, Noranda, and to Environment Canada for the Wildlife Toxicology Fund. In our first six or seven months of operation, we funded over 3 million dollars worth of projects, 22 projects worth over 3 million dollars. Of that, 1.3 million was Environment Canada money, and the remaining 1.7-1.8 million came from matching sources, including the private sector. The administrative costs

of the whole program have been underwritten by Noranda, at no cost to the taxpayer. There are arrangements that can be set up; there is money in the private sector.

**George Scotter, Canadian Wildlife Service, Edmonton:** I would like to emphasize a point Gregg Sheehy made about wildlife interpretation, by paraphrasing something from a South African journal: In the end we will only conserve those things we love. We will only love those things we understand. And we will only understand those things that we have been taught. I think if we had had good teaching, good understanding and lots of loving of wildlife resources, we probably wouldn't be here today.

**Bernard Harvey, Assistant Deputy Minister, Quebec Department of Recreation, Hunting and Fishing:** In Quebec over the last few years we've carried out experiments in particular areas of wildlife management. I'm thinking specifically of the controlled harvest zones and the user associations that my department - which is responsible for wildlife management - considers as partners in wildlife management or even co-managers of the wildlife on these lands. This experiment has gone on for more than seven or nine years now and is a success. It took the place of the private clubs, privileged groups who had sole access to some lands. Accessibility is a very important consideration for the Government of Quebec, and contrary to the fears of some people, accessibility did not result in a depletion of the wildlife resource, but instead a sharing of the responsibility for managing the resource.

Now, selling caribou meat is an experiment we would like to undertake in close cooperation with the Inuit. It is another management experiment, because the George River caribou herd, which moves between Quebec, Newfoundland and Labrador, has recently grown in size and this has alarmed most experts. The harvest has to be increased if we're going to avoid catastrophe. However, hunters, especially sport hunters, are somewhat opposed to this project for marketing caribou meat with the Inuit. We therefore have to develop a broader approach to resource management, one that prevents users from having unfounded fears about other users.

As far as privatizing some experiments, the new government elected in December is firmly committed to more privatization. The Department of Recreation, Hunting and Fishing is looking at different ways of carrying out wildlife resource management experiments with partners from the private sector; non-profit organizations and profit organizations, but without turning over to them the management of the resource, which we feel belongs to the government.

I'd like to close by telling you about an interesting experiment in the area of salmon and fishing. A group of citizens restored the rivière Jacques-Cartier, near Quebec City, with the assistance of federal job creation programmes and provincial programmes for special assistance. They reintroduced the salmon into a river where salmon used to run, but had

disappeared. In the last two or three years, salmon have returned to the river as a result of the initiative of a group of citizens who reintroduced a species of wildlife that unfortunately had disappeared.

**Richard Goulden, Director of Wildlife in Manitoba:** Through the federal government we were able to import into Manitoba some wood bison and reestablish them in north central Manitoba. This was done in a truly cooperative spirit. The group included the Canadian Wildlife Federation, Canadian Wildlife Service, our government, several branches of it, including Agriculture in our department, the Department of Indian and Northern Affairs, the Waterhen Indian Band and some unique outside people such as Robert Bateman and his serene highness Prince Albert of Monaco. All cooperated in not only getting the animals there but raising money, developing an organization, incorporating it - Wood Bison Ranches Incorporated - run wholly by the Indian band.

There is a foundation which raises money for the ongoing management costs, so that these are lifted off the shoulders of government. Everything seems to be moving extremely progressively. I think the place where the rubber is really going to hit the road is when it comes time to allocate the resources which will be built up. That herd is growing grandly and at some point the obvious is going to happen. It will be hunted or it will be taken for meat and so forth. Canadian tradition has not yet appreciated some of the things that have been talked about around this table today, and I think we have some way to go to, as it were, to soften up the Canadian tradition to allow for some of these unique and exploitive uses.

**Rick Morgan, Ontario Federation of Anglers and Hunters:** During Mr. Kerrio's opening remarks, he talked briefly about Ontario's community fisheries and wildlife involvement programs. He told us how successful those two programs are and I must agree with him. But then, that should be no surprise, because they were programs recommended by the Ontario Federation of Anglers and Hunters for many years.

Perhaps there is a message there: perhaps CWIP and CFIP, as we affectionately call them in Ontario, are successful because the sportsmen had been demanding them and were obviously behind them and committed to doing the work. Or perhaps the key is that the public doesn't have to spend money, they had to spend effort, and that is something to think about. CWIP and CFIP aren't perfect. They are subject to abuse by local and district ministry fish and wildlife personnel and frustrated by the lack of management funds that they receive from the treasurer. Some very marginal projects are being carried out while more important needs fail to get addressed. But all in all they are enhancing our wildlife and resources and ensuring that more Ontarians really care about wildlife. One caution to any other province considering similar involvement programs, and that is to keep central control. Putting the money and the program approval in your field offices will only lead to abuse of the system.

In Dr. Pearse's very thought-provoking address may lie the most devastating comments of this entire Colloquium. Imagine, the goals of Canada's guidelines for wildlife policy only talk about maintaining and preserving. There is no mention of enhancement. I congratulate Dr. Pearse on his perceptiveness and urge the wildlife ministers and directors to improve the guidelines.

Peter Pearse and Ken Brynaert discussed further commercialization of wildlife, and Dr. Pearse later asked why anyone would object. Game farming and the ensuing sale of moose meat in the supermarkets might seem attractive, in that it puts a commercial value on wildlife, but is it practical? For every moose raised on a game farm two steers will not be needed from another farm. We would only be trading meat production, not increasing any economic productivity. Although I don't hunt for the meat, the meat is the bonus of the hunt, which I enjoy for several months afterwards, especially because I can't simply go out and buy the same meat in my supermarket. Would the unique importance of the hunt be reduced for me, if I could buy that meat in the supermarket? It might be.

As for turning wildlife benefits on Crown lands over to timber companies to encourage their wise management and stewardship, it may be the wrong approach and I recommend extreme caution. Government wildlife managers should determine what they want from an area and what the dollar value is of that wildlife. Tell the company exactly what it must do for wildlife as a part of its operational and cutting plans. Then get a financial deposit approaching the value of the anticipated wildlife. If the company sticks with its wildlife plan, it gets its entire deposit back. Failure to follow the plan reduces the deposit return accordingly.

Barry Turner's excise tax plans have potential, if they truly do reach all who enjoy wildlife, not just today's principal payers, the hunters. I wish him well and encourage him to find allowances for those who use a lot of ammunition simply for target shooting, and suggest that the funds go to the provinces on the three-to-one split basis mentioned yesterday. This seems like an opportunity to get non-hunting naturalists to contribute financially, as hunting naturalists already do. The funds raised through that system should be put into a separate fund with joint government and non-government representation, as I'm sure Ontario will be doing with their angling license proceeds in the near future.

I also like the Canadian Wildlife Federation's suggestion of an income tax check-off. That is a neat, painless and most importantly an optional scheme to raise money for wildlife programs.

Has any province considered offering a separate and optional viewer's or enjoyer's license? We hunters are all buying licenses. I know a lot of people who would willingly purchase that license on an annual basis to contribute to wildlife, and it is another way that you might consider raising funds.

This entire exercise of trying to find more money seems somewhat ridiculous to me when you continue to allow foolish land use decisions. We've spent two days talking about how to help wildlife and yet for example, we refuse to allow even selective wood harvesting in our national parks and many provincial parks. We allow our wildlife habitat to be destroyed through aging. You need to review land use decisions, or all the money in the world isn't going to help. Consider options on saving people money, such as the untaxing of wetlands and wildlife habitat.

Some of the time we have spent discussing how to raise more money might be better spent in talking to Cabinets and treasurers about how important wildlife is. Most ministers, most wildlife directors and certainly almost all NGOs, are doing a horrendously poor job of telling politicians about the importance of wildlife.

I have a feeling as a non-government person, that we are going to run around and ask people to contribute more money and more money and they are going to do it. Consequently when Cabinets and treasurers are sitting down to review their priorities in the years ahead, and they are forced to make some cuts, they will find that the citizens of Canada have reached into their pockets and produced money, and therefore so much government money isn't needed, so we'll move that money into roads and hospitals and other good things. I'm afraid that gnaws away at me.

**Nestor Romaniuk, Alberta Fish and Game Association:** The first priority of the task force may be to take an accounting and assess what happens in other provinces to raise money for wildlife. In Alberta we have what we call A Buck for Wildlife. Every hunter, every fisherman pays an extra dollar for his licence. The Alberta government puts that money in a special account earmarked solely for habitat and habitat enhancement. It is an interest-bearing account. We now have in excess of four million dollars in that account. The government goes one step further. Using cooperation and volunteers, they now send out the Alberta Fish and Game Association, 127 clubs, to submit the projects across the province to enhance habitat. With government expertise and our volunteers, we enhance the habitat of Alberta with very little cost to the taxpayer. In fact, there is no cost, because the money was put in there by the sportsmen. So that is our user-pay concept in Alberta, and there are other such projects across Canada.

One more example is the Ward Ranch, a large piece of property in Alberta, bought by the Alberta government, Habitat Canada, Ducks Unlimited and the Alberta Fish and Game Association. If the property were held in the name of the Alberta government, the royalties would just go into a general fund. Our minister of forestry saw the potential here and notified the Alberta Fish and Game Association. We, with the help of Habitat Canada, bought the property with joint ownership, and now all the royalties from that property, about \$80,000 a year, go into a special bank account earmarked strictly for habitat. The Alberta Fish and Game Association will not see one cent of that \$80,000 but the habitat will.

**Herman Schwenk, Alberta Fish and Wildlife Advisory Council:** I like Peter Pearse's idea of private sector involvement in wildlife management. Again, we need to think through very carefully what we are trying to market. We've talked about game ranching, and two or three speakers noted that we don't need to produce elk and moose to put on the shelf, because we have an abundance of red meat right now.

We want to market the outdoor experience to that urban person. That is what we have to keep in sight when we discuss private sector management of wildlife.

**Jack Shaver, Alberta Fish and Wildlife Advisory Council:** I knew Rich Goulden and Dennis Surrendi when they were field biologists, Ed Bagen before he was even Executive Director of the Saskatchewan Wildlife Federation. Because of my ancient age and a career in wildlife law enforcement and administration, I feel compelled to make a few remarks. This Colloquium, is asking for dollars and cooperative programs and that is good. Those of us in sportsmen's organizations and other private non-government interests, have been looking for this for a long time. Cooperative programs are needed - partnership between non-government organizations and government organizations. We've done that in Alberta's Fish and Wildlife Advisory Council. That council represents 25 different organizations in Alberta, and it is becoming a better partnership every year.

Information and education programs must improve, so that the politician and the general public will understand what you mean. The goal of wildlife policy in Canada is to maintain the ecosystems upon which wildlife and people depend and to preserve the genetic diversity of wildlife. If you ran that by ten politicians this morning or ten people in the coffee shop, they wouldn't know what you meant, and if we want public participation and cooperation we are going to have to explain things a little better.

I agree with a task force. If it is going to work through, it will have to include non-government personnel. The task force should take an inventory of programs across Canada, because there are many good habitat projects, but I don't think one agency knows about the other.

The income tax check-off is good.

**Stew Morrison, Ducks Unlimited:** It is always very frustrating to us on the outside, for example in the area of wetlands, to be working so hard to preserve wetlands and getting the cooperation of say the wildlife department, and having another department draining them at the same time. It comes back to a need for very solid land use planning within provincial and federal jurisdictions, but mainly in the provincial area. As Colin said earlier, you really need the ministers of wildlife to be champions for that cause, and we will support any minister who will carry that forward.

We have made a lot of gain in the last 20 years and we should now talk about building on the strengths. The wildlife policy may not be perfect but it certainly was needed. I agree that we should now look at it again and enhance it. We should continue to support the Habitat Coalition and work closer together. Wildlife Habitat Canada was an outcome of some of that concern by the non-government organizations and I think will prove to be a very valuable tool.

I would also like to congratulate the provincial and federal governments on the North American Waterfowl Management Plan.

**Monte Hummel, World Wildlife Fund Canada:** I have a recommendation which is supported by seven national non-government organizations - Ducks Unlimited, World Wildlife Fund, Canadian Nature Federation, the Nature Conservancy of Canada, Wildlife Habitat Canada, the Canadian Wildlife Federation and the National/Provincial Parks Association. We wanted to issue one specific recommendation at least, and it is as follows: To generate additional funds for the implementation of the North American Waterfowl Management Plan and for the recovery of endangered species in Canada, we support the introduction of a special excise tax on wildlife-related consumer products.

**Dennis Surrendi, Alberta Department of Energy and Natural Resources:** There is no question in my mind that wildlife on private lands must be at least a break-even proposition financially for a landowner, and preferably a profitable one. If it isn't, we'll see the elimination of wildlife on private lands. It's the kind of calculation I've seen many landowners make on the back of a cigarette package. We can pump an awful lot of money into extension and government programs, and solicit support from sportsmen, yet if we cannot achieve that break-even proposition for that landowner, we will see a steady decline in wildlife. Certainly in Alberta, the very existence of wildlife is endangered, and we should put some of these personal biases - whether I get to use it first or how I get to use it - aside, because it is a moot point how we are going to use it, if we don't have any.



The second item relates to Treaty Indians. Treaty Indians are a major benefactor of wildlife and habitat programs, and we have recognized our responsibility in Alberta, allocating to Treaty Indians under their constitutional rights to hunt fish for food, a first priority for use of these resources. We have, in many cases invested substantial amounts of money in habitat programs, only to have brought wildlife into a much more vulnerable position, to be taken by the Treaty Indian community. Treaty Indians can hunt at any time of the year, by any means that is not dangerous. We must reexamine our relationship with the Treaty Indian community to work together, because unless we can do that, a great deal of effort, sportsmen's money and government funding will be neutralized by the Treaty Indian hunt. Treaty Indians, of course, need not buy licenses, they do not contribute to revenue for habitat programs.

**Bob Stevenson, Aboriginal Trappers' Federation of Canada:** We agree with the idea of the task force and would like to be part of it. We have another organization present and that is Indigenous Survival International. We work together on various issues with respect to wildlife and have begun to work with groups like the Fur Institute of Canada, the Fur Council of Canada, World Wildlife Fund and Greenpeace.

Other areas are being addressed in Alberta than just the Treaty Indians, for instance, the new Status Indians and the Métis people. Any province might see a failure or a lack of working relationship with native people because often the native people haven't been involved in planning.

With respect to the comment that they are not contributing, the biggest contribution they have made is their land, the whole of Canada. To find a working relationship, you will have encouragement, not only from ourselves, but also from the people in Alberta. We do have membership right across Canada, in each province, and we could put you in touch with these people, to work with them on a provincial basis.

**Bob Stewart, Federation of Ontario Naturalists:** I was very enthusiastic about Mr. Turner's approach to generate more money and a little discouraged when the professional economist talked about how difficult it is, technically, to acquire money gathered into government coffers. It seems to me that if we have a public prepared to support wildlife in a new way, we have reached an alltime low in our bureaucratic structures if we can't find a way of tapping that resource. Several times I have had a look at the demographics of Ontario and I am absolutely certain that neither Rick Morgan nor I can identify as much as 50% of those people spending money on wildlife on a continuing basis. Those are the people we are not tapping and who want to be tapped to provide support for habitat and wildlife management. I hope the task force will consider this way to reach that population.

**David Perry, Canadian Tax Foundation:** I'm sorry if in my 16-minute sprint yesterday morning, I left the impression that there were technical problems with the imposition of user charges and special taxes. It is not the technical problems that I draw to your attention, because they can be overcome. It is the problem of the stability and the growth in these special measures. Tying major programs to user fees or to special excise taxes can, in the long run, create problems. These have to be seen very much as supplemental sources, they can't be the sole means of long term financing for major wildlife management programs.

**Gregg Sheehy:** I have a copy of the Canada Wildlife Act here, and one section of the Act empowers the minister to undertake programs through wildlife research and investigation and establish and maintain laboratories and other necessary facilities for that purpose. There are other sections which empower him to enter into agreements with the provinces and the private sector and whomever he may choose. He is also empowered through parliament to pass regulations in support of the Act. There is real potential there.

The five formerly federal interpretation centres and half dozen or so major ones around the country are struggling for funds and looking for direction and I think there really is a need for a national strategy to address environmental education.

The Canada Wildlife Act empowers the federal minister to be involved in such things and I think there is a real need for a spark from Environment Canada to be taken up by the provinces and such other agencies as the federal and provincial forestry agencies as well as Parks Canada.

Canadian Forestry Service has a good interpretation program at the Petawawa Research Center, but there is a need for an overall plan, maybe modeled on a version of the Waterfowl Management Plan or the Endangered Species Plan.

**Dal Hall, Canadian Forestry Association:** I recommend the report and recommendations of the National Forest Congress held here three weeks ago, in which they consider new ways to implement cooperative programs.

One of the main impediments to the successful establishment of resource management, whether you are talking forest, water, fish, or wildlife is the lack of coordination between a) different levels of government and b) different departments within the same government, particularly in large departments. One of the recommendations of the Forest Congress is that forest harvesting rights be delegated free from political influence, based purely on the merits of the land and the capability of the land in sustaining a sustainable harvest. Surely, it is incumbent upon governments to work together at the federal, provincial and municipal levels, and within governments working department by department, on farming decisions affecting wildlife as well as all renewable resources, based on those principles which control and affect the relationship of man to his environment.

**Ralph Urban, Council of Forest Industries of British Columbia:** What do people see for wildlife 25, 50 or 75 years down the road? If we continue this way, will the wildlife habitat base be eroded, as Dr. Pearse suggested, or do you see it increasing or a status quo? My guess is that it is going to decrease, and if that is going to happen, do we not need new thinking, new ideas, new ways? We must involve private land in the management base.

**Honourable Vincent Kerrio:** The fact that we are talking about a resident fishing licence in Ontario takes into account a great deal of public input. In Ontario we spend some \$30 million in that field and we now collect about one third of that, or \$10 million, from non-resident fishing licences. We will take a presentation right across Ontario and invite the public to suggest not only ideas about fees, but also who should pay the fees, and what we should be doing with the money. Now, while we certainly are going to put the money into the consolidated revenue, the treasurer of Ontario has given his word that all of that money will be given to my ministry, and we will then add \$10 million to our budget, approximately 50% of that part of my ministry supported by a fee. It points up what proportion of the money we are spending is being supported by a user fee.

Significantly, we are waiting one year, so that we have time to go all across Ontario and all who want to participate can. There are those who are very willing to pay a user fee as long as they participate and that is what we are doing with that particular licencing arrangement.

**Honourable Red Pedersen, Government of the Northwest Territories:** The Northwest Territories agrees with the various tax measures mentioned, and in addition to these we may, within our own jurisdiction, try others such as taxation on consumer items. It is a high priority in our jurisdiction, not something that we have difficulties selling; we have the legislature behind us and the population fully support it. More than two thirds of our population depend on wildlife in one form or another as supplementary income, as main income and as a source of food.

I wonder though if we are not missing the boat on obtaining funding when we talk only about taxation in its various forms. These are compulsory forms of contributions which many people object to. In the paper by Margaret Young and Marion Wrobel, there is one excellent suggestion and that is the issuing of a semi-postal stamp. Not only is it an excellent form of raising revenue, it is also an attractive collector's item for stamp collectors, the largest single collectors group in the world. With the abundance of excellent wildlife artists that we in this country have, we could issue an international series of desirable stamps and raise unbelievable monies. It certainly has been done in other countries. In addition to the semi-postal, there is also the non-revenues issue. Stamp collectors will know what I talk about. We have done that within Canada, we do it every year with Easter Seals and Christmas Seals and it is done in other countries for other causes.

**Rick Morgan, Ontario Federation of Anglers and Hunters:** I would like to add to Mr. Kerrio's comments on the proposed resident angling license. We too, did a questionnaire so that we would be able to support Mr. Kerrio. We asked a question which Mr. Kerrio's people did not, and that was whether the people wanted the money to go into the central treasury, with the guarantee of the treasurer that 100% of the net revenues would be spent on sport fishing, or whether they would prefer it to be in a separate fund, so that the funds could be readily identified and earmarked for sports fisheries. Some 95.5% of the respondents insisted that the revenues generated be put into a separate fund, so that the monies they are contributing to wildlife will indeed remain set aside for wildlife.

**Honourable Vincent Kerrio:** That is a very valid survey, but there then comes a question, would those who pay a license for any other use demand the same privilege?

**David Perry, Canadian Tax Foundation:** Much of what you are talking about, land use dedication of lands under private ownership to habitat and so on, involves local governments tremendously in their tax load and also residents of local governments, because once you take a piece of land off the tax rolls, you are throwing additional burdens on the existing taxpayers. This is an important aspect when you get down to the nitty gritty of habitat conservation. It is not something to be overlooked and perhaps it presents an opportunity for local governments to take part in any task force that may be set up.

**Frank Carter:** The task force will have to develop reasonably precise ideas for projects. It seems to me that the more precise, daring and interesting the ideas, the more chance they will have on selling governments. On certain fairly rare, but nevertheless recognizable occasions, provincial and federal ministers have bucked their collective cabinets and brought in new federal-provincial programs successfully, because they have had a certain strength of character themselves, and they were able to say to their cabinets, look we've got the backing of our provincial colleagues, they are prepared to get in and sweat with us. A valid idea and the willingness of governments to work together become, in certain circumstances, an irresistible combination. If the task force can provide the material the federal and provincial ministers can work with, then you may really create something worthwhile for Canada.

**David A. Munro:** I would like to summarize what has taken place. We have considered needs and priorities in wildlife conservation. We have looked at new ways of funding and managing wildlife conservation. The registered attendance was about 80.



There was certainly agreement that the values of wildlife, economic and recreational, required that existing management programs be maintained, and that they should be supported by the present sources and methods of funding. Some people have expressed the apprehension that if we did tap new sources of funds, governments might then say, oh well, things are looked after, we don't need to provide the same level of support from our regular sources of funding. We should guard against that happening.

Participants noted that the Guidelines for Wildlife Policy in Canada should be reviewed after the 5th anniversary of their adoption by ministers. That 5th anniversary will be in 1987.

Proposals for securing a greater economic return from wildlife in special circumstances attracted a good deal of favourable attention. It also attracted some apprehension, and the task force will need to look at that broad area in considerable detail. It was suggested that management regimes which would enable the market value of wildlife to be realized should be the subject of experiment in certain special circumstances. Native communities might receive a high priority in contributing to the execution of such experiments.

We all noted that there are increasing demands for using wildlife in various ways, and growing pressures on the other hand to intensify and extend competing uses of the land that constitutes wildlife habitat. Therefore the improvement of techniques for habitat management and the expansion of lands reserved for habitat was a high priority, and the North American Waterfowl Management Plan was a specific example of that sort of activity.

Other needs identified were better ecological or environmental interpretation programs. Several people spoke of the need to coordinate efforts of this sort across the country, and of the need for more long-term research to improve understanding of ecosystems under stress. These were seen as top priority requirements. The need to harmonize plans and decisions relating to all uses of the land and of renewable resources was stressed on a number of occasions. It is essential in our approach to wildlife management to overcome the administrative problems, the turf problems within governments that sometimes stand in the way of achieving this.

A number of possible options for raising the additional revenues that might be needed to undertake such programs were discussed. These included an excise tax on outdoor equipment, increases in user fees, an income tax check-off and others. All aspects of exploiting these and other possible sources of revenue should be carefully studied. Many points have been raised in this discussion which we will record and which should be set before the task force to guide them in their further and more detailed examination of these options.

Participants were impressed with the opportunities for greater and more productive collaboration between governments, between public and private sectors. They were especially interested in the concept of cooperative wildlife and fishery research units which has worked well for so long in the United States and was explained to us so well by Bob Jantzen. They noted that non-governmental organizations could undertake some programs more effectively and more cost effectively than governments, and resolved to identify appropriate opportunities for expanding the roles of NGOs.

Finally, it seems to be assumed that it would be desirable to establish a federal-provincial task force to evaluate the options for fund raising, the suggestions for greater collaboration, the other points raised at this Colloquium and to provide a report containing detailed recommendations within a year. It might be useful to charge the Federal-Provincial Wildlife Conference, which will be held within five weeks, to actually appoint that task force, this would give some time for ministers and officials to consider and to consult with NGOs with respect to the constitution of the task force, and it is not so far away that the idea will be lost. The task force should review the possibilities for cooperation in wildlife conservation that emerged at the Colloquium, and prepare specific and practical recommendations for their later consideration.

This concludes the formal session.