Barlow, John ENV:EX

From: OfficeofthePremier, Office PREM:EX
Sent: Thursday, March 12, 2009 11:27 AM
To: s.22
Cc: Minister, ENV ENV:EX
Subject: RE: Gordon Campbell

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Flagged

Thank you for your email regarding the black bear hunt on the Queen Charlotte Islands.

Your correspondence has been shared with the Honourable Barry Penner, Minister of Environment, for his information and attention as well. You can be assured that your comments will be given every consideration by the Minister and his staff during related discussions.

Again, thank you for writing. We appreciate the time that you have taken to make us aware of your views on this matter.

pc: Honourable Barry Penner

From: s.22
Sent: Thursday, February 26, 2009 8:59 PM
To: OfficeofthePremier, Office PREM:EX
Subject: Gordon Campbell

Honorable Gordon Campbell,

I am writing in regards to the recent announcement of the deal brokered by the Province of British Columbia including the potential sale of a guide-outfitter tenure in the Queen Charlotte Islands, tied to it a limited resident harvest of 4 black bears.

There are serious, wide-reaching implications of such a deal which implicitly ignores my rights not only as a resident hunter but also a citizen of British Columbia.

It has been the Ministry of Environment's mandate to manage based on science; in this instance that has been abandoned in favour of politics. There is no discussion about conservation or black bear management in any of the briefs that have been released to the media. The number of 4 bears is based on reported historical harvest; the historical harvest is based on a sample size which is so small the results can only be described as inaccurate. Again, the historical harvest has nothing to do with conservation or science based management.

Furthermore, what this deal illustrates is that wildlife in British Columbia is for sale. Tying resident allocation and harvest to a private business transaction alienates the North American Wildlife Conservation Model (NAWCM) and the very basic premise that wildlife is a public resource. The NAWCM also states that allocation of wildlife is by law not by market pressures, land ownership or special privilege and that the public gets a say in how wildlife resources are allocated. This deal removes ownership of wildlife from the public, no different than what happened in Europe where the environment and access to nature was effectively destroyed. When the people have no wildlife to value and foster there will be no wildlife left.

As a citizen of British Columbia I believe the construction and execution of this deal has not considered or acknowledged the citizens of British Columbia's ability and right to access and use wildlife and habitat, even as non-consumptive users.

This deal removes the publics ability to manage black bear for whatever purpose they wish to use it for. There was no public consultation or input from the public regarding this precedent setting deal. How is one ministry in the government to know what is best for the citizens or the other ministries when no one else was consulted?

It is incumbent upon the government to act in the best interests of its citizen and in this deal the citizens have not been considered, acknowledged or consulted.

Lastly, please do not pass this letter onto the Ministry of Environment and use the Ministry of Environment as a scape-goat. It is very clear that the MoE was not consulted or an integral part of this deal. This deal has been driven solely by politics. Management through science has been abandoned and the rights and future of the citizens of British Columbia have been negotiated away by one branch of the government that never consulted its citizens and has no expertise in wildlife management.

This has been a systematic failure of government to meet its commitment to represent its citizens and in my opinion is tantamount to larceny. As a hunter and citizen of British Columbia who had no input, and a firm believer in the North American Wildlife Conservation Model, none of this acceptable.

Yours in conservation,
s.22