However, collaboration is not a panacea. Many problems remain, both in theory and practice. Experience to date shows that agencies are often the stumbling block by refusing to implement the outcomes negotiated by community groups. In some cases, agencies hold back for good reason; they do not have legal authority to proceed, and/or the upshot may not be consistent with their national commitments.

Problems also abound with regard to potential participants. NGO's which represent national constituencies concerned with specific areas are not always present at the local level. Distant stakeholders are often neglected in these efforts (e.g., urban stakeholders). Sometimes, too, a key stakeholder may decline to participate; such holdouts can undermine the effort to implement a solution. When a large cast of players is brought into the process, the odds favor producing a consensus which represents the "lowest common denominator"—a really sub-optimal solution. This can amount to letting a minority veto what the majority wants. Some see consensual approaches as overturning the philosophy that the majority will should prevail.

Moreover, not all participants may be equally equipped to participate in a competitive fashion. There may be disparities in resources—financial,
informational, and in negotiating skills. Skilled facilitators may not be available. And where the players are skilled and committed, they may not always be able to bring their constituencies along with them. Experiences in these processes are very personal ones and can be difficult to translate to others. Finally, it is one thing to negotiate an agreement; it is another to see it through to successful implementation. Some report failures of implementation, as only watchdogs with "deep pockets" and paid staff can stick with the process through a period of years.

Intellectual Trends

Since the mid-1980’s the field of Conservation Biology has emerged with great impact. Its leaders have marshalled the findings of field research around a program representing their ideas of how to protect biodiversity. This research is valuable and its implications need to be heeded. The aim of protecting biodiversity is one that all those interested in protected areas will share. However, their approach also reflects an ideology that challenges accepted approaches.

In the emerging literature of Conservation Biology, the preservation of biodiversity is put forth as the
raison d'être for protected areas. Every other reason for having them is treated as secondary, if not trivial and old-fashioned. Little interest is shown in the rich culture of values accumulated over more than a century that explain why so many areas exist (over 70 such values are discussed in the taxonomy of wilderness values I have prepared). The diversity of reasons for having protected areas has expanded the constituency for them.

Moreover, the system of national parks and protected areas is not judged in terms of these reasons that explain why we have the areas which we do have and why they are located where they are and are of the size they are. Viewing the product of so much history through a new lens (representing a kind of presentism), these observers are quick to judge the existing system wanting in terms of achieving their new biodiversity goals. They assert that the parks are not in the right places; they are not large enough; they are often too far apart; they are not managed properly; they are not buffered from outside influences; and sometimes they represent damaged goods. One commentator decries "...drawing lines around areas and trying in vain to hold them forever in the condition in which they were found." They observe that a large number of major habitat
types are not represented at all in the National Park System, pointing out that 33% of the potential natural vegetation types are not represented. They observe further that Forest Service wilderness areas fail to represent 40% of the terrestrial ecosystems (as laid out in the Bailey-Kuchler scheme). Having noted that 35% of designated wilderness is still open to grazing, they then assert that only about 3% of the land area of the United States is really strictly protected (in contrast to 11-12% nominally protected).

Their disdain for what has been achieved so far is evident. One of them characterizes the notion of reserves as "anachronistic." He asserts that "Amenity preservation has resulted in parks as ecological islands, crown jewels without a crown." He dismisses the achievements represented by existing systems as "...token environmental reform." Those who are concerned with esthetics and recreation are sometimes lumped in with those concerned with profits and maximum yields. The very idea of "set asides" is attacked because it could engender "...a feeling of free license elsewhere."

This disdain for historic accomplishments has been encouraged by overblown credit given to the the "worthless lands" theory propounded by Alfred Runte. While there have always been those who
wanted to limit reserves to lands devoid of economic value, it is a distortion of history to assert they always succeeded, and even Runte does not contend that has been the case. Certainly Yosemite contains valuable water power sites, as does the Grand Canyon. It is unfortunate that the report of the IUCN on the Caracas conference gives credence to the notion that "In the history of protection in North America, parklands have largely been limited to what is considered barren and economically useless for other purposes." If this thesis ever tended to be true, it was primarily in the early history of protected areas.

As the park and conservation movement came to play a more active role, reserves have included more of value. Hard fought contests in the 1930's over establishing Kings Canyon National Park and Olympic National Park certainly involved lands of value for dams and timber, as did earlier efforts which succeeded in expanding Sequoia National Park. While commercial interests often succeeded in getting some areas they coveted dropped from park proposals, this is not the same as concluding that conservationists got nothing, or that parks got only worthless lands.

Most of the contests over protected areas in the period after World War II involved spirited...
struggles over lands that were rarely worthless in a commercial sense. The battle over the Redwood National Park stands as the ultimate example of lands going into the park system that were extremely valuable: $1.3 billion worth of timber was set aside there. Most struggles today over wilderness designation involve conflicts over lands valuable for timber or minerals.

While it is easy to acknowledge that the present system of protected areas is inadequate and reflects the historical interests that produced it, it is counter-productive to heap scorn on systems, which nonetheless, are still very valuable. Referring to the lands in the system as "worthless" suggests they are now worthless to the nation as protected areas. And then it is additionally unhelpful to have them pilloried as flawed, limited, mis-located and mis-managed.

It will be all too easy for the public to conclude that such systems should be dismembered if this is the message they get from leaders in the environmental community. In fact, this is exactly what the systems' critics in Congress are now advocating in the Hefley bill to dismember the system. They are saying, in effect, "weed out the old system before anything more is added." Unwittingly, some voices in the environmental community are playing into their
hands. What these conservation biologists really want is a vast expansion of the system of protected areas, but their rhetoric may instead feed efforts to shrink the size of the systems.

In contrast to the 11-12% of the U.S. currently in protected areas of some type, these conservation biologists are calling for setting aside an average of 50% of every eco-region in protected areas (in wilderness or buffer zones). Their "...calculations of the area necessary to represent all species and ecosystem types in a region can run as high as 99%, but are usually in the range of 25 to 75 percent." They not only want to maintain viable populations of all native species, but to do so in their "...natural patterns of abundance and distribution." 

Doing the latter requires devoting a majority of all habitat to its original uses prior to European settlement. To restore the Florida panther, these conservation biologists want to place 60-70% of the states of Florida, Georgia, Alabama and South Carolina in reserves. To assure the grizzly bear's status, they want to allocate 60% of the northern Rockies region to protected status. They want to put 50% of the Oregon Coast bioregion into reserves. And they feel that 25% of all rangeland belongs in reserves. Perhaps the idea of protected areas is
not so anachronistic after all.

And while they want to establish "...more or bigger parks, wilderness areas and other reserves," they also want to "...manage better the semi-natural matrix (multiple use public and private lands) that covers most of our country." And they want to do all of this on a continental scale, with a planning horizon of 10,000 years. And they want a moratorium on all habitat degradation while these new plans are being put in place.

Those putting forth these expansive ideas know they sound "utopian," but they warn of the consequences of thinking only "...in terms of what is politically reasonable [or] practical...". They caution that "...we had better be very clear about the consequences of pragmatism for both species and ecosystems: They will soon disappear, along with Earth's habitability for Homo sapiens."

Thus, notice is served on society: follow their course or accept responsibility for the consequences. Biological imperatives are posited which demand what "must" be done, with some saying these demands are "non-negotiable."

This posture represents a kind of neo-determinism: they are bearers of truth; society either conforms or pays the price. There is no room here for social
choice or uncertainty.\textsuperscript{30}

Yet, by their own admission, much is uncertain, and thinking on some matters has been reversed. How is one to know how much of their program is well supported or may be undermined by new findings? How much is based on scientific knowledge and how much on personal preference?

The field’s founder, Michael Soule, has specified that conservation biology exists to do a job: it is mission oriented, yet Reed Noss admits that some of what they advocate is "untested."\textsuperscript{31} Reed Noss states clearly that "We do not yet (and may never) know what we are doing."\textsuperscript{32} He states that "ecosystem conservation is problematic;"\textsuperscript{33} "we remain dangerously ignorant about natural ecosystems."\textsuperscript{34} "Ecosystems are more difficult to classify than species"\textsuperscript{35}; "no accepted classification of...ecosystems exists in the United States"\textsuperscript{36}; and "greater ecosystems are not self-evident."\textsuperscript{37} These admissions leave one wondering about how to persuade the public that their case is sound.

For example, discussion of the idea of wildlife corridors is instructive. While the case for connections between preserved blocks is sound, the case for corridors as one way of providing connections is less well established. Corridors are
suggested to facilitate genetic exchanges among populations in different locations; some think they ought to be wide enough to support their own resident populations. Yet the idea is not without controversy. Others point out that little has been proven about their value, especially at a regional scale. They point out that they may also spread disease, edge-loving species and wildfires and risk higher mortality by wandering animals. They observe that they may also be expensive to maintain. Michael Soule admits that there are "no answers yet" for these concerns. Is this an idea ready for its debut in a broadscale way (as contrasted to being tested and refined)? Notwithstanding these questions, many are ready to proceed.

All of these idee fixe come at a time when other long held notions of ecology are being discarded. It was long believed that the more diverse ecosystems (in terms of species richness) were more stable and resilient, yet that correlation is now in doubt. Diversity and stability may not go hand in hand.

Among the earliest ideas of ecology was that habitats progressed through successional stages of vegetation to reach a climax which would represent an equilibrium state (except for disturbances that
would start the process over). Now equilibrium theories "... have been largely replaced by dynamic paradigms." Nature is seen as "... full of uncertainty and episodic at different spatiotemporal scales." "... Nature is a shifting mosaic ... [and] is essentially in flux..." "Species composition of vegetation varies continuously in time and space..." "Because chance [disturbance] factors and small climatic variation can apparently cause very substantial changes in vegetation, the biota and associated ecosystem processes for any given landscape will vary substantially over any significant time period--and no one variant is more 'natural' than the others." Indeed, if the climates of regions are changing with the global buildup of greenhouse gasses, all sorts of changes may be triggered in plant communities. Habitats on mountain tops and in low-lying coastal areas may no longer be suitable; plants in the U.S. will need to migrate northward, and some have suggested that "preserves themselves may need to move."49

As implications of chaos theory in physics have seeped into ecology, one is left wondering whether reserves can be built around expectations that any given plant or animal community will be assured of a future there. Minor perturbations might displace
them, and climate change may wreak havoc.

The collapse of the equilibrium model and the diversity-stability supposition, along with the cloud being cast by impending climate change, all raise fundamental questions about the context for tackling major new challenges to protect biodiversity. Instead of knowing more about what to do, it almost seems as if we know less about what to do and how to plan for the future.

Notwithstanding these uncertainties, it should be observed, though, that the advocates of a major scale-up in preservation want to change some of the ways protected areas are managed.

Most advocate a kind of "hands-on management," with some boasting that "we can engineer nature at nature's rate..." Some cautions are issued, however, about avoiding "over-management." Hands-on management is justified to block agents that would undermine biodiversity and to restore habitats. Edward Grumbine also advocates varying approaches according to local conditions, with no consistent standards.

Michael Soule advocates managing wildlife in protected areas through various means, including culling, artificial transfers, and immunization; he also calls for eradication of exotic biota.
Donald Waller calls for re-thinking the prescription for managing wilderness so that it is managed from a biodiversity perspective; this will downgrade emphasis on esthetics and recreation. He suggests that some additional human intrusions may be justified if more land can be preserved for biodiversity purposes, leaving the door open for snowmobiling and cutting firewood in wilderness areas.

Most call for active programs to eliminate exotic species in reserves and to re-introduce native species. Restoration of damaged range habitats might also call for use of mechanical treatments or herbicides to return areas to natural condition. In discussing reserves on rangelands, Reed Noss and Allen Cooperrider also call for some restrictions on recreational activities, such as backpacking, which are perceived to have discernible impacts.

In buffer zones around reserves, they would allow light grazing, selection forestry, non-motorized recreation (including fishing and hunting), and small-scale subsistence agriculture. For forested areas in reserves, including new designations they contemplate, they would encourage natural fire regimes. In small reserves, they would use prescribed burning to do this. Where necessary
to create enough gaps for reproducing early successional habitats, they would fell trees to simulate treefalls. In general, though, they would try to do that at the edge of reserves or in buffers. Donald Waller would try to "...sustain disturbance regimes typical of the region without losing species...". This would entail efforts "to maintain patterns of disturbance and habitat patches similar to those that have occurred historically...".

William Baker, however, warns against rushing into heavy burning programs while so little is known about the frequency and size of high intensity wildfires. He says "...it is premature to undertaken extensive manipulative restoration action using either prescribed disturbances or mechanical means, as these may only produce undesirable alteration." In general, these changes in management prescriptions involve more intrusiveness than is now authorized in wilderness areas and a de-emphasis on recreation. They also suggest vesting more authority in managers to decide on what is warranted in the name of advancing the goal of biodiversity. The approach assumes that large amounts of data are available from monitoring to adjust approaches so that management can be adapted to apply new knowledge (i.e.,
While these voices from the field of conservation biology are calling for setting aside more than half the country in protected areas, those now in control of the U.S. Congress are trying to move in exactly the opposite direction. They think that too much has already been preserved. Strident voices call for reversing much that conservation has accomplished.

The Hefley bill (H.R. 260), discussed earlier, is really aimed at getting rid of the National Recreation Areas, such as Cuyahoga NRA in Ohio and Santa Monica Mountains in southern California. Forces in northern Minnesota are also trying to de-list the Voyaguers National Park and turn it over to local authorities; hearings on this possibility were held in the field by Congress this past summer. The House of Representatives has eliminated all funding for the National Park Service to manage the new Mojave National Preserve. Members of Congress from South Dakota are trying to get three National Park Service units there turned over to the state to administer (H.R. 1185)

Efforts are underway to take the Presidio in San Francisco out of the Golden Gate National Recreation Area. And legislation (H.R. 2081) is being pushed to
grant western counties rights-of-way for roads through units of the National Park System based on stale claims going back over a century.

Efforts are also underway to pry open the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge to authorize oil development on the Arctic plain; the budget reconciliation measure anticipates $1.3 billion in early revenues from this source (which is doubtful).

Even more sweeping measures are being considered. Legislation is being pushed to turn all federal lands administered by the Bureau of Land Management (269 million acres—mainly range lands) over to the states where they are found (S.1031 and H.R. 2032). Included among the lands transferred would be wilderness areas that Congress has designated in states such as Arizona and New Mexico; the states would then administer them. State grant lands are already characterized by administrative neglect and exploitation.

The formula for managing wilderness on BLM lands would also be weakened by another piece of legislation setting aside a truncated portion of wilderness in Utah (H.R. 1745 and S. 884). This measure, which has been reported out of committee in the House, would open wilderness there to road construction, pipelines, and use by motor vehicles. It
would establish less than a third of the amount of wilderness advocated by moderate environmentalists (1.8 million acres in contrast to 5.7 million acres).

Budget committees in the House of Representatives have already made deep cuts in funds for land acquisition by agencies such as the National Park Service, the Fish and Wildlife Service, and the Forest Service. The House has cut their acquisition budgets respectively by 78%; it would also impose a five-year moratorium on initiating new efforts to acquire lands. Senate cuts, though, are somewhat less. Surprisingly, the operating funds of the Park Service were not cut in the House; the committee chairman was influenced by a public outcry over the possibility of having to close parks because of budget cuts.

The Chairman of the Subcommittee on National Parks of the House Resources Committee is also proposing to grant concessionaires in national park units a possessory interest in facilities in units of the National Park System; if their concession should be discontinued, they would have to be paid fair market value. They would also be granted the right to buy the underlying land from the federal government.

Public Opinion

But there is scant evidence that the public really
wants to roll back in programs to protect nature.

Nearly two-thirds of the public consider themselves to be environmentalists. When asked whether the federal government has "gone too far or not far enough to protect the environment," 70% feel it has not gone far enough. And only 12% feel that the federal government has "gone too far" in protecting wild and natural land.

A poll a few years ago revealed that 74% of the public would oppose oil development in the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge if the federal government said "development would cause permanent harm to the wildlife and wilderness character of the area." Officials of the Fish and Wildlife Service have now issued studies making that claim.

And 98% of those surveyed by Colorado State University felt that it was important that "parks remain the special and protected areas that they have been in the past."

The disjunction between the public's preferences and trends in Congress may arise from the fact that 61% of the eligible voters failed to vote in the last election; only 39% voted. A bare majority of them--representing little more than 18% of the adult population--decided the composition of the current Congress. And 74% of those who did vote felt they were
voting more against the incumbent President (Clinton) than to favor the Republican platform. This interpretation is confirmed by a survey in June of 1995 showing that only 25% of the public approve of House Speaker Gingrich’s "handling of the environment." One can only suspect that the majority of the public is too disillusioned with politics and government to vote. However, by their passivity they have ceded the field to extremism.

The environmental movement itself now finds itself divided between those who are pursuing conventional approaches to protecting nature and those who are pressing for reserves of unprecedented dimensions in the interests of biodiversity. Some efforts are underway to effect a rapprochement, but agreements have yet to be reached on a practical basis for cooperation.

In the meantime, radical revanchism is loose in the halls of Congress. Who knows how much of the existing edifice of nature protection will survive this onslaught? This is hardly a good time for either divisions or passivity. The price is too high.

###
Addendum

1. Relevance for CNPPA:
   a. Changes in the intellectual basis for contemporary conservation ought to be analyzed and understood by CNPPA (e.g., shift away from an equilibrium model in ecology).
   b. CNPPA should also study trends in contemporary politics in North America affecting protected areas.
   c. CNPPA should work with other IUCN commissions to assess schools of thought among conservation biologists and implications for designing and managing protected areas.
   d. CNPPA should compare its new category 6 for Sustainable Use with recommendations in the literature of conservation biology to see if it meets the need, or whether some modification is indicated.
   e. CNPPA’s North American division should develop a report on proposals for continent wide systems of connected protected areas.

2. What Individuals Can Do
   a. Study and assess new ideas.
   b. Provide leadership in finding common ground.
   c. Help bridge the gap between idealism and practicality.
   d. Participate in processes shaping public policy.
   e. Help elect "green" candidates to legislative bodies.

###


3. Ibid., pp. 370-371; Cortner and Motte argue that "neither ecosystem science nor collaborative decisionmaking theory ... is well enough developed to present an acceptable paradigm." They also observe that "the emergence of a new paradigm of ecosystem management is being constrained by the lack of theory and data."

4. Cortner and Motte have raised this question, saying "The concept of localized decisionmaking raises questions about how national interests in the Grand Canyon or the old-growth forest of the Pacific Northwest are to be balanced against the desires of local and regional interests for dams and timber harvests;" ibid., p. 374.


7. Ibid., p. 92.

8. Ibid., p. 174.
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12. Ibid., p. 227.
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20. Ibid., p. 164.
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30. Duke University professor Lynn Maguire warns that proponents of this kind of thinking "...must be wary of confounding advocacy of [their] goals ... with scientific analysis of various means of achieving them. Not only would this be an inappropriate use of scientific analysis ... but it would be a perilous tactic, since much of the science of landscape ecology is more at the state of plausible hypothesis than of well-established theory." See Environmental Policy and Biodiversity, ed. by R. Edward Grumbine (Island Press, Washington, D.C., 1994), p. 270; but Edward Grumbine asks: "How can conservation biology survive the inevitable checks and balances of American politics?", id., p. 13.


60. Ibid., p. 149.

61. Ibid., pp. 165, 209, 209.

62. Ibid., p. 207.

63. Waller, *op.cit.*, p. 44.

64. Grumbine: *Environmental Policy and Biodiversity* *op.cit.*, p. 92.

65. An amendment adopted in committee excludes 54 classic national parks from the termination reviews; this leaves National Recreation Areas as one obvious focal-point for the reviews.

66. See Gallup poll commissioned by USA Today and CNN of April 17, 1995.


72. Gallup poll conducted for CNN/USA Today on June 8, 1995.
Planned operations shall be in harmony with the community's master plan for the development of the area. This plan shall be reviewed periodically and amended as necessary to reflect changing conditions and objectives. The planning process shall include public participation and the consideration of the opinions and interests of all parties concerned. The planning committee shall be composed of representatives from governmental agencies, community organizations, and the public at large. The committee shall meet regularly to discuss and develop recommendations for the future development of the area.
1. The Resource Room (RR) will contain curriculum, education and management materials available for reference. Open from 9:00am to 6:00pm, Wed 25 Oct – Wed 1 Nov.

2. The Education Exhibit (EdEx) will be an interactive setting where representatives from US Gov. Agencies, Intergovernmental Organizations, International Organizations and NGOs can share programmatic experiences that address Land-based Activities with the delegates. Open from 10:30am to 6:00pm, Wed 25 Oct and Thu 26 Oct, located in the 1st Floor Exhibit Hall.

3. The Primary Presentation will address implementation of Chapter 2 of the Draft Global Program of Action, with an international panel discussion focusing on capacity building. The 2 hour presentation will be followed by a 30 minute question and answer session in English only.

4. Field Trips: 1.) Chesapeake Bay Labs Research Site and Museum; 2.) Agricultural Non-Point Source (NPS) Best Management Practices; 3.) Urban NPS Best Management Practices; 4.) Anacostia River Marine Debris and Restoration Projects; and 5.) Chesapeake Bay Tour. Box lunch will be provided. All field trips will conclude with a seafood dinner in Annapolis. All buses will depart State Department at 9am, arrive at Crabhouse by 5:30pm, and return to State Department by 7:45pm. (138 persons max, 4 field trips @ 30 persons each, tour @ 18 persons)

5. The International Coral Reef Initiative (ICRI) Seminar will provide information on the ongoing activities associated with ICRI and provide opportunity for discussion of the relationship between land-based activities and the conservation and management of coral reefs and associated ecosystems. Lunch will be provided. (80 persons max)

6. The Education Seminar topic is entitled, "Education as a Management Tool." It will run from 12:30-2:30 with lunch provided. (80 persons max)

7. Four Workshops on Environmental Measures: 1.) Erosion and Sediment Control (Urban), 2.) Agricultural NPS (Rural), 3.) Coastal Change Analysis, and 4.) Habitat Restoration. Lunch will be provided. (160 persons max, 4 @ 40)

8. The Technology Exhibit (TechEx) will feature both public and private sector environmental technologies which address Land-based Activities. Open from 10:30am to 6:00pm, Mon 30 Oct and Tue 31 Oct.

9. Capacity Building Seminars: 1.) Monitoring Methods; 2.) Oil Spill Response Training; 3.) Water Quality Models; and 4.) Economic Impact of Land-based Activities on Coral and Fisheries. Lunch will be provided. (160 persons max, 4 seminars @ 40)
MR. CHAIRMAN (Adrian Phillips), DISTINGUISHED VICE CHAIRPERSONS, GRACIOUS HOSTS (and neighbors from Mexico and Parks Canada), COMMISSION MEMBERS, COLLEAGUES, FRIENDS;

THANK YOU FOR INVITING ME TO BANFF NATIONAL PARK ON THIS OCCASION -- THE FIRST CNPPA REGIONAL MEETING HELD IN NORTH AMERICA IN A DECADE. IT IS A PARTICULAR PLEASURE TO BE HERE IN BANFF, THE FIRST NATIONAL PARK IN CANADA (1885), AND TO BE HOSTED BY THE FIRST NATIONAL PARK SERVICE IN THE WORLD, PARKS CANADA.


IN THE MORE THAN 7500 PARKS AND PROTECTED AREAS IN OVER 145 NATIONS, WE HAVE REMARKABLY SIMILAR GOALS, SHARED OBJECTIVES AND MANY ISSUES IN COMMON. AMONG THE MOST CHALLENGING ARE: REDUCED OR STATIC BUDGETS IN ECONOMICALLY UNSTABLE AND INFLATIONARY TIMES; UNSUSTAINABLE AND OFTEN INCOMPATIBLE SURROUNDING LAND USE PRACTICES; INCREASING SOCIAL PRESSURES AND CONSUMPTIVE DEMANDS FOR FINITE RESOURCES; HEIGHTENED POLITICAL PRESSURES FOR DEMONSTRABLE PUBLIC BENEFITS, AND SHORT TERM GAINS; THE GROWING NECESSITY FOR GREATER COST EFFICIENCIES AND WRENCHING INSTITUTIONAL STREAMLINING; THE CONTRADICTORY AND PERPETUAL DESIRE FOR MORE PERSONNEL AND INCREASED MANAGEMENT CAPABILITIES; AND, THE EROSION OF PUBLIC TRUST REFLECTED IN A GROWING CYNICISM TOWARD GOVERNMENTS.

IT IS JUST COMMON SENSE THAT OUR COMMON ISSUES CAN BE ADDRESSED MORE EFFECTIVELY WITH A COMMON EFFORT. THE WORLD PARK COMMUNITY AND THE RESOURCES FOR WHICH WE ARE RESPONSIBLE WILL BE BETTER SERVED WITH A POOLING AND SHARING OF RENEWED COMMITMENT,
INFORMATION, TECHNIQUES, CONCEPTS AND INNOVATIONS – AMONG OURSELVES – AND WITH OUR PUBLIC BEYOND THE WALLS OF THE CHATEAU LAKE LOUISE.

IN THE TWENTY FIRST CENTURY, NO ONE ORGANIZATION, AGENCY OR INSTITUTION RESPONSIBLE FOR PARKS OR PROTECTED AREAS CAN REASONABLY EXPECT TO SURVIVE INTACT, FAR LESS EFFECTIVELY RESOLVE THESE CHALLENGING PUBLIC TRUST ISSUES WITHOUT SIGNIFICANTLY STRENGTHENED PARTNERSHIPS AND UNPRECEDENTED COOPERATION IN MEETING COMMON GOALS. WHEN YOU ARE UP TO YOUR BELT IN ALLIGATORS, IT IS DIFFICULT TO PROTECT THE SWAMP. THE VISION AND DETERMINATION CALLED FOR BY THE PREVIOUS SPEAKER (Mike McCloskey) IS MORE LIKELY TO HAPPEN IN A CHORUS THAN IN SOLO.

IN THE UNITED STATES, PARKS AT ALL LEVELS OF GOVERNMENT AND PROTECTED AREAS ACROSS THE COUNTRY GREW IN NUMBERS AND POPULARITY BETWEEN 1985 AND 1995. IN THE UNITED STATES, NATIONAL PARK RANGERS EMERGED AS THE MOST LIKED OF ALL FEDERAL EMPLOYEES IN NATION WIDE POLLS. AN ACTIVE CONGRESS ADDED 31 NEW NATIONAL PARK AREAS IN THE PAST DECADE. WE NOW MANAGE A TOTAL OF 369 UNITS COVERING MORE THAN 80 MILLION ACRES (ABOUT 3% OF THE U.S.). COMBINED WITH OTHER WILDLANDS SUCH AS PUBLIC FORESTS, WILDLIFE REFUGES, SANCTUARIES, WILDERNESS AND THE STATE PARK SYSTEMS, THE U.S. IS APPROACHING 12% OF ITS TERRITORY UNDER CONSERVATION MANAGEMENT. IN NATIONAL PARK AREAS, WE HAD A 26% INCREASE IN VISITATION TO ABOUT 270 MILLION PER YEAR DURING THIS SAME PERIOD. MORE THAN 700 MILLION ADDITIONAL VISITS WERE MADE TO STATE PARKS THIS YEAR.

AS YOU WELL KNOW, HOWEVER, THE POPULARITY OF PARKS IS A DOUBLE EDGED SWORD. BUDGETS DID NOT MATCH THIS AFFECTIONATE EMBRACE. AFTER DECADES OF MODEST FUNDING INCREASES TO A FY 95 LEVEL OF $1.4 BILLION FOR THE U.S. PARK SERVICE, WE NOW ANTICIPATE DECLINES AS MEASURED AGAINST BOTH APPROPRIATIONS AND INFLATION. OUR TOTAL NPS APPROPRIATION FOR 1996 IS A HUGE 6.6% DROP FROM 1995... AND 11.5% LESS THAN WE ASKED FOR. INTERNAL ADJUSTMENTS TO RESPOND TO THE LEGISLATED REQUIREMENTS OF A MORE COMPLEX AND AN EXPANDED SYSTEM, HOWEVER, HAVE RESULTED IN A GROWING BACKLOG IN MAINTENANCE FROM AN ESTIMATED COST OF $1.9 BILLION IN 1988 TO $4 BILLION TODAY. OUR ENTIRE INFRASTRUCTURE – ROADS, EMERGENCY AND PATROL VEHICLES, BRIDGES, BUILDINGS, WATER TREATMENT PLANTS, TRAILS, FIRE FIGHTING EQUIPMENT -- IS IN A GROWING STATE OF DISREPAIR.

DESPITE INCREASES IN VISITATION, SERVICES IN PARKS ARE BEING CURTAILED. PUBLIC FACILITIES, VISITOR CENTERS, EVEN ENTRANCE STATIONS WHERE FEES ARE COLLECTED ARE OPEN FEWER HOURS A DAY, DURING SHORTER SEASONS. INTERPRETIVE PROGRAMS, LONG BELIEVED TO BE THE KEY INGREDIENT TO AN AWARE, INTERESTED AND INVOLVED PUBLIC, HAVE BEEN REDUCED IN DIVERSITY, DURATION AND DIMENSION. FREQUENT AND INTENSIVE EMPLOYEE DEVELOPMENT PROGRAMS, REQUIRED TO PREPARE A CAPABLE, SKILLED AND
COHESIVE FIELD MANAGEMENT STAFF, WILL LAPSE ALMOST ENTIRELY THIS YEAR -- TRAINING FUND REQUESTS WERE ENTIRELY LOST IN THE APPROPRIATIONS PROCESS IN CONGRESS.

ACCORDING TO A RECENT GOVERNMENT ACCOUNTING OFFICE REPORT TO CONGRESS (AUGUST 1995), NATIONAL PARKS ARE AT A CROSSROADS. (COPIES ARE AVAILABLE FROM THE OFFICE OF INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS, US NPS, WASHINGTON, DC). WE ARE ADVISED IN THIS REPORT THAT WE MUST DO ONE, OR MORE OF THE FOLLOWING: (1) INCREASE OUR FINANCIAL RESOURCES, (2) LIMIT, OR REDUCE THE NUMBER OF UNITS IN THE NATIONAL PARK SYSTEM, AND (3) REDUCE THE LEVEL OF VISITOR SERVICES. FURTHER, WE MUST, AS WITH ALL U.S. FEDERAL AGENCIES, STRETCH THE AVAILABLE FISCAL RESOURCES WITH MORE EFFICIENT MANAGEMENT AND PERFORMANCE MEASUREMENT SYSTEMS. REMEMBER THE ALLIGATORS!

INTERPRETATIVE PROGRAMS AT SHENANDOAH NATIONAL PARK HAVE BEEN CUT 80% AND LAST YEAR LIFE GUARDS WERE NO LONGER ON DUTY TO PROTECT SWIMMERS AT PADRE ISLAND NATIONAL SEASHORE. AND AT THE SAME TIME AT SHENANDOAH THE U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES IS PROPOSING TO REDUCE THE SIZE OF THE CURRENTLY AUTHORIZED BOUNDARY. THE RESULT WILL BE DEVELOPMENT IN AREAS CRITICAL TO THE ENVIRONMENT OF THIS LOVELY PARK ON THE DOORSTEP OF THE URBAN EASTERN UNITED STATES.


FISCAL CONDITIONS IN OTHER PARK AND PROTECTED AREA AGENCIES IN THE UNITED STATES ARE NO BETTER, AND IN MOST CASES, WORSE. THERE IS AN INESCAPABLE IRONY IN THAT AS WE GRADUALLY HAVE REFINED OUR ECONOMIC MODELLING TECHNIQUES AND NOW HAVE THE BASIS FOR CONCLUDING THAT 11 OF OUR NATIONAL PARKS EACH GENERATE CLOSE TO $1 BILLION PER YEAR IN REGIONAL ECONOMIC REVENUES, WE'RE GOING BROKE. AN ADDITIONAL 25 NATIONAL PARK AREAS EACH GENERATE AN ESTIMATED ANNUAL REGIONAL REVENUE OF CLOSE TO $100 MILLION IN SERVICES, SALES, EMPLOYMENT AND TAXES. AND WE ARE STILL GOING BROKE!
THE ONGOING WORK OF ONE OF YOUR COMMISSION MEMBERS (Lee Thomas, Australia) HERE TODAY, AND HIS NPS COUNTERPART (Ken Hornback), HAVE GONE A LONG WAY TO HELP MANAGEMENT REFINE PRESENTATIONS ON SOCIOECONOMIC BENEFITS. BUT IT IS GOING TO TAKE FURTHER PERSUASIVE REFINEMENTS OF BROADER REGIONALY BASED ASSESSMENTS TO BRING ASSET AND INVESTMENT PROTECTION ARGUMENTS HOME TO LEGISLATORS AND THEIR CONSTITUENCIES. AND EVEN MORE WORK FOR THEM TO UNDERSTAND THAT NATIONAL PARKS ARE NOT JUST THEME PARKS, AND THAT THE REASONS FOR THEIR POPULARITY LIE IN THEIR INHERENT NATURAL AND CULTURAL RESOURCES, THEIR ABILITY TO REMAIN OUR REAL HERITAGE AS WE MOVE THROUGH AN EVER-CHANGING FUTURE, MORE DEVOID OF OUR CULTURAL PAST AND OUR NATURAL BASE IN EVERY PASSING YEAR.

IN THE UNITED STATES, THE RESPONSE TO PARK REVENUE ENHANCEMENT AND COST RECOVERY HAS BEEN MOST SUCCESSFUL AT THE STATE LEVEL. WHILE THE STATE BUDGETS HAVE EXHIBITED RELATIVE DECLINES AND HAVE UNQUESTIONABLY BEEN IMPACTED BY FEDERAL GRANT REDUCTIONS (NOW ELIMINATED IN THE 1996 APPROPRIATION), AT LEAST SEVERAL STATE PARK SYSTEMS HAVE MANAGED TO MEET, OR ALMOST MEET, FULL ANNUAL OPERATING EXPENSES; A 65%-85% COVERAGE IS MORE COMMON PLACE. NPS DOESN’T COME CLOSE TO THESE LEVELS – NOR ARE WE LIKELY TO. REVENUE GENERATION OFTEN COMES AT A HIGH COST. ACCORDING TO THE "STATE GOVERNMENT NEWS" (January, 1995), IN AN ARTICLE TITLED "NATURE UNDER SIEGE", "STATE PARKS HAVE BECOME MORE EXPENSIVE TO VISIT AND LESS NATURAL AS PARK MANAGERS INCREASINGLY FOCUS ON GENERATING ENOUGH REVENUE TO STAY IN BUSINESS." MOST CHILLINGLY, I DON’T BELIEVE THE VISITING PUBLIC KNOWS WHAT THEY HAVE LOST. DAVID WEIZENICKER, WISCONSIN’S STATE PARK DIRECTOR AND PRESIDENT OF THE NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF STATE PARK DIRECTORS, CALLED THE CONSTANT STRUGGLE FOR FUNDING THE BIGGEST CHANGE HE HAS SEEN IN 32 YEARS OF PARK MANAGEMENT. IT IS NOT A POSITIVE COMMENT.

IN TODAY’S CLIMATE OF TIGHT FISCAL CONSTRAINT, IT IS UNLIKELY THAT NEEDED ADDITIONAL FUNDS WILL BE PROVIDED THROUGH NORMAL APPROPRIATED MEANS. OF THE POSSIBLE ALTERNATIVE SOURCES THAT REMAIN, INCREASED ENTRANCE AND OTHER USER FEES, HIGHER RETURNS FROM IN-PARK CONCESSIONERS AND FUNDS FROM NON-FEDERAL AGREEMENTS APPEAR TO HAVE THE HIGHEST POTENTIAL FOR SUPPLEMENTING BUDGETS. CURRENTLY, LESS THAN 8% OF THE NATIONAL PARK ANNUAL OPERATING BUDGET IS GENERATED THROUGH SUCH MEANS. FOR BENEFITS TO BE REALIZED, SUCH FUNDS WOULD HAVE TO STAY IN THE PARKS. UNTIL RECENTLY, ALL NATIONAL PARK REVENUES WENT INTO THE GENERAL RECEIPTS OF THE U.S. TRESURY.

FOR EACH PARK VISIT, AN AVERAGE OF 33 CENTS IS RECEIVED – IT COSTS NPS AN ESTIMATED $4.12 FOR EACH SUCH VISIT. IN SOME AREAS, A FEE OF OVER $25 PER VISITOR WOULD BE REQUIRED TO COVER A UNIT’S ANNUAL OPERATING COSTS, ASSUMING VISITATION LEVELS WOULD REMAIN THE SAME AND WE HAD THE STAFF TO COLLECT THE FEES. WITH ENTRANCE FEES FIXED IN LAW ON A
PARK BY PARK BASIS, THERE IS LITTLE CHANCE OF SIGNIFICANT OFF-SETTING GROWTH OF RETURN IN THIS AREA, UNLESS BOTH THE PRICE OF ENTRANCE FEES WERE DRAMATICALLY INCREASED ACROSS THE BOARD AND THIS AMOUNT COULD BE RETAINED FOR PARK USE.

HOWEVER, INCREASES BEYOND SOME LEVEL WOULD NO DOUBT AFFECT LEVELS OF VISITATION, AND PERHAPS EXCLUDE SEGMENTS OF THE SOCIETY FROM ACCESS TO THEIR HERITAGE. FEE INCREASE PROPOSALS MUST BE CAREFULLY THOUGHT THROUGH. THE 1996 APPROPRIATIONS BILL ESTABLISHES A FEE DEMONSTRATION PROGRAM FOR ALL LAND MANAGING AGENCIES. IT IS A START. NPS HAS A FEE BILL IN THE CONGRESS, WHICH WE ARE CURRENTLY WORKING TO IMPROVE EVEN MORE.

ADDITIONALLY, REPEATED EFFORTS HAVE BEEN MADE TO INCREASE REVENUES FROM CONCESSION OPERATIONS -- CHANGES IN CONTRACTS INCLUDING SHORTENING LEASES AND RENegotIATING THE PERCENTAGES TO GOVERNMENT HAVE IMPROVED THE RATES OF RETURN. THIS WOULDN'T TAKE MUCH. CONCESSION LEASES OF THE PAST AVERAGED ONLY 1%-2.5% OF GROSS SALES -- JUST SEVERAL YEARS AGO, COMBINED CONCESSION REVENUES RETURNED TOTaled ONLY $13 MILLION/ YEAR, EQUAL TO APPROXIMATELY 1% OF THE NPS BUDGET; CURRENTLY MOST SUCH FUNDS ALSO GO INTO OUR TREASURY AS WELL, NOT BACK TO THE PARKS, ALTHOUGH THIS IS CHANGING IN SOME INSTANCES. THE SERVICE HAS A BILL IN CONGRESS TO IMPROVE COMPETITIVENESS AND RETURN HIGHER PERCENTAGES TO THE PARKS. BOTH OF THESE BILLS -- FEES AND CONCESSIONS -- ARE CRITICAL.

MOST NATIONAL PARK UNIT BUDGETS AVERAGE AS MUCH AS 70%-95% IN EMPLOYEE SALARIES AND BENEFITS. SOME, IF THEY WERE TO OPERATE IN 1996 AS THEY DID IN 1995 WOULD NEED 110% OF WHAT THEY WILL RECEIVE FOR ALL PARK OPERATIONS JUST TO PAY PEOPLE CURRENTLY ON BOARD. TO REDUCE CENTRAL OVERHEAD COSTS AND INCREASE EFFICIENCY, WE ARE IN THE MIDST OF A MAJOR RESTRUCTURING OF REGIONAL AND HEADQUARTERS OFFICES. OUR INTENT WAS TO REDUCE CENTRAL OFFICES BY 40%, DECENTRALIZE ESSENTIAL FUNCTIONS AND REDISTRIBUTE SUITABLE PERSONNEL AND THEIR SALARIES DIRECTLY TO THE PARKS. THIS PROCESS IS WELL UNDER WAY. HOWEVER, BECAUSE OF EVISERATING BUDGET REDUCTIONS, AND LOWER APPROPRIATION EXPECTATIONS, THE PRIMARY BENEFIT GAINED WILL BE REDUCED CENTRAL OFFICE OVERHEAD COSTS WITH FEW ACTUAL GAINS TO PARK BUDGETS OR PERSONNEL CEILINGS.

ARE THERE OTHER MORE CREATIVE ALTERNATIVES? LAST MONTH ONE OF OUR DISTINGUISHED COLLEAGUES ASKED IF GREATER ECONOMIC BENEFITS COULD BE ACHIEVED BY TURNING THE MANAGEMENT OF GRAND CANYON OVER TO A LARGE CORPORATION LIKE DISNEY, INC. -- PERHAPS A CLUB MED-LIKE RESORT, OR SAFARI LAND? A LEGITIMATE QUESTION. HOWEVER, MANY, BUT NOT ALL, SUCH CORPORATE THEME PARKS HAVE PROVED HIGHLY PROFITABLE. WHAT ARE THE CONSEQUENCES OF A POOR RETURN ON INVESTMENT? WHO HAS THE PROPRIETARY INTEREST IN OUR NATIONAL (AND INTERNATIONAL) RESOURCE BASE? WHAT IS THE REAL VALUE OF AN APPROACH THAT DOES NOT
AFFORD ALL CITIZENS ACCESS TO THEIR PARKS AT REASONABLE COSTS? AND ONE THAT IS BUILT FIRST ON ENTERTAINMENT PRINCIPLES, NOT NATURAL OR CULTURAL RESOURCE PROTECTION PRINCIPLES? SUCH SCHEMES ARE NOT APPROPRIATE TO PARK SYSTEMS DEDICATED TO RETAINING OUR NATIONAL AND CULTURAL HERITAGE FOR THE BENEFIT OF FUTURE GENERATIONS. I DO NOT BELIEVE SUCH AN IDEA IS WORTH THE RISK, NOR DO THE AMERICAN PEOPLE IF WE CAN JUDGE BY WHAT HAPPENED WHEN DISNEY PROPOSED TO BUILD A CIVIL WAR THEME PARK IN VIRGINIA - AND GOT RUN OUT.

ELSEWHERE IN THE WORLD IN RECENT YEARS, ALTERNATIVE PRIVATE NON-PROFIT MANAGEMENT CONSIDERATIONS HAVE INDEED BECOME ACCEPTED AND IMPLEMENTED. WHILE ONLY TIME WILL TELL IF SUCH ACTIONS WERE IN FACT IN THE LONG TERM PUBLIC GOOD, EARLY WORLD BANK REVIEWERS WERE HARD PRESSED TO IDENTIFY SUCCESSFUL CASE STUDIES OF SUCH EXPEDIENCIES -- UNFORTUNATELY, MOST HAVE PROVEN TO BE SHORT LIVED PHENOMENA WITH EXTERNALLY FUNDED HIGH FRONT END COSTS AND BUILT IN OBSOLESCENCE. MANAGING HERITAGE IN PERPETUITY IS A LONG TIME ... AND EVEN THE GREAT CONSERVATIVE ECONOMIST ADAM SMITH WROTE THAT THIS FUNCTION SHOULD BE RESERVED "TO THE CROWN".

TO FURTHER FIX AND REDUCE COSTS, IT HAS ALSO BEEN SUGGESTED THAT THE NATIONAL PARK SYSTEM BE LIMITED TO NO FURTHER EXPANSION -- OR PERHAPS EVEN CUTTING THE NUMBER OF UNITS IN THE SYSTEM CONGRESSIONAL INITIATIVES TO ESTABLISH A COMMISSION TO REVIEW, IDENTIFY AND REMOVE AREAS FROM THE SYSTEM ARE STILL ALIVE IN THE U.S. CONGRESS. THERE IS NO CERTAINTY THAT SUCH EFFORTS WILL NOT BE SUCCESSFUL. TO ACHIEVE SUBSTANTIVE COST SAVINGS, THE EQUIVALENT TO CLOSING OF SOME OF THE LARGER NATIONAL PARKS WOULD BE REQUIRED. TO SAVE 10% OF THE NPS OPERATING BUDGET WOULD REQUIRE ELIMINATING THE EQUIVALENT OF CLOSING THE 200 LEAST EXPENSIVE PARKS.

WHAT IS IMPORTANT IS FOR CONGRESS TO ESTABLISH STRONG CRITERIA TO USE WHEN CONSIDERING NEW ADDITIONS TO THE NATIONAL PARK SYSTEM, AND REJECTING THE LESS WORTHY SUGGESTIONS. IF THERE ARE EXISTING UNITS THAT WOULD NOT MEET SUCH CRITERIA, CONGRESS ALREADY HAS THE AUTHORITY TO DEAUTHORIZE THEM. IT HAS HAPPENED IN THE PAST... JUST LAST YEAR FOR EXAMPLE THE CONGRESS MOVED THE KENNEDY CENTER FOR THE PERFORMING ARTS OUT OF THE NATIONAL PARK SYSTEM. IF CONGRESS WANTS TO CHANGE WHAT THEY HAVE PUT INTO THE SYSTEM THEY ALREADY HAVE THE AUTHORITY TO DO SO. DO WE REALLY NEED A NEW LAW THAT WILL OPEN UP THE POTENTIAL TO TAKE A RUN AT FEDERAL HERITAGE PROTECTION, AT A TRADITION THAT SPAWNED PARK SYSTEMS WORLDWIDE?

ALL FEDERAL LAND MANAGEMENT AGENCIES IN THE UNITED STATES (AS ELSEWHERE) ARE FACED WITH RAPIDLY MOUNTING PRIVATE SECTOR PRESSURES FOR COMMERCIAL RESOURCE DEVELOPMENT. WHEN OUR SUCCESSORS LOOK BACK FROM THE BICENTENNIAL OF THE PARK IDEA AND THE FIRST CENTURY OF ECOSYSTEM MANAGEMENT, WILL WE BE JUDGED AS HAVING DEMONSTRATED THAT WE ADEQUATELY UNDERSTOOD THE "LIMITS OF
ACCEPTABLE CHANGE”? – “RISK ANALYSIS”? – AND BE PROUD OF OUR LEGACY OF “SUSTAINABILITY”? OUR PLEDGE TO FUTURE GENERATIONS REQUIRES AT THE VERY LEAST WE BE CAUTIOUS. THERE ARE VERY FEW QUICK FIXES IN OUR BUSINESS. CONCERTED EFFORTS ARE CURRENTLY BEING MADE TO OPEN THE ARCTIC NATIONAL WILDLIFE RESERVE (ANWR) TO GAS AND OIL EXPLORATION – THIS AREA, AS MY CANADIAN FRIENDS HAVE LONG BEEN AWARE, IS ESSENTIAL FOR THE TRANSBOUNDARY HEALTH OF THE PORCUPINE CARIBOU HERD.

CONTINUED GAS AND OIL EXPLORATION, HARD ROCK MINING, HABITAT FRAGMENTATION, EXOTIC SPECIES INTRODUCTION, CLEAR CUTTING AND CONTINUED DEVELOPMENT IN THE YELLOWSTONE ECOSYSTEM POTENTIALLY THREATEN THE VERY RESOURCES DETERMINED TO BE OF WORLD HERITAGE STATUS IN THE WORLD’S FIRST NATIONAL PARK. AS IT WAS POINTED OUT DURING A PUBLIC FORUM THERE LAST MONTH, A BODY OF GOLD ORE MAY HAVE THE POTENTIAL EXTRACTED VALUE OF MILLIONS OF DOLLARS OVER FORTY YEARS, BUT YELLOWSTONE GENERATES CLOSE TO $1 BILLION EVERY YEAR IN ITS CURRENT STATE... AND ALWAYS WILL, IF PROTECTED.

CONGRESSIONAL INITIATIVES FOR REINSTATING TIMBER HARVEST IN CURRENTLY PROTECTED WILDLANDS OF THE TONGASS NATIONAL FOREST IN ALASKA COULD POTENTIALLY THREATEN THE INTEGRITY OF THE TRANSBOUNDARY CANADIAN AND U.S. WORLD HERITAGE SITE FROM KLUANE NATIONAL PARK THROUGH THE TATSHINNI - ALSEK DRAINAGE TO GLACIER BY NATIONAL PARK AND PRESERVE (the largest managed wilderness in North America).

ALTHOUGH YOU WILL HAVE OTHER OPPORTUNITIES TO DISCUSS WORLD HERITAGE IN MORE DETAIL DURING THIS MEETING, I WOULD LIKE TO SHARE A FEW OF MY OWN THOUGHTS ON THIS INCREASINGLY VISIBLE MANAGEMENT TOOL WITH YOU. FOR TWO DECADES AFTER RATIFICATION OF THIS TREATY, THE U.S. QUIETLY WENT ABOUT IMPLEMENTING OUR LEGAL RESPONSIBILITIES IN IDENTIFYING AND NOMINATING PROPERTIES WHICH IT BELIEVED TO BE OF OUTSTANDING UNIVERSAL SIGNIFICANCE. OVER THE LAST FIVE YEARS, THE CONVENTION HAS BECOME OPERATIONAL AS AN INSTRUMENT FOR DOMESTIC CONSERVATION AND INTERNATIONAL COOPERATION.

THE LISTING OF EVERGLADES AS A SITE “IN DANGER” BY THE 21 NATION INTERGOVERNMENTAL WORLD HERITAGE COMMITTEE SUPPORTED CRITICAL NEGOTIATIONS AND LITIGATION RESULTING IN THE COSTS SHARING OF A $800 MILLION WETLAND RESTORATION PROGRAM. A PROPOSAL FOR THE CALIFORNIA STATE HIGHWAY REALIGNMENT OF ROUTE 101 THROUGH REDWOODS WORLD HERITAGE SITE WAS MODIFIED FROM REMOVING 750 OLD GROWTH REDWOOD TREES, TO THE NOW ACCEPTABLE LEVEL OF NO MORE THAN 5 (AND PROBABLY ONLY 2) SUCH TREES AFTER THE INTERVENTION OF THE WORLD HERITAGE COMMITTEE.

IN THE U.S., CANADA, MEXICO AND IN THE 140 COUNTRIES WHICH HAVE RATIFIED THIS CONVENTION, WE AS INDIVIDUALS AND COLLECTIVELY HAVE PERHAPS OUR MOST EFFECTIVE EMERGENT TOOL FOR BROADENING OUR GLOBAL SUPPORT BASE, STRENGTHENING PUBLIC RESOLVE AND REINFORCING OUR NATIONAL PRIDE, WHILE MORE EFFECTIVELY CONSERVING BIOLOGICAL
DIVERSITY ON OUR PLANET. SUCH LONG TERM INTERNATIONAL COOPERATIVE GOALS MUST NOT BE PRECLUDED BY THE CONTEXT OF OUR ADMITTEDLY STRETCHED SITUATION, OR CURRENT POLITICAL EXINGENCIES.

FOR THE LAST ONE AND ONE HALF YEARS, THE NATIONAL PARK SERVICE HAS BEEN BRILLIANTLY AND CRITICALLY REPRESENTED IN THE MIDDLE EAST PEACE NEGOTIATIONS BETWEEN ISRAEL AND JORDAN BY ROB MILNE. THIS SUMMER, I PERSONNALLY TRAVELED WITH SHARON CLEARY TO TIBERIAS TO PARTICIPATE IN THESE ONGOING DELIBERATIONS. AT THIS TIME, ALL PARTIES HAVE AGREED THAT DISPUTED BOUNDARIES IN THE JORDAN RIFT VALLEY BETWEEN AQABA AND THE GOLAN HEIGHTS CAN BE ADDRESSED IN PART WITH THE CREATION OF AN INTERNATIONAL TRANSBOUNDARY PEACE PARK. A JOINT INTERNATIONAL MARINE PARK HAS BEEN DESIGNATED IN THE GULF OF AQABA AND PLANS ARE UNDER WAY FOR SIMILAR ACTION IN THE AREA OF THE DEAD SEA. WHEN SUCH OPPORTUNITIES AND THE NEED FOR INTERNATIONAL COOPERATION IS PRESENTED IT SIMPLY CAN NOT BE IGNORED (INCIDENTALLY, ROB MILNE DESERVES SPECIAL CREDIT FOR QUIET, EFFECTIVE, INTERNATIONAL SIGNIFICANT CONSERVATION WORK WHICH SUBSTANTIALLY AFFECTED A VERY DELICATE PEACE PROCESS).

CLOSER TO HOME, AFTER DECADES OF PRODUCTIVE INTERCHANGE, THE NATIONAL PARK SERVICE AND PARKS CANADA HAVE NEGOTIATED AND WILL SIGN AT THE EARLIEST APPROPRIATE OPPORTUNITY, A MEMORANDUM OF AGREEMENT WHICH WILL FURTHER STRENGTHEN HERITAGE COOPERATION BETWEEN OUR TWO COUNTRIES. AS WITH CANADA, WE SHARE ECOSYSTEMS AND MANY AREAS OF COMMON HERITAGE WITH MEXICO. THE NATIONAL PARK SERVICE, IN FACT, HAS JURISDICTION OVER THE NORTHERN SIDE OF 28% OF THE SOUTHERN BOUNDARY OF THE US -- WITH THE RECENT DESIGNATIONS BY MEXICO OF SEVERAL BORDER AND NEAR BORDER BIOSPHERE RESERVES, SIGNIFICANT STRATEGIC STEPS HAVE BEEN TAKEN TO STRENGTHEN JOINT CONSERVATION EFFORTS IN THE CHIHUAHUAN AND SONORAN TRANSBOUNDARY ECOSYSTEMS. BY DEFINITION, SUCH SYSTEMS CAN NOT BE MANAGED WITH THE COLLABORATIVE INVOLVEMENT OF MANY INDIVIDUALS AND ORGANIZATIONS FROM BOTH NATIONS.

THESE ARE SIGNIFICANT AND HOPEFUL STEPS FORWARD, AND SHOULD BE APPLAUDED. BUT AS WE DO THAT, LET'S LOOK SOBERLY IN SUMMARY AT THE STATE OF PROTECTED AREAS IN THE UNITED STATES.

THE 1996 BUDGET CUTS ARE TERRIBLE FOR THE NATIONAL PARK SERVICE. THEY ARE WORSE FOR THE REST OF THE AGENCIES. EVEN MORE ALARMING IS THE PATTERN OF USING THE COMBINATION OF THE BUDGET PROCESS UNDER THE LEGITIMATE CONCERN FOR DEFICIT REDUCTION WITH OTHER LEGISLATIVE APPROACHES TO MOUNT A MASSIVE ASSAULT ON THE ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION SIDE OF THE EQUATION FOR A SUSTAINABLE FUTURE.

COMBINE THE CURRENT POLITICAL CLIMATE WITH THE PRESSURES OF INCREASING POPULATION AND THEIR NEEDS FOR JOBS, A BETTER LIFE FOR THEIR CHILDREN, AND A SECURE FUTURE IN CONCERT WITH AN URBANIZING
CITIZENRY WITH LITTLE UNDERSTANDING OF THEIR DIRECT TIES TO THE
NATURAL WORLD. THE RESULT IS THE GREATEST PRESSURE AGAINST
CONTINUED, LET ALONE INCREASED, OPPORTUNITY FOR PROTECTED AREA
PROTECTION THAT WE HAVE SEEN SINCE WORLD WAR II.

AT THE MOMENT, THE ENVIRONMENTAL ORGANIZATIONS IN THE UNITED
STATES ARE LESS INFLUENTIAL THAN THEY HAVE BEEN IN DECADES.

A COMPLETE REVERSAL OF THIS TENDENCY IS NEEDED. IT CAN ONLY OCCUR
THROUGH GRASS ROOTS CITIZEN EDUCATION, UNDERSTANDING AND
INVOLVEMENT, IN WHICH WE ALL MUST PARTICIPATE.

IT IS MY HOPE THAT THE DIVERSITY AND PROFESSIONAL CAPACITY
REPRESENTED IN THE MEMBERSHIP OF THIS COMMISSION CONTINUES TO
EXPAND, AND BE INCREASINGLY ACTIVATED IN NORTH AMERICA TO MEET
THOSE, AND THE OTHER GREATEST PARK AND PROTECTED AREA CHALLENGES
AND OPPORTUNITIES OF THE NEXT CENTURY.

THIS IS CLEARLY A TIME FOR DEVELOPING COHERENT STRATEGIES -- A TIME
FOR CONVERGENT, NOT DIVERGENT EFFORTS -- A TIME FOR COOPERATION. I
WISH YOU EVERY SUCCESS IN YOUR DELIBERATIONS. THANK YOU FOR YOUR
UNTIRING EFFORTS -- AND FOR YOUR CONTRIBUTIONS TO MAKING ESSENTIAL
PARTNERSHIPS MORE EFFECTIVE. THANK YOU FOR INCLUDING ME AND OTHERS
FROM THE U.S. NATIONAL PARK SERVICE IN THIS MEETING.

AS JAY D. HAIR SAID, THIS IS A TIME TO CLIMB MOUNTAINS. I CLIMBED THE
GRAND TETON THIS SUMMER ... HARD WORK FOR ME. WHAT LIES BEFORE IS
HARDER WORK, BUT THE REWARD IS A BRIGHTER FUTURE FOR THIS PLANET.
WE WON'T HEAR OUR GREAT-GREAT GRANDCHILDREN SAY THANK YOU. BUT THEY WILL.
CONSIDER THE CURRENT POLICY OF CLIMATE CONTROL AND BIODIVERSITY PROTECTION AND THE
INCREASING POPULATION AND THEIR NEEDS FOR ENERGY, THEIR CHILDREN, AND A SECURE FUTURE. IN CONSEQUENCE, IT IS

THE AUTHOR'S CREDIT TO THE INSTITUTION OR ORGANIZATION WHICH FUND THE RESEARCH.

THEY ARE WORK FOR THE BENEFIT OF THE HUMAN AND THE ANIMAL.

THE LEGITIMATE CONCEPT FOR CLIMATE CONTROL AND BIODIVERSITY PROTECTION IS THE SOLUTION FOR A SUSTAINABLE
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THE STATE OF PROTECTED AREAS IN CANADA -- THE NGO PERSPECTIVE

by Kevin McNamee and Cliff Wallis

Canadian Nature Federation

THE CANADIAN NATURE FEDERATION

- CANADA'S NATIONAL VOICE FOR NATURE AND NATURALISTS
- 20,000 MEMBERS
- LONG-STANDING ROLE IN PROMOTING PROTECTED AREAS AND ECOLOGICAL INTEGRITY
- REFOCUSING ON GRASSROOTS AND ON ENVIRONMENTAL ADVOCACY
PROTECTED AREAS
--THE PRESENT AND RECENT PAST

- FAILURE OF BUREAUCRACY TO ENFORCE LAWS AND POLICIES (Wood Buffalo Logging; Banff Development)
- NGOs GOING TO COURT (Wood Buffalo, Banff)
- NGOs SEEK HELP IN INTERNATIONAL ARENA (Canada sensitive to criticism from others)
- STRONG PUBLIC AND POLITICAL SUPPORT FOR COMPLETING SYSTEMS OF PROTECTED AREAS (recognition that saving wild areas is an essential part of Canada's economic and environmental well-being)
- MULTI-STAKEHOLDER APPROACH TO ISSUES RESOLUTION (Wood Bison, Bow Valley Study, B.C. CORE Planning Process)
- NEW PARKS BEING ESTABLISHED
- TREND TO ECOSYSTEM-BASED MANAGEMENT (expansion of Ontario's Wabakimi Provincial Park, Model Forests and Jasper, Prince Albert, Fundy and Gros Morne National Parks)
REASONS FOR FAILURE

• Lack of Political Will, e.g. Alberta, leading to talk and cut, talk and drill, talk and allocate -- *lots of talk and little protection*

• Absence of Strong Advocacy Groups

• Budget Cutbacks

REASONS FOR PROGRESS

• NGO/Public Pressure, e.g. new B.C. parks; leadership of WWF Spaces Campaign -- 600,000 signatures and industry support)

• Government Leadership (e.g. B.C.)

• Partnerships (Friends of Parks, Industry, Environmental NGOs)

• Economic Transition Strategies for Affected Areas

• Need to End Uncertainty and Conflict

• Land Claims Settlement
SUCCESSES

- July 95--B.C. to designate 2.4 million hectares in 106 new protected areas
- Feb. 95--Manitoba establishes 4 new parks protecting more than 2.1 million hectares
- April 94--Nova Scotia releases plan for public review, proposes protecting 287,000 hectares in 31 new protected areas
- PEI uses land trading to protect private land
- Restrictions on development on sensitive lands outside protected areas (B.C. CORE planning process, 25% of Cariboo-Chilcotin plan)
- Khutzeymateen--Canada's first grizzly bear sanctuary
- Kitlope--North America's largest intact temperate rainforest
- Saguenay and Gwaii Haanas marine parks
- Vuntut, Tuktut Nogait/Bluenose - land claims and protected areas working for community interests
PROTECTED AREAS -- THE FUTURE

- CONFLICT CONFLICT CONFLICT
- CONTINUE LOSING WILDLANDS AT 1 SQ. KM/HR
- PRODUCES GREATER CONFLICT AND MORE PUBLIC DEMAND TO SAVE WILD AREAS
- MORE PAs (even in "underdog" natural regions) AND STRENGTHENED LEGISLATION
- STILL SMALL POTATOES--(only 5.2% of Canada protected in WCU Category I and II, dramatically up from 3.4% in 1989; < 5% of Canada's 400 natural regions adequately represented, > 50% have little or no representation)
- PAs IN SETTLED CANADA WILL BECOME INCREASINGLY ISOLATED ECOLOGICALLY
- MORE DEMANDS TO OPEN PAs FOR NEW TOURISM AND RECREATION DEVELOPMENT AND TO EXPLOIT NATURAL RESOURCES (e.g. Waterton, Dinosaur)
- MORE PRESSURE FROM NGOs (e.g. WWF's Owner's Manual; International Campaigns Aimed at Recalcitrant Provinces and Industries)
- MORE PARTNERSHIPS TO SOLVE ECOLOGICAL INTEGRITY PROBLEMS
## 1994/95 World Wildlife Fund
### Endangered Spaces Report Card

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Jurisdiction</th>
<th>Ecological Criteria</th>
<th>Critical Path</th>
<th>PA System Completion</th>
<th>Annual Rate of Progress</th>
<th>Adequacy of Protection</th>
<th>Legislation and Policies</th>
<th>1995 Grade</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>FEDERAL-TERRESTRIAL</strong></td>
<td>C</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>C-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>FEDERAL-MARINE</strong></td>
<td>C</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>D-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>YUKON</strong></td>
<td>D</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>NORTHWEST TERRITORIES</strong></td>
<td>D</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>BRITISH COLUMBIA</strong></td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>B?</td>
<td>B?</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ALBERTA</strong></td>
<td>D</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SASKATCHEWAN</strong></td>
<td>D</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>D+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>MANITOBA</strong></td>
<td>C</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>C-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ONTARIO</strong></td>
<td>C</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>D+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>QUEBEC</strong></td>
<td>D</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>D+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>NEW BRUNSWICK</strong></td>
<td>C</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>D-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>NOVA SCOTIA</strong></td>
<td>B</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>C+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>PRINCE EDWARD ISLAND</strong></td>
<td>A</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>NEWFOUNDLAND</strong></td>
<td>C</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>C-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
HOW TO DO BETTER

- NEED PROTECTED AREA MINISTRY SUPPORT FOR NGOs AND THEIR RECOMMENDATIONS
  - governments may not like what NGOs say about their decisions but recognize NGO work will usually support protection policies even when there is strong political interference

- PROTECTED AREA MINISTRIES SHOULD BE ADVOCATES FOR PROTECTION; NOT COMPROMISING MULTI-STAKEHOLDER CONSULTATION GROUPS
  
  - Agricultural, Energy and Natural Resource Extraction Departments often consult only with the industries they represent, bringing strong voices for development to the Cabinet table
  
  - Environmental Protection agencies consult with everybody, bringing compromised voices for protection to the Cabinet table
  
  - either need environmental NGO involvement with all agencies or stronger ties to protected area agencies
"WE STAND ON GUARD FOR THEE...":
An overview of current protected areas initiatives in Canada
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INTRODUCTION: Some thoughts on Canada

Stretching from the Atlantic coast in the east to the Pacific coast in the west and from the Great Lakes in the south to the archipelago of islands in the Arctic, Canada is a land of incredible diversity. Within its land mass of 9.9 million sq km are boreal forests and temperate rainforests, prairie grasslands, mountains and deserts. And with one of the longest coastlines of any nation, it also has a diverse marine heritage. On a global scale, this natural heritage is impressive: 20% of the planet’s remaining wilderness (excluding Antarctica), 20% of the world’s freshwater, 24% of remaining wetlands and 10% of the world’s forests are found in Canada. Ninety percent of the land-mass is owned by the government, in so-called Crown land, giving governments both the responsibility and the opportunity for protecting Canada’s rich endowment. In some parts of the country, however, much of the land is in private hands, reflecting patterns of historical development.

Throughout its history, Canada has depended on its abundant natural resources for its wealth and prosperity. Fish, fur and forests, followed by agriculture, provided the basis for development. Today, the economy is still largely resource-based. In 1993, for example, forest product exports were worth $26.7 billion and mining contributed $20 billion to the Canadian economy. In 1991, Canadians spent nearly $5.6 billion on wildlife-related activities such as photography, birdwatching, hunting and fishing while American tourists spent an estimated $800 million on the same activities.

"The wilds" are not only economically significant to Canada. They occupy an important place in the psyche of many Canadians who identify themselves with the untamed, elemental beauty of this country and they have inspired generations of painters, poets and musicians. Canadians have a deep affinity for the natural world around them.
PROTECTED AREAS IN CANADA

Governments in Canada have been creating parks and other kinds of protected areas for over one hundred years and just as "diversity" describes Canada's landscape, so too is "diversity" the watchword in any attempt to describe Canada's current work in this area. Since the establishment of the first national park at Banff (1885), the first wildlife sanctuary at Last Mountain Lake in Saskatchewan (1887) and first provincial park - Algonquin, in Ontario (1893) - various systems of government-owned protected areas have grown across the country and the province of Quebec is celebrating the centennial of its first park, Mont Tremblant Park, this year. Established by the federal, provincial and territorial governments to protect the natural features of Canada's diverse landscapes and to provide opportunities for Canadians and visitors to experience outdoor recreational opportunities, national and provincial parks, ecological reserves, wildlife reserves, migratory bird sanctuaries and a myriad of other protected areas have been created, with varying degrees of legal protection and a range of permitted and prohibited activities. Some of these protected areas are the responsibility of the federal, provincial or territorial park agencies; others are the responsibility of wildlife agencies or other parts of the government. In addition to government efforts, some protected areas are created and managed through private stewardship initiatives or partnerships with non-government organizations such as The Nature Conservancy of Canada and the Island Nature Trust of Prince Edward Island. According to the National Conservation Areas Data Base (NCADB), maintained by the State of the Environment Directorate of Environment Canada, approximately 80 million hectares of Canada are in some kind of protected area. Approximately half of these protected areas are considered highly protected areas - IUCN categories I and II - with the remainder being IUCN III-V protected areas.

In Canada's federal system, the federal government and the 10 provincial and 2 territorial governments have all established and are managing systems of parks. As wildlife management is primarily a provincial responsibility, protected areas for wildlife conservation are largely provincial, though the Canadian Wildlife

The Diversity of Canada’s Approach to Protected Areas Is Reflected Not Only in the Variety of Designations Used and the Multiplicity of Protected Areas Systems, But Also in the Institutional and Management Structures Which Have Developed to Support Their Establishment and Management. Some Park Agencies Are or Have Been Housed Within Ministries of Tourism, Recreation or Economic Development, While Others Reside in Departments of Natural Resources or Environment. The National Parks System Is Presently Part of the Department of Canadian Heritage, a Federal Department Also Responsible for Amateur Sport, Canadian Identity and Arts and Cultural Programs. Wildlife Agencies Are Normally Found in Departments of Natural Resources in the Provinces and Territories, While the Federal Wildlife Agency Is Found in the Environment Department. To Address Some of the Challenges Inherent in Canada’s Federal System, the Canadian Wildlife Directors Meet Regularly, as Does the Federal-Provincial Parks Council (FPPC), to Discuss Issues of Common Concern and to Develop, Where Possible, Cooperative Activities.

In Addition to These Intergovernmental Fora, the Canadian Council on Ecological Areas (CCEA) Makes an Important Contribution to Protected Areas Activity in Canada. Bringing Together Government and Non-Government Organizations, Industry and the Research Community, It Provides a Forum for Sharing Information and Expertise and Devotes Much of Its Efforts to Encouraging the Science Required for Conservation Management, Ecological Integrity and Biodiversity Conservation.

As Can Be Expected, Current Protected Areas Efforts in Canada Reflect Not Only Present Understanding and Thinking About Protected Areas, but Also the Origins and
long history of these efforts. Historically, for example, some of the country’s park systems were developed as, and continue to be, important resources for tourism and recreation, and vehicles for local economic development. At a time when park agencies are increasing their focus on protecting features of the natural landscape and maintaining ecological integrity within the parks, these parks systems will nevertheless continue to play their tourism and recreation roles. Wildlife agencies are also changing some of their approaches. For example, to ensure that management activities enhance all the species sharing a habitat, they are now adopting a broader biodiversity perspective compared to an earlier focus on the management of single species.

CANADA'S PROTECTED AREAS GOALS: Sustainable Development, Representation and 12%

During the late 1980s and early 1990s, heightened awareness of the impacts of human activity on the planet's natural systems focused public and political attention on the need for improving the balance between our use of the Earth's resources and our stewardship of them. This attention produced several important concepts that now figure prominently in Canadian discussions of parks and protected areas, discussions which increasingly focus on the importance of protected areas to the overall effort to adequately protect our natural environment and life-support systems. In 1987, the Brundtland Report popularized the concept of "sustainable development", characterized as a state of social and economic development in which the present generation satisfies its own needs without compromising the potential of future generations to do the same. One of the "indispensable prerequisites for sustainable development", the report stated, was to "save species and their ecosystems." With a focus on protecting key species and critical habitat, wildlife programs in Canada contribute directly to the pursuit of these goals.

The Brundtland report also popularized another concept which has assumed an important place in Canadian thinking about protected areas. It included the
statement: "a consensus of professional opinion suggests that the total expanse of protected areas [4 million sq km or 4% of the Earth's surface in 1987] needs to be at least tripled if it is to constitute a representative sample of Earth's ecosystems". This statement has given rise, in Canada at least, to the widely quoted figure of 12% as the target for the amount of land that should be protected if sustainable development is to be achieved. It is a quantifiable and easily-remembered measure, and one which has considerable currency with the public. It must be remembered, however, that the more elusive goal of the Brundtland Report is really the protection of a "representative sample of the Earth's ecosystems."

In 1989, World Wildlife Fund (Canada) translated this goal into a public campaign to promote the establishment of additional protected areas across the country. It launched the Endangered Spaces Campaign, a program that aims "to establish a network of protected areas representing all the natural regions of Canada by the year 2000". By mobilizing broad-based public support for this goal, WWF set out to secure a political commitment from each government for this goal and to monitor progress toward it. In doing so, it has recognized that when each of Canada's diverse ecosystems is adequately represented by a protected area, approximately 12% of Canada's land-mass will be protected, but it is not pushing 12% as a specific target. Such a target, it could be argued, could be achieved in this country by focusing efforts in the vast wilderness of northern Canada or parts of the country dominated by "rock and ice", but it would not have the intended effect of protecting representative areas or those areas of Canada under most immediate threat. Achieving "representivity" within systems of protected areas has become a key concept in Canada over the last few years.

A National Goal: A Statement of Commitment To Complete Canada's Networks of Protected Areas

Though the focus on completing networks of representative protected areas is a relatively recent development for some parks systems in Canada, government thinking on the issues raised by the Brundtland Report, WWF's campaign and the
heightened interest in environmental policy generally reached a significant conclusion on November 25, 1992. At that time, the Canadian Parks Ministers' Council, the Canadian Council of Ministers of the Environment and the Wildlife Ministers' Council of Canada met in an unprecedented "Tri-Council" session and endorsed *A Statement of Commitment To Complete Canada's Networks of Protected Areas*. Representatives of the Canadian Council of Forest Ministers and representatives of Canada's four national Aboriginal organizations also attended the meeting and endorsed the *Statement of Commitment*.

In signing the *Statement of Commitment*, the Council members agreed to "make every effort to:

- Complete Canada's networks of protected areas representative of Canada's land-based natural regions by the year 2000 and accelerate the protection of areas representative of Canada's marine regions

- Accelerate the identification and protection of Canada's critical wildlife habitat

- Adopt frameworks, strategies, and time-frames for the completion of the protected areas networks

- Continue to cooperate in the protection of ecosystems, landscapes and wildlife habitat

- Ensure that protected areas are integral components of all sustainable development strategies"

Agreed upon by all 13 senior governments, The *Statement of Commitment to Complete Canada's Networks of Protected Areas* now constitutes the clearest statement of a national goal for protected areas in Canada. Though it is not a starting point for Canada's protected areas efforts, it can be seen as a significant
step in a long history, a point along the way, when current thinking about protected areas was, in effect, "codified" into a single, national political statement. It reflected individual government’s endorsement of the WWF campaign goals, existing and ongoing initiatives such as the development of British Columbia’s Protected Areas Strategy and other policy commitments, such as the 1990 Wildlife Policy for Canada, which contained the commitment to “complete and maintain comprehensive systems of protected areas, through legislation and/or policy, that include representative ecological types and give priority to the protection of endangered or limited habitats.”

By including the commitment to “accelerate the identification and protection of Canada’s critical wildlife habitat”, the Statement of Commitment recognized that a comprehensive approach to protected areas is required. Protecting areas that are representative of larger ecological units must be complemented by protecting areas that are special, unique or otherwise important for key species and habitat. In Canada, this latter concept is often considered to include protecting “critical wildlife habitat” and some of Canada’s largest protected areas, such as the Thelon Game Sanctuary and the Queen Maud Gulf Migratory Bird Sanctuary, both in the Northwest Territories, are managed for wildlife conservation purposes. For simplicity’s sake, the protected areas agenda in Canada is often treated as a combination of protecting unique areas, protecting representative areas and protecting critical wildlife habitat.

The Statement of Commitment is now being implemented across the country. Each jurisdiction is addressing its commitments through its own protected areas programs and planning processes, in keeping with the shared responsibilities for protected areas in Canada. In some cases, these efforts are a continuation of initiatives - developed in response to other factors - that were already underway when the Statement of Commitment was signed, while in other cases, new activity has been launched since 1992.
ADDRESSING THE STATEMENT OF COMMITMENT: A work in progress

Attempting to describe the progress of each government toward fulfilling the Statement of Commitment is beyond the scope of this paper. However, Nova Scotia’s efforts illustrate some of the key features of the approach that, in a general way, has been adopted and is being followed across the country.

In 1990, Nova Scotia set out to develop a systematic approach to protected areas planning in the province. The result, its Proposed Systems Plan for Parks & Protected Areas, rests on an ecologically-based classification of the province's land-mass into 77 distinct "natural landscapes". Of the 77 landscapes, only seven are currently considered to be well-represented by national and provincial parks, national wildlife areas and other existing protected areas. The province has identified 31 candidate protected areas that are representative of some of the remaining landscapes and these areas are currently being considered through a public consultation process. These candidate areas were identified through a multi-step exercise. To begin, the government used a province-wide air photo survey to identify 74 "study areas" (defined as areas where natural ecosystems were clearly evident and where change occurred primarily as a result of natural processes) in excess of 2000 hectares that were predominantly Crown land. These 74 study areas were then evaluated to determine: their representative qualities in relationship to the broader landscape type(s) in which they occurred; the presence of outstanding natural features; the availability of wilderness travel opportunities; and the occurrence of private holdings and of existing land- or resource-use commitments. This led to the identification of 31 potential candidate sites which were subsequently reviewed more thoroughly within the Department of Natural Resources to identify existing commitments with respect to land and resource use. This review process was supported by a moratorium on all new land- and resource-use commitments within the potential candidate protected areas - not a common practise in Canada - to ensure that the areas' natural values were not compromised during the review.