

Wildlife Act Review

Submission Comment 43:

Contributor: Individual

Primary interests:

- Management and control of wildlife causing problems or damage
- Wildlife welfare
- Licenses and authorisations

Comment

I own and manage a [REDACTED] farm [REDACTED]. Our business is a substantial contributor to our National economy, and directly supports industry and employment in our region. Ten percent of our holding is privately conserved for wildlife with no management or controls being implemented. The remainder is either grazed or has annual crops planted. Kangaroos abound in numbers, which without abundant food and water on offer would never have existed before European settlement. To reduce the degree of grazing pressure exerted by this overpopulation of mainly eastern grey Kangaroos, we have exclusion fences which allow our pastures to remain sustainable, and our crops to be economically viable. The sheer pressure of numbers of hungry Kangaroos cannot be contained by fencing alone and we do avail ourselves of the Authority to Control Wildlife system. This along with fencing allows us to sensibly manage the problem. We still have a need to cull Kangaroos but at a much reduced number. The "Authority to Control Wildlife" is a sensible and practical tool to assist producers like me to manage wildlife. It has been historically regionally managed by knowledgeable, practical people who know the issues. This authorisation to control wildlife must be retained. Kangaroo numbers in my region 150 years ago would have been restricted by the available food and water. Dry seasons meant that only small groups could survive with the meagre water available. Now mobs of hundreds of Kangaroos are common. This unnaturally large population is not sustainable, and presents as a welfare issue in even average summers.

Provided May 20/2021