

**INQUIRY INTO DINGOES IN NATIONAL PARKS IN NEW
SOUTH WALES**

Name: Name suppressed

Date Received: 16 July 2026

Partially
Confidential

This submission argues that dingoes should receive the highest level of legal protection within New South Wales national parks and other public conservation lands.

Dingoes are Australia's apex terrestrial predator and play an essential role in maintaining the ecological integrity of protected areas. National parks exist to conserve native biodiversity, ecological processes and natural heritage. Routine lethal control of dingoes within these areas is fundamentally inconsistent with those conservation objectives and undermines the ecological functions that dingoes perform.

The current practice of trapping, shooting and poisoning dingoes causes significant and avoidable suffering to highly social, intelligent animals. The use of 1080 poison has been widely criticised on animal welfare grounds because it can result in prolonged distress before death. The destruction of breeding adults also fragments family groups, leaving dependent pups vulnerable to starvation, disrupting natural social structures and potentially increasing conflict by destabilising established packs.

This submission recommends that the NSW Government prohibit routine lethal control of dingoes within national parks, permitting it only in exceptional circumstances where there is a demonstrable and immediate threat to human safety that cannot reasonably be managed through non-lethal means.

Where livestock conflicts occur outside protected areas, governments should prioritise evidence-based, non-lethal management strategies, including exclusion fencing, guardian animals, improved husbandry practices, compensation mechanisms and practical support for affected landholders, rather than relying on widespread lethal control. These approaches better balance agricultural needs with biodiversity conservation and animal welfare.

In the view of this submission, the continued routine killing of dingoes in protected areas is ecologically counterproductive and ethically unacceptable.