

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

Name: Name suppressed

Date Received: 17 July 2026

Partially
Confidential

Email:

14 July 2026

The Committee Manager
Animal Welfare Committee
Parliament of New South Wales
Macquarie Street, Sydney NSW 2000

SUBMISSION: Inquiry into the treatment and the cultural and ecological significance of Dingoes in national parks in New South Wales

To the Committee Members,

Thank you for the opportunity to write a submission for this inquiry.

My name is _____, and I am an enrolled voter who resides in New South Wales.

My professional background includes working as a government lawyer in the law enforcement and child protection sectors and previously as a TAFE teacher of English and Literacy. My legal studies included units on environmental, climate change and animal law, and ethics. Additionally, I hold a TAFE qualification in horticulture, which included specialised training in the safe use of pesticides and insecticides and integrated pest management for insects and plants.

My submission asks the New South Wales Government ("NSW Government") and the New South Wales National Parks and Wildlife Service ("NPWS") to stop the killing of Dingoes in national parks and on private properties, and calls for a shift toward humane, science-based ways of protecting native animal species and supporting farming communities.

(a) The genetic status of Dingoes, the distinction between Dingoes and dogs and recent research into the genetic profile of NSW Dingoes

New genetic research shows that over 75% of wild canids in NSW are in fact Dingoes, not "wild dogs." Calling them wild dogs is scientifically incorrect. Furthermore, killing Dingoes breaks up their family packs. This pack disruption causes social confusion and makes Dingoes more likely to breed with domestic dogs.

(b) The legislative, regulatory and policy frameworks governing the management of Dingoes in New South Wales in national parks

Dingoes are the only native mammals denied protection under the *Biodiversity Conservation Act 2016* (NSW).ⁱ Current laws use broad terms like "nuisance" or "troublesome" to justify killing them.ⁱⁱ This legislative bias against Dingoes reduce a vital native animal to a pest to be exterminated.ⁱⁱⁱ It causes immense suffering, solely to protect farming interests.

(c) The ecological role of Dingoes in national parks

As apex predators, Dingoes keep nature in balance. They naturally control kangaroo populations and scare pests like foxes and feral cats away from smaller native animals and livestock. When Dingoes are removed, fox and cat numbers rise. This imbalance harms the environment and drives a sharp drop in the populations of smaller, endangered native animals.

(d) The cultural significance of Dingoes for First Nations communities

I will not presume to speak on behalf of First Nations communities as they are perfectly capable of articulately stating their own case.

I will however acknowledge that Dingoes have deep spiritual and family value for First Nations people. The 2023 *National First Nations Dingo Declaration* eloquently calls for a "Caring for Dingoes on Country" approach.

Indigenous communities must be consulted at every stage. Their voices should not be drowned out by professional lobbyists retained by farmers, nativist conservationists, and shooters and hunters interest groups.

(e) The impact of current government policies and programs for the management of Dingoes in national parks

Current Dingo management practices rely heavily on the use of traps and 1080 poisoned baits. Not only are these methods cruel; they are ineffective. Decades of data show that Dingo populations quickly bounce back after culling.^{iv}

Animals, both native and introduced, wild and domesticated, that ingest 1080 poison can suffer for many hours before dying, making it one of the most inhumane wildlife control methods still used in Australia.^v It is a fallacy to claim that Australian native animals are less likely to be killed by 1080 because its active ingredient, sodium fluoroacetate, is found in plants in the south-west of Western

Australia and native animals have developed an immunity to this toxin. For example, the forestry and agricultural industries in Tasmania have used 1080 poison to control wildlife browsing of seedlings, crops and pastures by native Tasmanian pademelons, Bennetts wallabies and brushtail possums.^{vi} Owls, Magpies, raptors and other carnivorous birds, as well as reptiles, are vulnerable to secondary poisoning, as are companion and working dogs in areas adjacent to 1080 drop zones.

More than sixty years ago, Rachel Carson's book *Silent Spring* warned of the environmental consequences of relying on poisons before their broader ecological impacts were properly understood.^{vii} Her message remains relevant today. The precautionary principle also supports a more careful approach by requiring governments to properly assess environmental risks before resorting to irreversible, lethal methods of wildlife management.^{viii}

(f) Dingo management including opportunities for incorporation of Indigenous knowledge and leadership in Dingo conservation in national parks

The NSW Government and NPWS should combine traditional Indigenous knowledge with modern science to manage our precious National Parks in a collaborative manner. Instead of spending money on eradicating Dingoes, the government should invest in non-lethal tools. Guardian animals including Maremma dogs, alpacas and donkeys, combined with the use of predator-proof electrified fencing can protect livestock while keeping Dingoes safe.

(g) Any other related matters

We need to move beyond outmoded conservation models that rely on hunting down, slaughtering and poisoning animals labelled as "invasive" or "feral".

Modern ecological science increasingly recognises that protecting biodiversity is not simply about whether a species is native or introduced. It is about how species interact within ecosystems, and how we can protect vulnerable native wildlife and domestic livestock using the most effective and humane methods available.^{ix} The NSW Government should invest in evidence-based conservation approaches that achieve these goals while reducing unnecessary animal suffering.^x

It is unfair to blame Dingoes for biodiversity loss while ignoring how human land-clearing and climate change destroys habitats.^{xi}

Finally, state-sanctioned killing normalises violence. Research shows that treating animals as disposable objects reinforces aggressive attitudes in society.^{xii} In my research for this submission, I was appalled to see confronting images of Dingoes dead and mutilated bodies strung up on fences or stuffed into rubbish bins in public places. This level of sadism is unacceptable in a modern society

governed by the rule of law.

In a state facing alarming and distressing rates of domestic and family violence, child abuse and exploitation—and recent public tragedies that have triggered tighter gun control legislation and procedures—our laws should model peaceful, innovative science-based solutions and empathy, rather than violence.

Summary of Recommendations

- **Stop all killing** of Dingoes inside NSW National Parks, including the use of trapping and 1080 poison baiting.
- **Ensure engagement with First Nations communities** in the development of Dingo management policies, along with co-management of policies and procedures.
- **Shift funding** to continued scientific research into, and the use of, non-lethal Dingo management practices including the use of guardian animals and predator-proof fencing on boundaries between National Parks and private properties.

Yours faithfully,

Endnotes

ⁱ *Biodiversity Conservation Act 2016* (NSW), Schedule 5, 'Protected animals'.

ⁱⁱ Sophie Riley, "Model Codes for Humane Treatment of Animals: Australian Law and Policy on Lethal Control of Pests," *Journal of International Wildlife Law & Policy* 18, no. 4 (2015): 278.

ⁱⁱⁱ Arian D. Wallach et al., "Recognizing animal personhood in compassionate conservation," *Conservation Biology* 34, no. 5 (2020): 1098–1099.

^{iv} Riley, "Model Codes for Humane Treatment of Animals," 281–282.

^v Wallach et al., "Recognizing animal personhood in compassionate conservation," 1102.

^{vi} Australian Government and the Tasmanian Department of Natural Resources and Environment, *Final Report – April 2011 Alternatives to 1080 Program: A Summary of Research, Extension and Demonstration Activities Funded and Undertaken under the Alternatives to 1080 Program*, accessed 17 July 2026, <https://nre.tas.gov.au/Documents/1080ReportFINAL.pdf>

^{vii} Rachel Carson, *Silent Spring* (Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1962).

^{viii} Riley, "Model Codes for Humane Treatment of Animals," 283, 287.

^{ix} Carlos Santana, "Ecology's war on invasive species isn't science," Aeon, accessed 17 July 2026, <https://aeon.co/essays/ecologys-war-on-invasive-species-isnt-science>.

^x Wallach et al., "Recognizing animal personhood in compassionate conservation," 1098, 1101.

^{xi} Riley, "Model Codes for Humane Treatment of Animals," 283, 287.

^{xii} *Ibid*, 1103.