

**ST. GEORGE HUNTERS & ANGLERS ASSOCIATION INC.**

**REGISTERED OFFICE :**

**2-28 Kaleula Crescent, Kiama, NSW 2533**

24 November 2015

Natural Resources Commission  
GPO Box 5341  
Sydney NSW 2001

Email : [nrc@nrc.nsw.gov.au](mailto:nrc@nrc.nsw.gov.au)

Dear Sir/Madam

**SUBMISSION – STATE-WIDE REVIEW OF NSW PEST ANIMAL MANAGEMENT.**

Please accept the enclosed Submission from the St. George Hunters & Anglers Association Inc. (STGHAA) to the above review.

STGHAA is only a small hunting and fishing Club with around 45 members and while we may not have the sophistication and resources of many of the larger hunting Clubs and Associations, we do have an abiding interest in hunting non-indigenous pest animal species and other vermin by suitably accredited hunters.

I am not sure we have ever considered ourselves part of NSW Biosecurity Strategy (as it relates to pest animal management) but if that is the document that includes prevention, eradication, containing or reducing pest animals coupled with the protection of assets from the impact of established pest animals, then so be it.

Please contact the writer if you require clarification on any of the matters raised in our Submission.

Yours faithfully

*Peter Snelling*

Peter G Snelling  
Secretary/Public Officer.

TEL: 0429.010.005  
Email [peter.snelling@iinet.net.au](mailto:peter.snelling@iinet.net.au)

COPY : Gareth Ward  
MP for Kiama

## **ST. GEORGE HUNTERS & ANGLERS ASSOCIATION INC.**

### **SUBMISSION – STATE-WIDE REVIEW OF NSW PEST ANIMAL MANAGEMENT**

#### **1. PRESENT SITUATION**

This is succinctly covered in the Premier's Terms of Reference which states, in part :

*“Pest animals create economic, social and environmental costs for the NSW community. Across Australia, pest animals have been estimated to cost \$745 million annually, including losses in agriculture and expenditure in management, administration and research. They also threaten the environment. Within NSW more than 350 species, populations and communities are considered to be threatened by the impacts of pest animals. The social and emotional impacts on farmers and communities are also significant, especially where pest animals kill livestock”.*

“Where many invasive species are already well established and widespread in NSW, eradication with existing control measures is not achievable” – DPI 2015.

#### **2. THE PROBLEM(S)**

Government responses to the above problems are normally budget limited, usually involve baiting (with its adverse impacts on natural fauna), short in duration and therefore of limited long term benefit.

In fact some government initiatives are counter-productive e.g. National Parks insisting that kangaroos killed on a property must be left on the property which actively promotes other feral pest animals.

Evidence based studies such as the cost benefit analysis of wild dog eradication performed by the then Game Management Council and cost benefits of hunting performed by the University of Queensland, seem to have been ignored.

Government appreciates the positive results of hunting in state forests but does not translate these to national parks.

Some government departments resort to age old dogmatic approaches such as bounties don't work; hunters only scatter animals; which are either untrue or patently incorrect.

### **3. THE WAY FORWARD**

Clearly, it would seem that recreational hunters are best equipped to provide sustained pressure on pest animals not provided by government instrumentalities.

In hunting pest animals, hunters are not only providing a service to the State but pay licence fees to government for the privilege !

Additionally, in pursuing hunting activities, hunters also make a positive contribution to local economies by way of firearms and ammunition purchases, specialist motor vehicles and equipment, fuel, camping gear etc. etc.

It is important for government to realise that if hunter's efforts are contributing to reduce the cost burden (\$745 million across Australia) of pest animals and are paying for the benefit to do so, this cannot be treated by government as a one-way street.

While it may be a step too far to expect government to provide assistance in things such as fuel costs for hunters getting to pest animal infected areas etc., it is realistic for them to recognise hunters efforts by way of paying a bounty for feral animals taken. This is an infinitely controllable mechanism which allows governments to manage feral animal populations by increasing or lowering bounties paid. Selective programs can be mounted in high infestation areas with bounties set accordingly. This has proven beneficial in other States and conclusively proves that bounties do work.

Given suitable conditions, it is also possible that some feral animals can be treated as a commercial resource and this could provide win-win solutions for governments and hunters alike.

Allowing land holders to issue 'tags' to cull animals on their properties as a means of controlling pest animals is also seen as beneficial.

### **4. THE SOLUTION**

Working together, with government instrumentalities providing targeted short term solutions and hunters providing ongoing long term pest animal control pressures, a sustained and cost effective program can be achieved.

Paying bounties for pest animals taken is a relatively simple and inexpensive way for government to recognise hunter's efforts in ongoing pest animal reduction.