

From: [REDACTED] Environment

Subject: FW: Clarification of submission from [REDACTED] : Eastern Grey Kangaroo draft management plan

Date: Tuesday, 28 March 2017 8:56:42 AM

[REDACTED]

Sent: Monday, 27 March 2017 11:43 AM

To: Environment

Subject: Clarification of submission from D. Wyatt: Eastern Grey Kangaroo draft management plan

Manager, Conservation Research, Environment, Planning and Sustainable Development
Directorate.

Dear Sir/Madam,

Re my submission sent by email on Friday:

If possible, please replace the first sentence of paragraph 7 with the following:

"The plan offers a replacement for the assumed effects of former hunting by Aborigines and dingoes."

Thank you.

Yours faithfully

[REDACTED]

From: [REDACTED] Environment

Subject: FW: Submission: Eastern Grey Kangaroo: Draft controlled native species management plan.

Date: Tuesday, 28 March 2017 8:39:08 AM

Attachments: [Kangaroo_submission_from_](#) [REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

Sent: Friday, 24 March 2017 3:42 PM

To: Environment

Subject: Submission: Eastern Grey Kangaroo: Draft controlled native species management plan.

Manager, Conservation Research, Environment, Planning and Sustainable Development
Directorate.

Dear Sir/Madam,

Please find attached my submission on the Eastern Grey Kangaroo: Draft controlled native species management plan.

Yours faithfully

[REDACTED]

**Eastern Grey Kangaroo:
Draft controlled native species management plan.**

Submission from [REDACTED]

I oppose many aspects of the plan, mainly because it addresses a problem that is man-made (the growth of our city) but offers a solution that makes an innocent party (the kangaroo) pay the price.

Another reason is that despite the countless creatures that have been and continue to be killed or displaced by population growth, the plan purports to show concern for some animal and plant species that now appear endangered, and chooses to protect them by killing another species.

What this plan appears to be saying is that one species has a greater right to life than another. This raises ethical issues. It is not nature at work. Neither is precautionary killing. I believe it is a presumption that scientific analysis can justify the wholesale slaughter of sentient creatures.

Kangaroos were once free to roam what are now rural leases. Now they are at the mercy of the farmer. The fact that 11,130 kangaroos were shot on rural leases in 2015 as a profit-protecting strategy is a measure of what they can expect.

The plan says the culling of kangaroos is not done to address vehicle-kangaroo collisions, but it mentions efforts made to minimise accidents. These efforts are to be applauded, and need to be extended.

The conundrum of what to do with infant Eastern Grey Kangaroos orphaned in such circumstances has been solved by making it illegal to care for them, even though there are carers willing and able to do so. The infants are "euthanased" by a blow to the head (not the way we would treat a dog or cat). Compare this with the many volunteer carers outside Canberra who nursed wildlife victims of recent bush fires without discrimination on the grounds of species.

The plan offers a replacement for the assumed former predation of Aborigines and dingos. But a government cull of, say, 2000 kangaroos a year (an average of five or six animals a day dying a violent death) is not the real total. At least this number must die on Canberra's roads. Add these two figures to the 11,000 kangaroos shot on ACT rural land and the actual annual death toll of kangaroos in Canberra caused by humans is likely to be at least 15,000 a year, or 40 per day. The facts should be made clear.

Before white settlement kangaroos had a chance to escape from their pursuers. The individuals that died were probably the slowest or weakest, which is nature's method. I doubt this is the criterion used in the government's program or on farms. Today's kangaroos have no hope of escaping the shooter's bullet or the speeding car, and their deaths are more or less random. So nature's selection process is missing.

Kangaroos, like many animal species, have family ties. When shooters “cull” a group of kangaroos, they must break these bonds, causing harm which we would all appreciate if they were humans. As they are not, we are inclined not to empathize with them. This is our failing.

The sight of the bodies of scores of kangaroos lying on our roads does not seem to touch us much. If it did those bodies would not be left where they fall. How many are checked for pouched joeys? It is a strange way to treat an animal on our coat of arms.

As the dominant species we have a responsibility to all others, including the Eastern Grey Kangaroo. I believe we need a more compassionate and proactive attitude to kangaroos, helping them to move more freely through the landscape we have changed to suit ourselves, instead of fencing them in and creating deadly hazards for them. Higher fences can protect where necessary; lower fences where suitable could allow more freedom.

I suggest that Instead of treating kangaroos as a problem to be solved by killing them, we aim to protect them from harm on our roads and remove them from shooters' sights.