

**Submission
No 12**

**PREVENTION OF CRUELTY TO ANIMALS AMENDMENT (VIRTUAL STOCK
FENCING) BILL 2024**

Name: Mr Alan Schmidt

Date Received: 9 April 2024

Dear Sir,

This letter is in support of the review of the 'Prevention of Cruelty to Amendment (Virtual Stock Fencing) Bill 2024'

I wish to show my support for this bill and to give some reasons why it is important to cattle producers, and it should be supported. As background, I am 71 years old with a lifetime of experience in the cattle industry having held senior positions with many large cattle breeding and fattening companies throughout Australia.

I am a strong supporter of Virtual Fencing and believe that there are significant advantages for agricultural production and environmental protection. Virtual Fencing will provide grazers with the ability to move stock on a daily basis (without the significant expense of substantial fencing works), see where stock are at all times, be notified if stock are sick or bulls are not performing and be notified of any stock disappearance. These are huge benefits which are currently not accessible through available technology.

Virtual Fencing also allows sensitive environmental areas to be excluded from grazing pressure. This can include waterways and areas subject to erosion, which will lead to improved water quality and stable environments.

The ability to move stock on a continuous basis will allow for the maximum accumulation of soil carbon by enabling pastures to be intensively grazed and then provided with long rest periods (which are what drives carbon creation in our soils).

Virtual Fencing is legal in many other Australian states and competing beef and dairy production countries, such as Canada, the USA and NZ.

The negative argument is that the small electric pulse is cruel.

The positive arguments are:

Field trials have shown no difference in production of dairy cows between those Virtual Fenced and those run normally. This would imply that they are not stressed.

The systems provide the farmer with information on animals that have not moved or are moving in an abnormal manner (indicating that they are sick), which allows them to be attended to versus potentially not being seen at all and perishing.

I believe that a lot less animals will die with the introduction of Virtual Fencing than will die without it and many will suffer less due to being able to be treated versus not being seen.

The environmental benefits have no other way of being delivered.

I can see no reasons to keep the technology from being available in NSW and a lot of very beneficial reasons for it to be allowed.

Please feel free to contact me, should you have any questions.