




Speech By
Shane Knuth

MEMBER FOR DALRYMPLE

Record of Proceedings, 10 May 2016

NATURE CONSERVATION AND OTHER LEGISLATION AMENDMENT BILL

 **Mr KNUTH** (Dalrymple—KAP) (11.26 pm): I would like to express my complete opposition to the Nature Conservation and Other Legislation Amendment Bill. This bill aims to take the community out of national parks by reinstating the conservation of nature as the sole objective of this bill. Sporting teams, schools and community groups may no longer have access to the beauty of these national parks. The bill could lock out sporting groups and schoolchildren from publicly owned parks as a result of the passing of this bill. This bill could lock out small businesses which run tours, rope courses and hiking tours from our parks.

The bill seeks to revert rolling term leases for agriculture, grazing or pastoral purposes within nature conservation areas and specified national parks back to term leases by excluding them from rolling term lease provisions under the Land Act. Some of these rolling term leases have been ongoing since time began. This bill seeks to tell landowners that someone who has never been to their property knows all about their property and knows what is in the best interests of their property, while their families have been looking after these properties for generations. The bill also takes away the right of appeal for landowners.

The explanatory notes state that rolling term leases will become term leases 'to allow inconsistent activities to be phased out upon expiry of the lease and allow these lands to be protected for the purpose that they were intended'. If a parcel of land has been a grazing property for 100 years and the landowner has cared for it, maintained the native growth and continuously kept the feral animals to a minimum, how can this be anything but what is intended? Landowners invest more than just money into caring for the land that they have rolling term leases over. They eradicate pests, both plant and animal, maintain fences and have a genuine connection to the land that they live on. Even though at the present time the Labor government perceives this legislation will not affect landowners or ecotourism, the explanatory notes state that ecotourism and landowners in national parks will be heavily impacted. It is an illusion to say that it will not when the bill tells us that it will.

I remind the House that Wayne Goss won a massive majority and it appeared absolutely impossible that he would ever lose government. Then he made a decision to kick the fishermen out of the national parks. He thought that would be a great vote winner for him, but the people revolted. In the end he lost 35 seats and lost government. This bill is bad medicine. It is not good for this state. It is not good for the landowners. It is not good for ecotourism. I completely oppose this legislation.