Dear Members of the Legislative Scrutiny Committee,

I am a Territorian, born and bred in the Territory, conceived at the old Nightcliff drive-in Cinema and born in the Old Darwin Hospital on top of Myilly Point. I have run several major Businesses in the NT, as a Gaming Manager I ran the daytime operations for the NT's largest employer in the early 2000's The MGM Grand International Hotel and Casino. I won both employee and manager of the year and was rewarded with travel to Las Vegas, spoke as an Australian representative at the 15th Annual Gaming expo and enjoyed other perks of my effort.

I have performed on stage through drama representations in the NT, from school plays to several Beats, and several Times at the university and our DPAC. I entertained from an early age in major public entertainment venues and on national television until my early 20s. I have owned an operated Coffee business, jewellery stalls, Gardening businesses, Real estate companies and spent almost three decades keeping the public safe in a range of security roles.

I have trained just under 900 security personnel in the NT from Alice Springs, to Wadeye, to Darwin, many of the managers of current security companies, with over 2160 registered security personnel in the NT, that is a substantial chunk of the industry. A member and published author, with over 1,000 published articles and blogs since 2007, a trainer and recognised industry advocate with both international security associations and Australian. ASIS and ASIAL. I am a business owner, a security professional and a trainer/assessor.

I have spoken at major business training events in Las Vegas, Kuala Lumpur, Cairns, Brisbane and San Diego in front of over 5,000 paying attendees. I have led and coordinated marches and protests and provided over 14,000 bottles of water (Heggie Tears) to thousands of Territorians marching against government overreach and mismanagement.

I am an author with over 20 published academic manuals, books on violence de-escalation, read by members of parliament, and endorsed by Australian high Court Justices, the mediation council of Australia and the even some Major US City mayors and police associations. I have even written poetry and children's stories and I am **most grateful** for being a lucky husband and father to four amazing children, three born in Darwin.

I share this not to gain credibility, your acknowledgement is your own choice, I want you to understand that I am not special, that the Territory and many Territorians are some of the best in their fields and we are an industrious and intelligent group of Australians that often over-achieve both nationally and internationally. We are survivors and we thrive, because we are, flexible, free-thinking and unpredictable, we are extremely capable. We really don't need your interventions or meddling.

I appreciate the opportunity to provide feedback on the *Territory Coordinator Bill 2025*. Upon thorough examination, it becomes evident that this Bill poses significant threats to individual rights, property ownership, and the foundational principles of our democratic system. Worse, it places my home, *The Northern Territory,* at substantial risk of even greater mismanagement and abuse.

The Bill grants the Territory Coordinator extensive authority to designate areas for development and authorise entry onto private land without the owner's consent, provided a seven-day notice is given. This encroachment on private property rights disregards the sanctity of individual ownership and autonomy. The requirement of mere notification, without the necessity of obtaining consent, undermines the fundamental respect for personal property that is central to a free society.

The Bill's provision allowing the coordinator to direct public entities to undertake activities within designated development areas raises concerns about the potential for governmental overreach into the lives of citizens. Such powers, if unchecked and reigned in, will lead to arbitrary decisions that adversely affect individuals and communities, stripping them of their rights without due process.

The concentration of power in the hands of the Territory Coordinator, as proposed, effectively sidelines the judiciary's role in reviewing administrative decisions. By making the coordinator’s decisions final and not subject to appeal or review, the Bill eliminates essential checks and balances designed to prevent the abuse of power. This not only undermines the judiciary's constitutional role but also further erodes public trust in the government's commitment to fairness and justice.

The Bill's provisions allowing the Coordinator to override existing laws and regulations encroach upon the legislative powers of Parliament. This usurpation of parliamentary authority disrupts the balance of power that is crucial for a functioning democracy and sets a dangerous precedent for future governance.

The Bill's potential to exempt significant projects from environmental assessments and other regulatory processes has been met with public outcry, with critics labelling it as anti-democratic and authoritarian. The lack of lengthy and adequate consultation, particularly the exclusion of major population centres like Darwin and Palmerston from public forums, further exacerbates the perception of a government unwilling to engage with its citizens. This approach not only alienates the public but also fosters distrust in governmental institutions and processes.

Considering these concerns, it is evident that *the Territory Coordinator Bill 2025* poses significant risks to individual rights, property ownership, and the foundational principles of our democratic system. The concentration of unchecked power, the erosion of judicial oversight, and the disregard for public consultation undermine the very fabric of our society. Therefore, I urge the Legislative Assembly to reject this Bill in its entirety to preserve the rights and liberties of all Territorians and maintain the integrity of our democratic institutions.

Kind Regards,

[redacted]

Sam Wilks

[redacted]

Type text here

Please find my initial submission sent to OTC on the 16th January 2025.

Setting A Dangerous Precedent for Governance in the Northern Territory

by Sam Wilks

The proposal to establish a Territory Coordinator (TC) model in the Northern Territory (NT) represents an alarming concentration of power in an unelected official, granting them significant authority to override existing democratic and regulatory processes. While its proponents (the current Government) argue that this model will streamline approvals, foster economic development, and attract investment, the risks inherent in such a system outweigh its purported benefits. Historical precedent, philosophical principles, and practical concerns all point to why this model sets a dangerous precedent for the NT, undermining its progress toward self-governance and exposing its people to the risks of bureaucratic overreach.

History offers a clear warning about the dangers of centralised power, particularly in the NT. Before achieving self-government, the region suffered under external control, with decision-making dominated by unelected bureaucrats who prioritised their agendas over the needs of local communities. This systemic abuse disenfranchised Indigenous populations, stymied local development, and left a legacy of mistrust in governance.

The proposed TC model threatens to resurrect this dark chapter by consolidating decision-making authority in a single office. By granting the TC powers to override statutory processes, prioritise approvals, and exempt projects from legislative requirements, this model undermines the democratic principles that have been central to the NT's governance since achieving self-government. It risks fostering the same patterns of neglect and mismanagement that characterised its pre-self-government era.

The TC model is premised on the idea that regulatory efficiency will lead to economic growth. While reducing red tape is a positive goal, centralising decision-making in an unelected bureaucrat does not guarantee better outcomes. In fact, it leads without exception to the opposite, increased opacity, reduced accountability, and a higher likelihood of corruption.

Economic and philosophical principles underscore the value of decentralised decision-making. Markets thrive on competition and innovation, which emerge from a diversity of perspectives and approaches. Concentrating power in one office risks creating a system of favouritism, where certain projects are prioritised not based on merit but on proximity to power. The Territory already has a history of this corruption which led to the creation of the independent commission on corruption (ICAC), itself proving to be a flailing failure of bureaucratic mismanagement. Moreover, the lack of accountability inherent in an unelected position increases the risk of decisions being made for expediency rather than long-term benefit.

Psychological research highlights the dangers of unchecked authority. Individuals or offices with excessive power succumb to cognitive biases, including overconfidence and groupthink. The TC, acting as an intermediary between government and private proponents, will inadvertently prioritise the interests of the few over the needs of the many.

The CLP should be extremely weary of such decisions as the “Free bus” policy introduced and promoted by your previous MLA John Elferink, led to, quite predictably, increases in juvenile crime and an increase in runaways. Although, the “virtuous” promotion of the policy was to protect children, the subsidised transport action only burdened Territorians greater. Economic losses due to increased crime and costs, the increase in child endangerment a result of centralised decision making without public consultation.

The COVID-19 pandemic serves as another stark example of the consequences of centralised decision-making. Policies implemented by unelected officials often resulted in unintended harm, from economic hardship to mental health crises. These missteps underscore the need for robust checks and balances, which the TC model conspicuously lacks.

Proponents of the TC model may argue that it will streamline regulatory processes and expedite economic development. However, the assumption that efficiency and effectiveness are synonymous is flawed. Regulatory processes exist not merely as hurdles but as safeguards to ensure that development is sustainable, fair, and in the public interest.

Streamlining processes by bypassing these safeguards risks creating long-term damage. For example, the power to issue exemption notices or "step in" to make decisions effectively nullifies the role of regulatory bodies, undermining their expertise and independence. While this may expedite approvals, it also increases the likelihood of oversight failures, environmental degradation, corruption and injustice.

The NT’s unique socio-economic and cultural context demands a governance model that prioritises inclusivity and local autonomy. The region’s reliance on private-led projects makes it particularly vulnerable to imbalances in power. A TC, with authority to direct regulatory priorities and exempt projects from legislative requirements, risks creating a system where economic decisions are divorced from community needs and values. We have already experienced this several times in my lifetime, and each political party has lost an election over such failures.

The NT’s historical and ongoing challenges with Indigenous rights and land use require governance structures that emphasize consultation and collaboration. While the TC model includes provisions for stakeholder consultation, the concentration of

power in one office inherently diminishes the influence of these voices, reducing consultation to a box-checking exercise rather than a meaningful dialogue. With great power comes great corruption.

Economic growth is not merely a product of efficiency; it requires stability, trust, and inclusivity. Investors are attracted to regions where governance is transparent, predictable, and fair/just. The TC model, with its potential for arbitrary decision-making and lack of accountability, risks creating greater uncertainty.

The evidence of unintended consequences stemming from a lack of practical consultation and thorough investigation is all too clear. The failure to provide adequate detention facilities, coupled with the inability or unwillingness to reform a judiciary plagued by ineptitude, corruption, or incompetence, has resulted in predictable chaos. Recent events expose this reality: as increased policing fills the existing cells to capacity, the infrastructure remains woefully unprepared to meet the demand. Adding six new laws without proper public consultation or rigorous review has only compounded the problem. The result? Rising crime, escalating costs, and an atmosphere of growing uncertainty. Outcomes that could have been avoided with a more measured and accountable approach.

The focus on expediting projects of “Territory significance” often prioritises short-term gains over long-term sustainability. Projects in renewable (unreliable) energy or agriculture, while beneficial, must be balanced against broader considerations, including environmental impacts and community well-being. The TC’s powers to override statutory processes undermine this balance, creating the risk of irreversible harm. No politician from either party has been willing to discuss the environmental damage and future liabilities associated with solar panels and their lack of recyclability.

So, what could be a better trade-off? The NT does not need a centralised authority to achieve economic prosperity. Instead, it needs governance structures that empower its people, respect democratic principles, and foster collaboration between stakeholders. The following measures offer a more sustainable path forward:

Strengthen Democratic Processes: Rather than consolidating power, enhance the role of elected representatives and independent regulatory bodies in decision-making. This ensures accountability and transparency.

Empower Local Communities: Decentralised decision-making to local councils (that prove themselves capable) and community organisations (not NGO’s), ensuring that development aligns with local needs and values.

Enhance Regulatory Frameworks: Streamline processes within existing frameworks rather than creating parallel structures that bypass safeguards.

Foster Public-Private Partnerships: Encourage collaboration between government and private proponents to develop infrastructure and projects that benefit all Territorians. Encourage private industry standards, they are far higher than those promoted by public facilities.

Focus on Long-Term Planning: Prioritise sustainable development that balances economic, social, cultural, and environmental considerations.

The proposed Territory Coordinator model is a step backward for the NT. By concentrating power in an unelected bureaucrat, it undermines the principles of self-government, risks repeating the mistakes of the past, and exposes the region to new challenges and concerns. While the goals of economic growth and regulatory efficiency are important, they must not come at the expense of democracy, accountability, and sustainability. The NT deserves a governance model that empowers its people, respects its history, and builds a future that benefits all Territorians, not just a select few.

Regards,

Sam Wilks
Property and Security Consultant
[redacted]

The following is a report dedicated to the substantive reasons and evidence why the *Territory Coordinator Act 2025* should not be passed.

To summarise I will discuss the-

Expansion of Government Power at the Expense of Private Enterprise

- The bill centralises decision-making in a *Territory Coordinator*, an unelected bureaucrat who would have broad authority over "economically significant" projects. This undermines the principles of limited government and free-market economics.
- It effectively replaces market-driven decision-making with government intervention, which historically leads to inefficiencies, corruption, and misallocation of resources.

Undermines Private Property Rights

- The bill grants sweeping powers to enter private land without a warrant (*Part 8, Section 92*), forcing property owners to submit to government intrusion.
- While compensation is mentioned, past experiences with government land acquisition suggest delays, underpayment, or outright neglect in just compensation (*Section 94*).
- The ability to unilaterally declare "infrastructure coordination areas" and "territory development areas" (*Part 6, Section 43*) enables the government to seize land under the pretence of economic development, bypassing individual consent.

Authoritarian Control over Infrastructure and Development

- The Act establishes a bureaucratic bottleneck where the *Territory Coordinator* decides what is a “significant project” (*Part 3, Section 23*), placing unelected officials above businesses, investors, and local councils.
- The Coordinator has the authority to direct public and private entities, overriding existing regulations and statutory bodies (*Part 7, Section 68*).
- By allowing government officials to "step in" and make decisions previously made by responsible entities (*Part 7, Division 3*), the Act overrides due process and local decision-making.

Suppression of Appeals and Judicial Oversight

- The Act *explicitly prohibits* appeals or reviews of decisions made under it (*Part 9, Section 95*), removing any checks on bureaucratic overreach.
- This undermines the rule of law, as individuals and businesses affected by arbitrary decisions have no recourse beyond judicial review, which is costly and limited in scope.

Economic and Political Favouritism

- By prioritising certain projects (*Part 7, Section 64*), the Act allows the government to pick winners and losers in the market, a practice known to foster crony capitalism and corruption.
- Politically connected businesses and developers will receive preferential treatment, while smaller, independent entrepreneurs will face excessive bureaucratic barriers.

Dangerous Precedent for Expedited Statutory Decisions

- The Act allows the *Territory Coordinator* to bypass existing regulatory processes, including environmental, planning, and community consultation laws (*Part 7, Division 4*).
- Government projects could be rushed through without proper scrutiny, increasing the risk of poorly planned infrastructure and environmental damage.

Undermines Local Governance and Community Rights

- The Act centralises authority at the expense of local councils, traditional owners, and community groups, making their input into development projects merely symbolic.
- By declaring certain areas "territory development areas" without local consent (*Part 6*), the Act strips local councils and indigenous groups of decision-making power over their lands.

Risk of Corruption and Unchecked Bureaucratic Power

- The Act enables the *Territory Coordinator* to grant exemptions from existing laws (*Part 7, Section 77*), allowing politically favoured projects to bypass regulations.
- The potential for abuse is exacerbated by a lack of oversight, as decisions cannot be appealed or reviewed.

Potential for Economic Stagnation

- Increased government intervention and regulatory uncertainty deter private investment. When businesses are subject to arbitrary intervention, they are less likely to invest in long-term projects.
- The Act places excessive emphasis on centralized economic planning, ignoring historical lessons that such models often lead to stagnation rather than growth.

Undue Influence Over Media and Public Discourse

- The Act includes provisions restricting the disclosure of information (*Part 9, Section 103*), criminalizing the release of details about government decisions.
- This suppression of transparency ensures that the public remains uninformed about potential conflicts of interest, bureaucratic overreach, or mismanagement.

A Threat to Economic and Individual Freedom

- The *Territory Coordinator Act 2025* represents an overreach of government power, granting unelected officials unprecedented control over economic development, land use, and statutory processes.
- By undermining property rights, restricting appeals, enabling bureaucratic intervention, and prioritizing government-led economic planning, the Act creates an environment ripe for corruption, inefficiency, and political favouritism.

The bill should be **rejected outright** to protect free enterprise, property rights, and local governance from an intrusive, centralised authority.

Expansion of Government Power at the Expense of Private Enterprise

The Territory Coordinator Act 2025 represents yet another instance of government overreach at the expense of private enterprise. The bill's centralisation of decision-making in an unelected bureaucrat with broad discretionary power over "economically significant" projects is not only anti-democratic but also antithetical to the principles of limited government and free-market economics. A review of Australian history reveals the detrimental effects of such government interventions, leading to inefficiencies, corruption, and the misallocation of resources.

The following are examples of well-known historical precedents of government overreach that had long-lasting detrimental effects on the economy and to the health and safety of Australians and Territorians as a whole.

The Nationalisation of the Australian Economy During and After World War II

During World War II, the Australian government expanded its control over key industries under the guise of wartime necessity. While some interventions were arguably justified for national security, many persisted long after the war ended that created long term economic harm. The nationalisation of key sectors such as transport, banking, and energy led to inefficiencies and stagnation. Government-run enterprises became bloated and inefficient, requiring continual taxpayer subsidies to remain operational.

The banking nationalisation attempt of 1947, wherein the federal government sought to take over private banks, was met with strong resistance from the High Court and private industry. Had this effort succeeded, it would have strangled competition and innovation, much as excessive bureaucratic intervention threatens to do under the *Territory Coordinator Act 2025*.

The Interventionist Policies in the Northern Territory's Pastoral Industry

The Northern Territory has a long history of government intervention in private enterprise, often with disastrous results. In the mid-20th century, the federal government's administration of the NT imposed regulations on the pastoral industry, controlling land leases and restricting private investment. This led to severe underdevelopment, discouraging innovation and investment in what could have been a globally competitive industry.

Restrictive land laws have historically prevented Aboriginal landowners and private enterprises from developing their lands efficiently. The government's bureaucratic hold over land use has meant that vast tracts of the NT remain underutilized, with local communities unable to capitalise on potential economic opportunities. The

effects well-known, well documented and a substantial reason for foreign and local investment hesitation due to real fear of further government, local, and/or federal interventions.

The Failure of Public Housing and Urban Planning in Darwin

Following Cyclone Tracy in 1974, the Australian government took direct control over Darwin's reconstruction through the Darwin Reconstruction Commission. While some emergency intervention was necessary, the long-term planning and public housing projects became costly and inefficient. Government-directed reconstruction projects failed to address private sector needs, resulting in poorly designed infrastructure, bureaucratic delays, and misallocated resources that stifled economic growth for years. The well-known and documented cases of bribery, corruption and ineptitude of bureaucratic involvement in the housing industry led to the implementation of private certification in 1993, and the acknowledgement of such historical breaches of the trust of Territorians were the reason for the moratorium on building certificates in the early 2000's.

Public housing in the NT remains a world-wide economic case study in government inefficiency. High levels of government ownership in the housing sector have led to poor maintenance, underutilisation of land, and a dependency culture among residents. The result has been economic stagnation in areas where private development could have driven wealth creation and social mobility. The attempt by the government to reverse such harmful decisions thwarted by federal government intervention during the last CLP reign.

The Over-Regulation of Indigenous Businesses and Economic Participation

Government control over Indigenous affairs, particularly through the permit system and restrictive land rights policies, has historically prevented Indigenous Australians from fully engaging in the market economy. In the NT, vast tracts of Aboriginal-owned land remain economically inactive due to overregulation and bureaucratic roadblocks. Instead of allowing Indigenous communities to lease, sell, or develop their land as they see fit, they are forced to navigate layers of government approvals, effectively denying them the economic benefits of their own property.

This paternalistic model has created a cycle of dependency, with government funds and intervention replacing organic economic development. Programs intended to empower Indigenous Australians have instead entrenched bureaucracy and discouraged entrepreneurship. The *Territory Coordinator Act 2025* risks further exacerbating this trend by extending government control over "economically significant" projects, reducing the role of private and local decision-making.

Government-Induced Economic Disasters in Australia

The Collapse of the NT's BTEC Program and Cattle Industry Damage

The Brucellosis and Tuberculosis Eradication Campaign (BTEC) in the 1980s is an example of federal overreach that devastated the NT's cattle industry. The forced culling of cattle herds led to the financial ruin of many pastoralists. While disease control was necessary, the government's heavy-handed approach, without proper compensation or market-based solutions, exacerbated economic losses. The pastoral industry suffered long-term consequences, with many businesses unable to recover.

The 2011 Federal Intervention on Live Cattle Exports and the Damage to local Industry

In 2011, the Australian Government imposed a ban on live cattle exports to Indonesia, which significantly impacted pastoralists in the Northern Territory. In 2020, the Federal Court ruled that the ban was unlawful and awarded the Brett Cattle Company nearly $3 million in damages. (the Geelong advertiser)

Following this decision, a class action was initiated on behalf of affected cattle producers. In 2022, the Commonwealth offered a $215 million settlement to resolve the class action. However, the cattlemen sought a higher compensation of $510 million plus interest and costs, totalling up to $400 million, which the Commonwealth rejected. (The Courier Mail)

As of January 2025, legal proceedings are ongoing to finalise the compensation owed to the industry.

The Government-Run Intervention in Alcohol Policy and Economic Decline

The NT's history of government control over alcohol regulation has been a repeated failure. Policies such as the Banned Drinker Register, and alcohol sales restrictions have failed to address social issues while harming legitimate businesses. Instead of allowing market-driven solutions such as responsible service initiatives, the government's regulatory stranglehold has led to the decline of hospitality industries, loss of employment, and the proliferation of black-market alcohol sales.

The NT governments recent removal of "government imposed floor pricing (price fixing)" an acknowledgment of such failed policies, and yet like other failed jurisdictions where floor pricing was shown to have a detrimental and destructive effect on the most vulnerable, like pensioners, the private alcohol companies and bottle shops maintained the higher prices after the removal of such floor pricing, often citing the government's own false and misleading established "virtue" reasons to maintain higher profits.

Present-Day Implications of the *Territory Coordinator Act 2025*

The proposed *Territory Coordinator Act 2025* centralises decision-making authority into the hands of an unelected bureaucrat. This is precisely the kind of interventionist approach that has historically failed the NT's economy. The Act would:

Replace Private Decision-Making with Bureaucratic Control

- The private sector, which is the true driver of economic innovation and efficiency, would be forced to operate under the directives of the Territory Coordinator.
- Market forces, rather than government planners, should determine which projects are economically viable.

Create an Inefficient and Politicised Approval Process

- Politically connected businesses and projects are likely to receive preferential treatment, while independent entrepreneurs face increased barriers to entry.
- The Act's discretionary powers allow for politically motivated interference in economic development.

Discourage Investment and Economic Growth

- Investors are less likely to commit to projects when the government can override market dynamics.
- Similar interventionist policies in the past have led to stagnation rather than prosperity in the NT.

Lead to Greater Corruption and Misallocation of Resources

- History has shown that centralised economic planning invites corruption and corporate welfare.
- The Act's provisions create avenues for cronyism, where politically favoured entities benefit at the expense of genuine competition.

The recent actions of the CLP Government, as highlighted by the Auditor-General's findings, serve as a contemporary reminder of the risks associated with expanding government power at the expense of private enterprise. Such centralisation not only undermines democratic principles but also paves the way for inefficiencies and potential corruption, ultimately detrimentally affecting the residents of the Northern Territory.

Considering these historical and recent events, it is imperative to critically assess the implications of *The Territory Coordinator Act 2025*. Ensuring a balance between governmental authority and private enterprise is essential to prevent the recurrence of past mistakes and to promote a thriving, transparent, and accountable governance structure in the Northern Territory.

If history has taught us anything, it is that government overreach into the economy leads to stagnation, inefficiency, and, in the worst cases, economic disaster. The Northern Territory's economy should be driven by market principles, private enterprise, and individual initiative, not by a centrally planned authority with unchecked power. The *Territory Coordinator Act 2025* is yet another step in the wrong direction, one that history has proven time and again to be destructive. The History is clear, government intervention, regardless of intention, at the expense of private enterprise leads to economic decay. The *Territory Coordinator Act 2025* must be rejected in favour of a future driven by innovation, competition, and free-market principles.

It Undermines Private Property Rights

The proposed *Territory Coordinator Act 2025* in the Northern Territory grants an unelected official extensive power, including the authority to enter private land without a warrant (Part 8, Section 92) and to unilaterally designate "infrastructure coordination areas" and "territory development areas" (Part 6, Section 43). While the bill mentions compensation for affected property owners (Section 94), historical precedents in Australia, particularly in the Northern Territory, raise concerns about the protection of private property rights under such legislation.

The Northern Territory has a history of government interventions that have impacted private property rights. For instance, the Batchelor Demonstration Farm, established in 1911, led to the displacement of the Warrai and Kungarakany people from their traditional lands. The farm was closed in 1919, but the land was later repurposed for defence purposes during World War II, further entrenching government control over previously private or Indigenous lands.

In another case, the establishment of Florida Station in 1884 involved the purchase of vast tracts of land in the Northern Territory. The venture faced significant challenges, including conflicts with Indigenous populations and environmental hardships, leading to its eventual abandonment. Illustrating the complexities and potential negative outcomes of large-scale land acquisitions and developments without adequate consideration of existing land rights and environmental factors.

In the Northern Territory (NT), the process of selling properties, particularly those owned by individuals residing overseas, or nominated “Deadman’s” blocks has raised concerns for decades regarding the adequacy of advertising and the potential financial impact on absentee owners. Local regulations often mandate only minimal advertising requirements, such as notices in local newspapers or postings on community boards, which won’t effectively reach property owners or their families who are abroad. This limited exposure results in properties being sold below their market value, as the pool of potential buyers is restricted. Often the excuse for the sale is non-payment for rates and land cost that did not exist at the time of purchase, and this practice is considered illegal under international courts.

The revenue generated from these sales, especially when properties are sold at undervalued prices, leads to financial gains for local councils through associated fees and taxes. This situation creates a dynamic where councils benefit financially at the expense of absentee property owners, whose assets are liquidated without adequate market exposure.

The Northern Territory has a history of government interventions that have adversely affected property rights. A notable example is the compulsory acquisition of Aboriginal land during the Northern Territory Emergency Response (NTER) in 2007. The Australian government compulsorily acquired Aboriginal land under five-year leases, undermining the property rights of Indigenous communities. This move was widely criticized for its lack of consultation and inadequate compensation, highlighting the potential for government overreach to infringe upon individual property rights. (Amnesty.org)

In another instance, the case of *Griffiths v Northern Territory* involved the compulsory acquisition of land in Timber Creek for commercial development. The High Court awarded compensation to the traditional owners for the loss of native title rights, acknowledging the significant impact of government actions on private property rights. This case underscored the potential for government policies to infringe upon individual property rights, leading to prolonged legal battles and delayed compensation.

Other concerns have been shared recently by the media -

The ABC recently shared The *Territory Coordinator Act 2025* has been criticized for potentially eroding Indigenous and pastoral land rights. Legal experts and environmentalists have expressed concerns that the bill will allow the Territory Coordinator to bypass legislative safeguards and overrule community and traditional owners' input on major projects. This centralisation of power in an unelected official raises significant issues regarding transparency, accountability, and the protection of private property rights.

The Courier Mail shared “the bill proposes to limit third-party merit reviews, which have been a critical mechanism for communities and individuals to challenge government decisions affecting their property rights. Industry leaders support this move, arguing that it will streamline project approvals and boost economic growth. However, critics argue that removing these reviews will silence community voices and lead to unchecked government power, further threatening private property rights.”

Governments in Australia have a history of acquiring private land under dubious pretences, often resulting in financial and social devastation for affected property owners, there family and loved ones. Large tracts of land have been forcibly acquired from private owners to facilitate government projects (often through councils etc.), with many landholders receiving inadequate compensation, leading to long-term economic hardships.

The Northern Territory's Aboriginal land tenure system has seen government intervention that restricts private ownership and development. Despite false claims of empowering Indigenous communities, bureaucratic control over land rights has created significant barriers to private economic activity, keeping vast areas under government control rather than in the hands of those who could develop them productively.

The current legislation echoes these historical injustices and exacerbates them by giving the Territory Coordinator unilateral power to interfere with private property in ways that fundamentally undermine ownership rights.

The Creation of 'Infrastructure Coordination Areas' and 'Territory Development Areas'

Part 6, Section 43 of the bill allows the government to declare certain areas as "infrastructure coordination areas" or "territory development areas." These provisions essentially give the government the ability to seize land without true consent from property owners, using economic development as a pretext.

This is particularly concerning in the NT, where previous land-use planning schemes have displaced local businesses and residents in favour of large, government-backed projects. Attempts to redistribute land through bureaucratic means rather than free-market mechanisms lead to inefficiencies and stagnation, proving once again that government control over private property rarely produces the promised economic benefits.

Government Entry to Private Land Without a Warrant

One of the most egregious aspects of the bill is Part 8, Section 92, which grants officials the authority to enter private land without a warrant. This provision allows the government to forcibly access property under the pretext of planning or infrastructure development. While the bill nominally requires notice to be given to landowners, history has shown that such provisions offer no real protection.

The potential for abuse is immense. Landowners could face surprise intrusions that disrupt their businesses, damage property, or violate personal privacy. The justification of economic development does not override the fundamental principle that property rights should be sacrosanct.

Delayed or Inadequate Compensation for Land Seizures

While the bill promises compensation for those whose land is acquired or affected by government projects (Part 8, Section 94), past experiences suggest that such guarantees are often hollow. Australian governments have a long history of failing to provide just compensation in a timely manner. Bureaucratic red tape, legal challenges, and government underestimation of property values mean that landowners often receive far less than their property is worth, if they are compensated at all.

The WA Kimberley Land Seizures

In Western Australia, our neighbouring state, the state government's handling of land acquisitions in the Kimberley region provides a cautionary tale. In the early 2010s, the government forcibly acquired land from Indigenous and private owners to develop large-scale gas and mining projects. While the official reasoning was economic growth, the projects stalled due to bureaucratic mismanagement, leaving displaced landowners without their property or promised benefits.

The NT faces a similar risk under the *Territory Coordinator Act 2025*, where government seizures will benefit select interests while local communities and businesses bear the cost.

The 'Just Terms' Myth in Sydney's Property Acquisitions

In Sydney, numerous landowners have been subjected to government compulsory acquisition for major infrastructure projects, such as WestConnex. Many received offers well below market value, and legal battles dragged on for years. Some families lost their homes without sufficient means to relocate. The government's assurances of "just terms" were little more than empty promises.

If such injustices can occur in Australia's largest city, there is even greater cause for concern in the NT, where oversight and legal protections for property owners are historically weaker.

The powers granted under the *Territory Coordinator Act 2025* based on historical evidence of overreach and corruption in the NT will lead to situations where property owners are subjected to government intrusion without adequate safeguards. The authority to enter private land without a warrant and to designate areas for development without individual consent undermines the security of property ownership. While the bill mentions compensation, historical instances indicate that property owners will face delays or insufficient compensation, exacerbating the infringement on property rights.

The ***Territory Coordinator Act 2025*** poses significant risks to private property rights in the Northern Territory. Historical and contemporary evidence demonstrates that granting extensive powers to government officials will lead to the erosion of individual property rights, inadequate compensation, and prolonged legal disputes. It is crucial to carefully consider these implications to protect the rights of property owners and maintain the balance between governmental authority and individual freedoms.

When property rights are weakened, economic prosperity declines. A strong system of property ownership is the foundation of a thriving, market-driven economy. History has demonstrated time and again that when governments encroach upon these rights:

Investment dries up: Property owners are less likely to invest in land and business development when there is a looming threat of government seizure.

Corruption and cronyism flourish: Government-controlled land allocation creates opportunities for favouritism and political influence.

Market inefficiencies increase: Bureaucratic decision-making replaces organic, market-driven resource allocation, leading to waste and stagnation.

The Northern Territory has endured over a century of government overreach that has hindered its economic growth and undermined individual freedoms. The *Territory Coordinator Act 2025* represents a continuation of this destructive trend, granting officials the power to violate property rights in the name of economic development. The bill's provisions for warrantless land entry, inadequate compensation, and arbitrary land seizures are a direct threat to individual ownership and economic prosperity.

To prevent repeating the mistakes of the past, the NT must prioritise policies that strengthen, rather than weaken, private property rights. True economic growth comes not from government central planning but from empowering individuals and businesses to invest, innovate, and develop their land without fear of state confiscation. This bill is a direct affront to those principles and must be opposed in favour of a framework that respects property rights and fosters genuine economic freedom.

Authoritarian Control over Infrastructure and Development

The proposed *Territory Coordinator Act 2025* represents a significant centralisation of authority, vesting substantial powers in an unelected official designated as the Territory Coordinator. This individual is empowered to unilaterally determine what constitutes a "significant project" (Part 3, Section 23), thereby superseding the roles traditionally held by businesses, investors, and local councils.

The Coordinator is authorised to direct both public and private entities, with the capacity to override existing regulations and statutory bodies (Part 7, Section 68). The Act further permits government officials to intervene and make decisions previously within the jurisdiction of responsible entities (Part 7, Division 3), effectively circumventing established due process and local decision-making mechanisms.

As discussed previously, **t**he NT's history provides cautionary examples of centralised governmental interventions yielding adverse outcomes. A pertinent case is the Humpty Doo Rice Project of the 1950s and 1960s. This initiative, aimed at establishing a substantial rice industry, was characterised by government-led development strategies that inadequately accounted for local environmental conditions and Indigenous knowledge. The project's eventual failure resulted in considerable financial losses and environmental degradation, underscoring the risks associated with top-down decision-making devoid of comprehensive local consultation.

Similarly, the proposal to establish a nuclear waste facility at Muckaty Station in the early 2000s exemplifies the pitfalls of centralised authority. The federal government's decision to nominate this site was undertaken with little consultation with Indigenous landowners, leading to legal challenges and widespread community opposition. Although the plan was ultimately abandoned, it engendered significant social discord and highlighted the perils of overriding local decision-making processes. Placing substantial financial burden on those seeking to protect their land from federal interventionism.

The centralisation of authority proposed in the *Territory Coordinator Act 2025* has elicited apprehension among various stakeholders as it should. Critics like me will contend that vesting such extensive powers in an unelected official undermines democratic processes and diminishes the participatory role of local councils and communities in decision-making. There is real and validated concern that this will precipitate decisions that prioritise proposed economic development at the expense of environmental sustainability and personal private property rights. The litany of failure of government interventionism in the NT is too great, the devastation already at the hands of unelected bureaucrats so evident, that this act must be contested.

The Act's provisions enabling the Coordinator to override existing regulations and statutory bodies will obviously result in a lack of accountability and transparency.

This concentration of power will lead to further decisions that fail to adequately consider the diverse interests and needs of the NT's residents, particularly those in remote and Indigenous communities.

The NT's unique social and environmental landscape necessitates a governance approach that harmonizes development objectives with the preservation of local autonomy and cultural heritage. The centralisation of decision-making authority, as proposed in the *Territory Coordinator Act 2025*, risks replicating past errors where top-down interventions have culminated in adverse outcomes. It isn’t a chance that it may happen, it will happen; I challenge the NT Government and their thousands of bureaucrats to provide me evidence to the contrary.

Negligence involves a duty of care, a breach of that duty, and foreseeable harm resulting from such actions. The Northern Territory government's proposed *Territory Coordinator Act 2025* centralises significant authority in an unelected official, the Territory Coordinator, who can unilaterally determine "significant projects" (Part 3, Section 23) and direct public and private entities, overriding existing regulations (Part 7, Section 68). This concentration of power bypasses established due process and local decision-making (Part 7, Division 3), leading to obvious foreseeable damage. Enacting this legislation without acknowledging or thorough consideration of its implications is a breach of the government's duty of care to its citizens, raising concerns of criminal negligence, and criminal liabilities whose cost again will be passed onto the taxpayer.

It is imperative to explore alternative approaches that empower local communities and ensure that development projects are undertaken with thorough consultation and respect for local knowledge and preferences. Such an approach would not only uphold democratic and legal principles but also promote sustainable and inclusive development outcomes.

The *Territory Coordinator Act 2025* signifies a substantial shift towards centralised control over infrastructure and development in the NT. Historical precedents in the region illustrate the potential and continual pitfalls of such an approach, including environmental degradation, social discord, and the marginalisation of local communities. It is essential to critically assess this legislation and consider more decentralised, participatory models of governance that uphold the rights and interests of all NT residents.

Suppression of Appeals and Judicial Oversight

The Proposed *Territory Coordinator Bill 2024*, under consideration, has ignited significant debate due to its provisions that limit avenues for appeals or reviews of decisions made under its authority. Specifically, Part 9, Section 95 of the Bill states:

"A decision made under this Act is final and conclusive and is not subject to any form of appeal or review."

This clause effectively removes traditional mechanisms for challenging administrative decisions, raising real and valid concerns about unchecked bureaucratic power and potential erosion of the rule of law. In effect its unconstitutional, however, seldom has that stopped the government of Australia.

The rule of law is a foundational principle in democratic societies, ensuring that all individuals and institutions are subject to and accountable under the law. A critical component of this principle is the availability of mechanisms to challenge and review governmental decisions. By prohibiting appeals or reviews, the Bill undermines this principle, leaving individuals and businesses without recourse against arbitrary and/or erroneous decisions.

By constraining the ability to appeal or review decisions, the Act effectively removes essential checks on potential bureaucratic overreach. This limitation undermines the rule of law, as individuals and businesses adversely affected by decisions have limited recourse to challenge them. While judicial review remains a potential avenue, it is often costly and limited in scope, making it an impractical option for many.

While the Bill precludes appeals and reviews, it does not explicitly eliminate the possibility of judicial review. Judicial review allows courts to assess the legality of administrative decisions, focusing on whether the decision-maker acted within their legal authority and followed proper procedures. However, judicial review is inherently limited in scope; it does not assess the merits of a decision but rather its legality.

Pursuing judicial review is prohibitively expensive and time-consuming, creating barriers for individuals and small businesses seeking redress. This financial burden is designed to deter affected parties from challenging decisions, effectively leaving them without a practical remedy.

The move to limit appeals and reviews is not without precedent in Australian legislative contexts. For instance, the Tasmanian government has proposed legislation to prohibit third-party appeals against council planning decisions, purportedly aiming to reduce delays in development projects. The legislation has come under fire for the very same breaches of civil liberties and private property rights.

The NT has previously experienced instances where limited judicial oversight has led to adverse outcomes. As mentioned, prior, during the 1950s and 1960s, the Humpty Doo Rice Project was a government-led initiative that proceeded with minimal consultation and oversight. The project's failure resulted in significant financial losses and environmental degradation, highlighting the dangers of unchecked governmental authority.

The High Court of Australia's decision in *Kirk v Industrial Relations Commission of New South Wales* (2010) is pertinent when discussing limitations on judicial oversight. In this case, the Court held that State Parliaments could not enact legislation that would deprive State Supreme Courts of their supervisory jurisdiction to review decisions for jurisdictional errors. These ruling underscores the constitutional limitations on legislative attempts to exclude judicial review entirely.

Nationally, the importance of judicial oversight is underscored by cases such as *R v Richards; Ex parte Fitzpatrick and Browne* (1955), where the Australian Parliament exercised its privilege to imprison individuals without judicial trial. This case serves as a reminder of the potential for abuse when checks and balances are circumvented.

I've provided several examples in this document of the economic destruction and abuse of Territorians at the direction of the NT Government, providing yet another avenue for such abuse is not recommended.

Consequences of Limiting Appeals and Reviews

By removing the possibility of appeals or reviews, the Bill will lead to several adverse outcomes:

Arbitrary Decision-Making: Without the prospect of oversight, there is a risk that decisions will be made without sufficient justification or adherence to established standards.

Erosion of Public Trust: The absence of review mechanisms leads to perceptions of unchecked power, diminishing public confidence in governmental processes.

Negative Economic Impacts: Businesses will continue to be hesitant to invest in an environment where decisions are final and unchallengeable, fearing unpredictable or unfavourable outcomes without the possibility of recourse.

Proponents of the Bill argue that limiting appeals and reviews will streamline processes and promote economic development by reducing delays associated with protracted legal challenges. While efficiency is a valid objective, it must be balanced against the need for accountability and the protection of individual rights.

Ensuring that there are adequate mechanisms to challenge and review decisions is essential to prevent abuses of power and to uphold the rule of law. Alternative approaches they might include is establishing specialised tribunals or ombudsman offices to handle appeals without resorting to lengthy court processes. However, the evidence of Tribunal mismanagement, unlawful decisions and protracted litigation in the NT Civil administration Tribunal are a testament to the failure of political appointees in these failed arbitrary and unconstitutional entities that seek to thwart the rule of law.

The suppression of appeals and judicial oversight within the *Territory Coordinator Act 2025* poses significant risks to the principles of justice and accountability. Historical precedents in both the NT and broader Australia illustrate the real dangers of limiting avenues for legal recourse. It is imperative to ensure that any legislative framework maintains robust mechanisms for appeal and review to uphold the rule of law and protect the rights of

The suppression of appeals and judicial oversight, as proposed in the Territory Coordinator Bill 2024, raises significant concerns regarding the maintenance of the rule of law and the protection of individual rights. While the aim of enhancing administrative efficiency is commendable, it should not come at the expense of essential checks and balances. A more balanced approach would preserve avenues for review and appeal, ensuring that governmental decisions remain fair, accountable, and subject to appropriate scrutiny.

A judicial review and the hiring of more skilled and non-activist judges is better than seeking to create yet another bureaucratic department that will abuse the public at the cost of the taxpayer.

Suppression of Appeals and Judicial Oversight

The **Territory Coordinator Bill 2025** establishes a regulatory mechanism that centralises authority over projects of economic significance, ostensibly for the purpose of streamlining development and economic growth. However, beneath the surface of bureaucratic efficiency lies a dangerous precedent: the elimination of meaningful judicial oversight. The bill, through **Part 9, Section 95**, explicitly **removes the right of appeal** against decisions made under its provisions, permitting only the narrow avenue of judicial review. This move is not merely an administrative convenience; it is a significant erosion of the principles of due process, fairness, and accountability.

A fundamental characteristic of free societies is the ability of individuals and businesses to challenge government decisions that adversely affect them. The ability to appeal decisions is not just an administrative step—it is a safeguard against **arbitrariness, corruption, and incompetence**. By eliminating appeals, this bill grants unelected bureaucrats final authority over projects and developments, removing any external oversight that could correct errors or prevent abuses of power.

The claim that the bill facilitates economic development ignores a basic reality: "**economic efficiency is not simply a matter of speed, but of stability and predictability**." Investors and businesses are unlikely to commit substantial resources in an environment where government authorities have unchecked discretionary power, knowing that **regulatory decisions cannot be challenged**. This unpredictability does not promote investment; it discourages it.

The bill does allow for **judicial review**, but this is a far weaker safeguard than the right to appeal. Judicial review does not evaluate the **merits of a decision**—it only determines whether the decision-making process was legally sound. If a bureaucratic authority makes an **arbitrary but procedurally correct** decision, judicial review offers **no remedy**.

Consider the implications for a business attempting to develop a new project. If the Territory Coordinator imposes an **unjustified restriction** or **unreasonably denies** a permit, the business cannot appeal based on the facts or economic consequences. The only challenge available is proving that the process was unlawful—a high bar that provides little comfort to those burdened by bureaucratic misjudgements. The cost of judicial review also places it out of reach for many individuals and small businesses, ensuring that **only the most well-funded entities can even attempt a challenge**.

Without **checks and balances**, government agencies operate under a perverse incentive structure. The absence of **consequences for poor decisions** encourages inefficiency, while the inability of businesses and individuals to challenge these decisions fosters an environment where **favouritism and corruption can flourish**. We have seen far too much of this in the NT already.

Consider the long-term implications of such a system. If a bureaucratic entity faces no risk of reversal, it is more likely to make expedient rather than justified decisions. Instead of prioritizing economic growth, bureaucrats may cater to political interests, ideological biases, or personal agendas. The absence of appeals removes the need for officials to ensure decisions are genuinely in the public interest, as they face no meaningful accountability for their rulings.

This is not a hypothetical concern. Historically, regulatory agencies that lack oversight tend to become bloated, inefficient, and arbitrary. I've provided several examples of this previously in this document. The greater the discretion given to bureaucrats without accountability, the greater the likelihood that businesses will be forced to comply with irrational and inconsistent demands, harming economic stability and discouraging investment.

A government that can act without legal recourse against its decisions is a government that operates outside the bounds of constitutional principles. Property rights—fundamental to economic progress—are undermined when regulatory decisions cannot be challenged. If the government can arbitrarily confiscate or restrict the use of property under the guise of development priorities, without fear of reversal, then property ownership becomes conditional on bureaucratic approval rather than a legal guarantee.

This shift in power concentrates authority in the hands of unelected officials, precisely the kind of overreach that constitutional systems were designed to prevent. The bill effectively places the Territory Coordinator and the Minister above the law, immune from the normal constraints of administrative and judicial review.

A comparison to regulatory regimes worldwide demonstrates the dangers of unchecked bureaucratic power. Nations with robust judicial review and appeals processes tend to have higher levels of investment, greater economic stability, and more transparent governance. Conversely, countries where government decisions cannot be appealed tend to suffer from regulatory capture, corruption, and declining business confidence.

For example, regulatory bodies in the United States and the United Kingdom function within systems where judicial appeals can overturn bad decisions. This ensures fairness, predictability, and investor confidence. Yet, as we are witnessing with the USAID debacle in the US, and the Immigration scam in the UK, a lack of transparency leads to inevitable waste, violence and destruction. Meanwhile, in countries where government agencies operate without appeal mechanisms, regulatory overreach leads to economic stagnation, capital flight, and increased political instability.

The **Territory Coordinator Bill 2025** moves the Northern Territory away from the former model and dangerously close to the latter. The restriction on appeals sends a clear message to investors and entrepreneurs: **you are at the mercy of the government, and there is nothing you can do about it**.

The suppression of appeals in the **Territory Coordinator Bill 2025** is not a minor administrative detail—it is a fundamental restructuring of power that eliminates accountability and threatens economic growth. By concentrating authority in the hands of unelected officials and removing the right to challenge their decisions, the bill creates a regulatory dictatorship, placing businesses and individuals at the mercy of bureaucratic whims.

If the goal is economic growth, stability, and a thriving private sector, then a transparent, accountable, and appealable decision-making process is essential. This bill does the opposite—it replaces free-market principles with bureaucratic command-and-control mechanisms, ensuring that political expedience, rather than economic logic, will dictate the future of the Northern Territory's development.

Those concerned with freedom, economic prosperity, and the rule of law should oppose this bill in its current form and demand the restoration of the right to appeal. Without this essential safeguard, the Northern Territory risks sliding into regulatory autocracy, where decisions are final not because they are right, but simply because the government says so.

Economic and Political Favouritism

Legislation often arrives wrapped in the rhetoric of economic growth, streamlining bureaucracy, and fostering development. The **Territory Coordinator Bill 2025** is no different, with its stated intention to coordinate and consolidate regulatory processes for projects deemed of “economic significance.” However, the bill does more than merely “coordinate”—it hands the government unchecked power to determine which enterprises succeed and which wither under regulatory red tape.

On its face, the bill offers **efficiency in decision-making**, eliminating delays and expediting processes. But at its core, it formalizes the government’s ability to pick winners and losers in the marketplace, creating an economic landscape rife with crony capitalism, selective regulation, and centralized intervention in what should be private enterprise decisions.

Under **Part 7, Clause 64**, the Territory Coordinator is granted the power to **issue prioritization requests** to government agencies, compelling them to fast-track the approval of specific projects. While advocates argue that this will accelerate vital infrastructure and job-creating enterprises, in reality, it introduces a mechanism that invites corruption and favouritism.

Government entities will be **pressured to favour politically connected businesses** while those outside the inner circle—smaller businesses, independent developers, and foreign investors without deep political ties—find themselves relegated to the regulatory backburner. Bureaucrats, through either political allegiance or financial incentives, will have vast discretion to decide which projects are “urgent” and which can be delayed indefinitely.

This is not free-market competition—it is a rigged game where government power dictates market outcomes. When priority is determined not by market demand but by ministerial fiat, the results are inefficiencies, waste, and economic stagnation masked as “development.”

The bill introduces **exemption notices** under **Clause 77**, allowing the government to **suspend or modify laws** selectively for certain projects. This is particularly dangerous, as it enables:

- **Wealthy developers** to bypass regulations while competitors remain shackled by them.
- The creation of **special economic privileges** for select firms.
- A precedent where laws become **negotiable** rather than universally applied.

The principle of equal application of the law is a foundation of any free and fair economic system. The ability to exempt certain projects from regulation while keeping others bound by them does not create a level playing field—it entrenches political favouritism.

Perhaps the most egregious provision in the bill is the **step-in power** under **Clause 68**, which allows the government to **take over decision-making authority from regulatory bodies**. This is economic interventionism in its most blatant form, allowing the **Minister or Territory Coordinator to override regulatory agencies**, taking control over approvals, environmental assessments, and other statutory decisions.

This raises critical questions:

- **What prevents abuse?** If a minister can override independent regulatory processes, how is the public assured that these interventions are in the best interest of taxpayers rather than private interests?
- **What happens to business certainty?** Investors rely on transparent, predictable rules. If laws can be suspended, changed, or overridden based on political discretion, businesses are at the mercy of government whim rather than a consistent legal framework.

This direct intervention contradicts the very principles of economic liberalism and free enterprise, replacing a system of clear rules with one of bureaucratic discretion—where decisions are based on political influence rather than market forces.

One of the core features of any stable economy is legal predictability. Businesses, particularly large-scale investments, require regulatory certainty to plan multi-year projects, allocate capital, and manage risk. The **Territory Coordinator Bill 2025** undermines this **by allowing retrospective and arbitrary regulatory changes**.

Consider **Clause 95**, which **eliminates the right to appeal or review decisions under the Act**. This provision alone should be a red flag for anyone concerned about rule of law and due process. It effectively removes legal recourse for businesses that fall victim to politically motivated decisions, making the Territory an unattractive investment destination.

This provision will discourage genuine private investment. Who would pour millions into infrastructure, energy, or technology when their investment is subject to political reinterpretation rather than clear, stable laws?

From a **security standpoint**, as I am an a recognised expert in the security industry, this bill introduces **unprecedented government intrusion into private property**.

Under **Clause 92**, the bill gives the **Territory Coordinator the power to authorize forced land entry**, even without a warrant. The justifications range from conducting environmental surveys to overseeing infrastructure projects, but the implications are clear:

- Private property rights are severely weakened.
- Owners and businesses can be subjected to unauthorized surveillance.
- Government actors are given sweeping enforcement powers with minimal oversight.

This provision is particularly alarming in a region where land disputes, particularly involving Aboriginal land rights and private developers, have been historically contentious. The broad ability to enter private land and take samples, inspect, and impose conditions could lead to significant legal conflicts and resistance from landowners.

The ability to override planning and zoning regulations means that security concerns—including environmental risks, social displacement, and crime displacement effects—are left in the hands of a single bureaucratic authority rather than a transparent regulatory process.

At its core, the **Territory Coordinator Bill 2025** embodies the flawed belief that economic development is best achieved through centralised planning and government intervention. History provides ample evidence that such top-down economic models breed inefficiency, corruption, and stagnation.

Governments that control which projects proceed, which laws apply, and which companies receive exemptions inevitably foster a culture of political favouritism. Over time, this destroys market-driven innovation and creates an economic dependency on political connections rather than competitive merit.

Instead of bureaucratic management, what the Northern Territory requires is:

1. A streamlined, transparent, and consistent regulatory framework that applies equally to all businesses, regardless of political influence.
2. Decentralized decision-making, allowing local communities and private entities to determine the best use of land and resources, rather than a central bureaucrat.
3. Legal certainty, ensuring that businesses are not subject to retroactive regulatory changes, politically motivated interventions, or selective exemptions.

While promoted as a vehicle for **economic efficiency**, the **Territory Coordinator Bill 2025** is in reality **an overreach of government power that legalizes political favouritism**. It creates **mechanisms for regulatory bypass**, grants **unchecked interventionist powers**, and removes **essential checks and balances**.

- The bill **rewards political allies** at the expense of independent businesses.
- It **undermines legal certainty**, deterring serious investors.
- It **creates avenues for corruption**, where bureaucrats and ministers hold **absolute discretion over approvals and exemptions**.
- It **dilutes private property rights**, allowing the government **to enter land without consent**.

Instead of accelerating economic development, this bill will entrench a culture of dependency, selective intervention, and crony capitalism. A genuine pro-growth strategy requires reducing government interference, not expanding it.

Dangerous Precedent for Expedited Statutory Decisions

The Northern Territory's proposed **Territory Coordinator Bill 2025** introduces sweeping powers designed to accelerate government projects under the guise of economic development. While streamlining regulatory processes may seem appealing to policymakers eager to fast-track infrastructure, this legislation sets a perilous precedent, undermining crucial checks and balances that exist to safeguard communities, property rights, and the environment.

The Act's framework allows the newly established Territory Coordinator and the Minister to override existing statutory processes, effectively centralizing decision-making authority within the government's executive branch. By removing bureaucratic friction, the Act introduces a mechanism that enables government projects to proceed with minimal scrutiny, bypassing the regulatory frameworks designed to mitigate risks.

One of the most alarming aspects of this Bill lies in **Part 7, Division 4,** which allows for **exemption notices**—effectively suspending the application of existing laws when deemed necessary by the Minister. Environmental regulations, zoning laws, and community consultation processes could all be modified or eliminated at the government's discretion. This eradicates the protective measures ensuring that developments align with sustainable practices and community needs.

The Act also allows the Minister to issue step-in notices, transferring decision-making authority from regulatory bodies to the Territory Coordinator. Such a provision is troubling because it effectively negates the role of independent oversight, ensuring that project approvals become little more than a formality.

Security practitioners understand that procedural safeguards exist for a reason. Just as a security professional follows established protocols to assess risk and prevent harm, regulatory frameworks function as safeguards to prevent costly, irreversible mistakes. To grant the government unilateral authority to suspend these processes is akin to removing security personnel from a high-risk event under the pretence of efficiency.

Fast-tracked decision-making often leads to inadequate risk assessment. Infrastructure projects require comprehensive planning, which includes evaluating potential hazards, economic feasibility, and the long-term impact on the region. The Territory Coordinator's ability to prioritize certain projects at the expense of others introduces a risk of misallocation of resources, favouritism, and corruption.

Moreover, removing regulatory hurdles does not inherently lead to better outcomes. Rapidly approved projects without robust environmental and social impact assessments could result in degraded ecosystems, displacement of communities, and increased crime rates in poorly planned urban expansions. Historical data demonstrates that rushed government initiatives frequently produce unintended consequences, requiring costly corrective measures later.

Security experts recognize that situational awareness and strategic foresight are critical to preventing threats before they materialize. Similarly, infrastructure projects must be subject to rigorous scrutiny to avoid negative downstream effects. By stripping away layers of oversight, the Bill creates an environment where rushed, ill-conceived projects can proceed without challenge.

A particularly concerning provision of the Bill is its allowance for government-authorized personnel to enter private land without a warrant**. Under Part 8, the Territory Coordinator may permit agents to conduct investigations on properties designated as Infrastructure Coordination Areas (ICAs) or Territory Development Areas (TDAs).** While the government frames this as a necessity for planning, it **represents an egregious violation of property rights.**

Historically, societies that undermine private property protections in the name of progress see an erosion of trust in governance and a chilling effect on investment. Entrepreneurs and developers may hesitate to engage in projects if they fear arbitrary government intervention. This ultimately stifles the very economic development the Act purports to encourage.

Security professionals often emphasize the importance of maintaining strong boundaries—both physical and legal—to prevent intrusion and exploitation. Property rights form the backbone of a stable and prosperous society, and any erosion of these rights should be met with firm opposition.

While marketed as a means of reducing red tape, the Act paradoxically increases government control over economic activity. The establishment of a central Territory Coordinator consolidates power under a single administrative entity, granting it the authority to override regulatory bodies. Instead of a competitive, market-driven environment where developers and businesses operate within clear legal frameworks, the Bill creates a system where government officials determine which projects proceed and under what conditions.

History has shown that concentrated authority over economic decisions often leads to cronyism, inefficiency, and economic stagnation. Government planners—regardless of expertise—lack the dispersed knowledge that free markets provide. Economic development flourishes when individuals and private enterprises can pursue projects based on real market demand, not because they have been deemed a **“significant project”** by a political appointee.

A strong security posture relies on decentralisation—spreading out critical assets to minimize vulnerability. Similarly, economic policy should favour decentralization, empowering local businesses and communities rather than consolidating control under a centralised authority.

When projects are rushed without considering long-term social implications, crime rates often rise. Poorly planned urban expansion can lead to disorganised communities, where inadequate infrastructure and law enforcement fail to meet the demands of a growing population. Unregulated construction projects may attract transient workforces, increasing the likelihood of social instability.

Security assessments emphasize the importance of foresight and community engagement in risk mitigation. The Bill, however, prioritises economic development without fully accounting for the secondary effects of rapid urbanization. Shortcuts in planning today can create long-term security vulnerabilities tomorrow.

The Territory Coordinator Bill 2025 represents a radical departure from the principles of prudent governance. By prioritising speed over scrutiny, centralizing power, and granting unchecked authority to government officials, the Act introduces significant risks to the economic, environmental, and social stability of the Northern Territory.

Security professionals understand that robust systems require layers of protection, strategic planning, and adherence to established protocols. The regulatory framework governing development should be no different. While economic growth is a desirable goal, it must not come at the expense of legal protections, property rights, and environmental sustainability.

If history has taught us anything, it is that government-led economic initiatives that disregard due process often led to unintended negative consequences. **Policymakers would do well to remember that efficient governance is not about eliminating safeguards—it is about ensuring that progress is achieved without compromising the foundations of a stable and prosperous society.**

Undermines Local Governance and Community Rights

The **Territory Coordinator Bill 2025** effectively sidelines local governance and community rights by consolidating decision-making authority within the Minister and the newly appointed Territory Coordinator. This top-down approach undermines the fundamental principle of local representation, reducing the role of councils, indigenous landowners, and community groups to mere spectators in the development process.

Under **Part 6**, the Act allows the Minister to designate **Territory Development Areas (TDAs)** without requiring the consent of local governments or traditional owners. While framed as a means of facilitating economic growth, this provision strips decision-making power from those with the greatest vested interest in the land—local communities who bear the direct consequences of large-scale development projects.

By centralising authority, the Act creates an environment where development decisions are dictated by bureaucrats rather than those who understand the local landscape, culture, and community needs. This increases the likelihood of projects that may serve short-term economic goals but fail to account for long-term social and environmental sustainability.

The ability to bypass local consultation transforms community engagement into a mere procedural formality, rather than a meaningful component of decision-making. Traditional landowners and local councils may be **“consulted”** on projects, but their objections or concerns hold no legal weight under the Act’s framework.

The result? A legislative mechanism that prioritises centralised control over democratic governance, eroding trust in government institutions while diminishing the rights of local stakeholders. When power is removed from those most affected by development and placed in the hands of a few appointed officials, the risks of overreach, mismanagement, and community resentment grow exponentially.

Risk of Corruption and Unchecked Bureaucratic Power

The **Territory Coordinator Bill 2025** creates a fertile ground for corruption and unchecked bureaucratic power by granting expansive, unchallengeable authority to the **Territory Coordinator and the Minister**. Under **Part 7, Section 77**, the Act allows the **Territory Coordinator to issue exemption notices**, effectively modifying or outright bypassing existing laws for select projects. This means that politically connected developments could be fast-tracked while others are forced through standard regulatory hurdles, creating a **two-tiered system of governance** where influence, rather than merit, determines outcomes.

The **lack of oversight** further compounds the risks. The Act explicitly states that **decisions made under its provisions are not subject to appeal or review** (**Part 9, Clause 95**). This removes any legal recourse for affected individuals, businesses, or community groups who may challenge the legitimacy or fairness of exemptions granted to certain projects. In effect, the Territory Coordinator and the Minister act as **judge, jury, and executioner** in deciding which regulations apply and which do not.

Unchecked power in the hands of a few appointed officials, without the possibility of judicial or administrative review, **incentivises cronyism and corruption**. Without transparency, politically aligned businesses and developers can gain preferential treatment, bypassing environmental, planning, or public consultation laws with little accountability.

History is rife with examples of government agencies exploiting discretionary powers for personal or political gain. When **a government functionary can arbitrarily override regulations**, the potential for **nepotism, backroom deals, and compromised decision-making** skyrockets.

The Act does not just create loopholes—it formalises them as a standard practice, undermining both public trust and the integrity of the Territory's governance.

Potential for Economic Stagnation

The **Territory Coordinator Bill 2025** presents itself as a mechanism to facilitate economic development, but its structure introduces a significant risk of **economic stagnation** rather than growth. By granting the **Minister and the Territory Coordinator** broad, unchecked powers over project approvals and regulatory exemptions, the Act creates **uncertainty for private investors**, discouraging long-term commitments and introducing the kind of centralized economic planning that historically leads to inefficiency and decline.

Private investment thrives in an environment of **predictable regulations, stable legal frameworks, and minimal government overreach**. Investors—whether local businesses, real estate developers, or industrial corporations—need **certainty** that their projects will be evaluated based on **transparent rules and fair competition**, not the arbitrary whims of a government appointee.

Under **Part 7, Section 77**, the Act allows **certain projects to be exempt from existing laws** at the discretion of the Minister or Territory Coordinator. This selective application of regulations **distorts the free market**, favouring some investors while placing others at a competitive disadvantage. If businesses believe that regulatory compliance is no longer a level playing field—where politically connected projects receive preferential treatment while others are mired in red tape—many will **choose to invest elsewhere**, seeking jurisdictions with **greater predictability and legal stability**.

Moreover, the **lack of an appeal process** (**Part 9, Clause 95**) **further erodes investor confidence**. If a business faces an unfavourable ruling or is denied the ability to operate within a newly designated **Territory Development Area (TDA)** or **Infrastructure Coordination Area (ICA)**, it has no legal recourse. Without **checks and balances**, businesses cannot mitigate the risk of **arbitrary government intervention**, making long-term investment highly unattractive.

The emphasis on government-controlled economic development, where bureaucrats designate **“significant projects”** and determine which industries receive prioritization, echoes the failures of centrally planned economies. Economic history is filled with examples where state-driven decision-making led to inefficiency, stagnation, and economic collapse.

Governments do not have the dispersed knowledge of millions of individuals making economic decisions. When bureaucrats attempt to direct investment by selecting projects deemed “significant” while ignoring market signals, they distort natural economic incentives. Markets are dynamic, responding to consumer demand, technological innovation, and capital flows—all of which are unpredictable and impossible for a central authority to efficiently control.

This top-down economic planning ignores the reality that business success is determined by the market, not government designation. A project that a bureaucrat considers “significant” may fail because it lacks consumer demand, while an overlooked small business could have grown into a major industry if left to operate freely. Governments cannot manufacture prosperity; they can only create the conditions for it by ensuring low taxes, minimal regulatory burdens, and a fair, open market.

By placing excessive economic power in the hands of government officials, the Act increases the risk of wasteful, politically motivated spending. When investment is driven by political influence rather than market forces, resources are frequently misallocated into inefficient projects that produce little long-term value.

For instance, history shows that large infrastructure projects, when rushed through government pipelines without rigorous cost-benefit analysis, frequently lead to debt, maintenance problems, and underutilized assets. Bureaucrats are not spending their own money and thus have little incentive to ensure projects are financially viable, profitable, or necessary.

Worse still, government-led projects have a tendency to expand beyond their original scope, increasing public debt and requiring continued subsidies just to remain operational. Once government allocates resources to a project, sunk-cost fallacies often drive officials to continue investing in failing ventures rather than admit mistakes. Meanwhile, taxpayers bear the burden of these inefficiencies.

One of the core justifications for the Act is to streamline approvals and reduce bureaucratic barriers. However, the reality is that the centralisation of decision-making does not remove red tape—it simply relocates it into the hands of fewer people.

The **Territory Coordinator’s ability to override existing laws** does not eliminate regulatory burdens; it replaces transparent, predictable processes with uncertain, ad hoc decision-making. This creates an unstable business environment, where companies cannot plan because laws may suddenly change at the discretion of a single bureaucrat.

Rather than ensuring smooth, efficient development, this type of regulatory inconsistency slows down private-sector activity. Companies must spend more time and money on lobbying and political maneuvering, rather than focusing on business growth. This distortion of economic incentives leads to stagnation, as businesses seek ways to navigate an unpredictable system instead of investing in innovation and expansion.

If the goal is to **stimulate economic growth**, a far more effective strategy would involve:

1. **Reducing Government Interference** – Rather than centralising decision-making power, economic policies should focus on removing barriers to business formation, investment, and competition. Deregulation, lowering taxes, and cutting bureaucratic delays create a pro-growth environment that encourages investment without government intervention.
2. **Decentralizing Decision-Making** – Local councils, community groups, and private investors should play a greater role in determining which projects are worth pursuing. Top-down economic mandates are often out of touch with local realities. When decision-making is left to those closest to the projects, outcomes tend to be more efficient, effective, and sustainable.
3. **Strengthening Legal Protections for Investors** – Investment requires certainty. Ensuring a clear, transparent legal framework—where businesses know they will not be arbitrarily shut down, overregulated, or subjected to unequal regulatory treatment—is essential to attracting private-sector capital.
4. **Allowing Market Forces to Dictate Development** – Instead of appointing a Territory Coordinator to “select” winners and losers, policymakers should allow the free market to determine which industries and projects are viable. When businesses compete freely, the most efficient and productive enterprises succeed—leading to sustainable, long-term economic growth.

The **Territory Coordinator Bill 2025 claims** to promote economic development, but it undermines the very principles that drive growth: free enterprise, competition, and regulatory stability. By centralising power, creating legal uncertainty, and prioritizing political decision-making over market forces, the Act discourages investment and introduces inefficiencies that stifle long-term prosperity.

If the Northern Territory truly seeks economic progress, it must reject centralized planning in favour of free-market principles. Only when businesses operate without arbitrary government interference, and when local stakeholders—not bureaucrats—guide development, will the economy flourish in a sustainable and meaningful way.

Undue Influence Over Media and Public Discourse

One of the most alarming aspects of the **Territory Coordinator Bill 2025** is its **direct assault on transparency and free speech**. Under **Part 9, Section 103**, the Act **criminalizes the disclosure of government decisions**, effectively **gagging public discourse** on crucial matters of governance. This provision not only **stifles investigative journalism** but also **prevents whistleblowers and community advocates** from exposing corruption, conflicts of interest, or bureaucratic incompetence. I cannot for the life of me understand why the media has not taken you to task on this Bill on this alone?

When governments restrict the flow of information, they create an environment where mismanagement can thrive unchecked. By penalising those who attempt to disclose government actions, the Bill ensures that the public remains in the dark about how decisions are made, who benefits from them, and whether projects are truly in the best interests of the Territory.

At its core, **Section 103 makes it an offense to reveal confidential information related to government decisions**. This means that anyone—from a **journalist to a public servant to a concerned citizen—who attempts to expose questionable decision-making** could face **severe penalties, including imprisonment or fines**.

This is not the behaviour of a government committed to accountability and democratic governance. It is a deliberate move toward obfuscation, where officials can make decisions without public scrutiny. When government activities are shielded from transparency, abuses of power become not only possible but inevitable.

Throughout history, governments that suppress transparency have consistently fallen into patterns of corruption, inefficiency, and authoritarian control. Without public oversight, misallocation of funds, cronyism, and environmental and economic mismanagement can occur without consequence.

A **free and independent press** serves as a **critical check on government power**. The ability of journalists and researchers to **investigate and report on government decisions** is essential to ensuring **ethical governance**. However, by introducing **legal threats against disclosure**, the Bill discourages **journalistic inquiry** and **public debate** on key development projects.

This has several severe consequences:

- **Suppressed Investigations** – Media outlets will be less willing to investigate government projects for fear of legal consequences. Even when irregularities occur, journalists may be forced into silence.
- **Reduced Public Awareness** – If government mismanagement cannot be reported, the public remains unaware of poor decision-making, making it impossible to hold officials accountable.
- **Unchecked Corruption** – Without scrutiny, officials can abuse their powers with little fear of exposure. Deals made in backrooms escape public scrutiny, leading to wasteful spending, nepotism, and compromised public projects.

By **shielding government activity from media scrutiny**, the Act **creates an opaque system where public officials operate with impunity**.

The **broad wording of Section 103** means that even **whistleblowers within government departments**—who might witness **corruption, waste, or unlawful activity**—will be unable to speak out **without facing legal repercussions**. This not only silences **public servants who want to act in the best interest of the community** but also **emboldens corrupt officials** who now know that **their actions cannot be exposed**.

This type of **bureaucratic overreach fosters a culture of fear**—where individuals within government agencies and the private sector self-censor rather than risk legal retaliation. It discourages ethical governance and eliminates one of the most effective tools for preventing government abuse—whistleblower accountability.

While the Act **pays lip service** to community engagement, it simultaneously **undermines genuine participation** by controlling access to information. The government can claim that the **public was consulted on major projects**, but without **full transparency**, community members lack the information needed to **meaningfully engage** in discussions about developments that **affect their land, businesses, and livelihoods**.

This means that when controversial projects—such as environmentally damaging developments or poorly planned infrastructure—are approved, the public may only discover the details when it is too late to intervene.

Governments that seek to limit free expression and public access to information often justify it under the guise of protecting sensitive government processes. However, history demonstrates that such restrictions serve only those in power, not the public.

When a government **exempts itself from transparency**, it no longer serves the people—it serves itself. By criminalizing the dissemination of information, the **Territory Coordinator Bill undermines democracy, silences dissent and erodes trust in governance**.

The **Territory Coordinator Bill 2025** is not just an economic or administrative measure—it is a **direct attack on democratic accountability**. By restricting disclosure of government decisions, penalizing whistleblowers, and shielding development projects from scrutiny, the Act creates an environment where corruption, mismanagement, and authoritarian overreach can flourish unchecked.

A government that truly values its people does not fear transparency. The fact that this Act includes explicit measures to suppress disclosure raises a fundamental question: **What does the government have to hide?**

For a society to function with integrity, its leaders must be accountable to the people they serve. By criminalizing transparency and suppressing public discourse, this Act does not facilitate progress—it sets the foundation for unchecked bureaucratic power and systemic corruption.

The right to information is not a privilege—it is a necessity for democracy to thrive. If the Northern Territory wishes to foster economic development and maintain public trust, it must reject the suppression of transparency and ensure that its governance remains accountable to the people, not just to its own interests.

A Threat to Economic and Individual Freedom

The **Territory Coordinator Act 2025** is not just another piece of government legislation—it is a **fundamental overreach of government authority** that threatens the very foundations of economic freedom, property rights, and individual liberty. By centralising decision-making in the hands of unelected bureaucrats, removing legal recourse, and prioritizing government-led economic planning over free enterprise, the Act paves the way for corruption, inefficiency, and systemic political favouritism.

The economy flourishes when individuals, businesses, and local communities have the freedom to develop land, invest in projects, and make financial decisions based on market demand rather than government intervention. This Act flips that principle on its head, handing immense power to a government-appointed Territory Coordinator and the Minister—who can override existing laws, bypass statutory processes, and exempt favoured projects from regulations at their own discretion.

This level of unchecked bureaucratic control does not foster economic growth—it stifles it. Businesses, landowners, and entrepreneurs who lack political connections or government approval will find themselves subject to regulatory uncertainty, arbitrary rulings, and the potential seizure of economic opportunities by government-backed competitors.

One of the most egregious aspects of the **Territory Coordinator Act** is its **attack on private property rights**. Under **Part 8**, the Act gives government agents the authority to **enter private land without a warrant** for the purpose of planning and development assessments. While this is framed as a necessary measure for facilitating infrastructure projects, it effectively grants the state **unrestricted access to private property**, disregarding the rights of landowners.

The right to own, control, and develop property is one of the pillars of economic liberty. Societies that undermine property rights in the name of “progress” often experience declining investor confidence, sluggish economic growth, and increased government dependency. Once landowners and businesses recognise that their property can be accessed, assessed, or even repurposed without their consent, they become far less likely to invest in long-term projects, expand operations, or commit capital to regional development.

By enabling the **Minister to designate "Territory Development Areas" (TDAs) without local consent**, the Act **strips local communities of their ability to manage their own land**, effectively placing economic decision-making in the hands of government officials rather than property owners and market participants.

In a functioning democracy, **citizens and businesses have the right to challenge unfair government decisions** through legal and administrative appeal mechanisms. However, under **Part 9, Clause 95**, the **Territory Coordinator Act explicitly removes the right to appeal or seek review of decisions made under the Act**.

This means that if the government intervenes in a project, denies an application, or issues an unfair ruling, affected parties have no legal means to contest the decision. The ability to appeal government rulings is a fundamental safeguard against corruption, favouritism, and bureaucratic overreach—without it, businesses and individuals are entirely at the mercy of government-appointed officials with no accountability.

The absence of due process creates an unpredictable and unstable business environment, where investment becomes too risky due to the potential for sudden government intervention with no recourse. Instead of fostering economic confidence, this uncertainty discourages entrepreneurs and businesses from committing resources to the Northern Territory, further slowing economic growth.

By granting the Territory Coordinator and Minister control over project designations, exemptions, and land development approvals, the Act shifts the economy toward a centralized planning model. History has consistently shown that economies perform best when investment decisions are left to private individuals and businesses rather than dictated by government officials who lack firsthand market knowledge.

Government-led economic planning has a well-documented history of inefficiency, waste, and corruption. Instead of allowing businesses to compete on equal terms, the Act allows politically connected projects to receive exemptions from standard regulations, while independent businesses are forced to comply with costly and time-consuming bureaucratic processes.

This type of state-controlled economic favouritism has consistently led to misallocation of resources, declining innovation, and decreased productivity. When economic success depends on government approval rather than market efficiency, businesses shift their focus from serving customers to securing political influence—a recipe for economic stagnation and declining overall prosperity.

Why the Territory Coordinator Act 2025 SHOULD Be Rejected

This **Act does not promote economic development—it consolidates power in the hands of a few unelected officials**, eliminates **legal protections for individuals and businesses**, and creates a **system where government intervention determines economic winners and losers**.

It should be **rejected outright** for the following reasons:

1. **It Centralizes Power and Removes Accountability** – By eliminating the right to appeal and consolidating economic control under a single Coordinator, the Act removes all safeguards against abuse of power.
2. **It Undermines Property Rights** – The government's ability to enter private land, designate TDAs without local approval, and intervene in development projects without oversight threatens the security of private ownership.
3. **It Discourages Investment and Economic Growth** – Regulatory uncertainty, political favouritism, and exemptions granted to select projects create an unstable investment climate, pushing businesses and entrepreneurs away.
4. **It Encourages Cronyism and Corruption** – By allowing exemptions for certain projects while restricting legal challenges, the Act opens the door to backroom deals, favouritism, and political influence over economic outcomes.
5. **It Suppresses Public Transparency and Free Speech** – The criminalization of **disclosing government decisions (Part 9, Section 103)** ensures that corruption and mismanagement go unchecked.

If passed, this legislation will not bring prosperity—it will bring economic stagnation, legal uncertainty, and increased government overreach. Economic progress comes from protecting individual rights, fostering a fair and competitive market, and ensuring government accountability.

The **Territory Coordinator Act 2025 fails on all these counts**. It represents a **dangerous expansion of bureaucratic power** that **threatens individual freedom, economic stability, and democratic governance**.

For the sake of economic liberty, transparency, and long-term prosperity, this bill must be rejected. The Northern Territory deserves policies that promote investment, protect property rights, and ensure accountable governance—not centralised control, cronyism, and unchecked bureaucratic power.

Thank you for your time in reading my submission.

Your Faithfully,
Sam Wilks [redacted]