

From: JF Armstrong
To: [EPSC](#), [Annie McCall](#)
Subject: Supplementary comments to committee hearing
Date: Friday, 2 February 2018 1:51:50 PM

The Economic Review Committee for the Pastoral Land Act Regulation Amendments

Further comments

NARMCO

Issue with production tax would cost too much to administer, would be retrospective because Gov wont know til after how much it needs to charge per head to arrive at their 5M

Corporates will be shifting cattle from property to property or interstate and it cannot be tied down.

There may be a big sale for deceased estate and it would be unfair on that family to pay a higher rent when they are just trying to settle their family business.

Herron Todd White

This argument was based on an UCV basis. We would make the point that our UCV went up 1265% in 2006 whilst property values only appreciated 35%. While we appealed most strongly we lacked the financial means to take the matter to court and our UCV is still not correct - it is too high. In that cycle of valuations, 85% of lessees objected, there was a major correction but nearly all subsequently abandoned the process because it was too costly or too frightening, which gave the VG an unfair advantage. Moving to UCC would wipe that whole process out and benefit both government not having to defend and producers by not having the financial and mental stress involved with the appeal process.

NLC

Northern Land Council made a number of statements.

We would comment that Sacred Sites have to be consulted for every pastoral land clearing development. This is already in the PAct. To add to that with more legislation would add duplication and complexity to an already rigorous process.

The current 50% trigger is area based, as asserted by the NLC, but we doubt any Lease would ever trigger that with clearing and development. Environment just wouldn't let that happen.

We would object most strongly to NT claimants being able to negotiate any type of development on a pastoral lease, as they have no commercial legal connection to Pastoral lessees who hold sole tenure ship under the NT Pastoral Land Act therefore Lessees rights must be protected by the Crown.

The Pastoral Land Board represents the Minister of Lands regarding the Pastoral Land Act which is not a Native Title Act, and as already outlined, sacred sites clearance must be obtained by any clearing application.

The enjoyment of Native Title does not come at a higher level than the rights of the Lessee to carry out his business under the Pastoral Lands Act.

Valuer General

We should explain that the value of the water tank facility example given in evidence to the committee should have been deducted from the sale value at full replacement value rather than zero as the VG wished to do as following the valuers wish would inflate the UCV unfairly, technically transferring capital value paid for by the lessee to the Crown. All fit for purpose assets should not be depreciated, as they are kept in a constant state of repair to be made fit for purpose.

Thank you for the opportunity to submit this supplementary material.

Yours Faithfully

John Armstrong

Sent from Captain's iPad



Virus-free. www.avast.com