

Division 44: Planning, Lands and Heritage — Service 2, Lands, \$76 249 000 —

Mrs L.A. Munday, Chair.

Dr A.D. Buti, Minister for Lands.

Ms J. Cant, Director General.

Mr M. Darcey, Assistant Director General, Land Use Management.

Ms A. Gibson, Executive Director, Land Use Management.

Mr J. Kwong, Chief Finance Officer.

Ms C. Smith, Principal Policy Adviser, Minister for Lands.

[Witnesses introduced.]

The CHAIR: This estimates committee will be reported by Hansard. The daily proof *Hansard* will be available the following day. It is the intention of the chair to ensure that as many questions as possible are asked and answered and that both questions and answers are short and to the point. The estimates committee's consideration of the estimates will be restricted to discussion of those items for which a vote of money is proposed in the consolidated account. Questions must be clearly related to a page number, item, program or amount in the current division. Members should give these details in preface to their question. If a division or service is the responsibility of more than one minister, a minister shall be examined only in relation to their portfolio responsibilities.

The minister may agree to provide supplementary information to the committee, rather than asking that the question be put on notice for the next sitting week. I ask the minister to clearly indicate what supplementary information he agrees to provide and I will then allocate a reference number. If supplementary information is to be provided, I seek the minister's cooperation in ensuring that it is delivered to the principal clerk by close of business Friday, 1 October 2021. I caution members that if a minister asks that a matter be put on notice, it is up to the member to lodge the question on notice through the online questions system.

The member for North West Central.

Mr V.A. CATANIA: I refer to page 727 of the budget papers and the table of appropriations, expenses and cash assets. It seems that there is a reduction of \$20 million in funding for the delivery of services over four years. How will this impact service delivery constraints?

Dr A.D. BUTI: I might ask the director general to elaborate, but mostly this involves one-off additional funding, so it should not affect the forward delivery of services. Ms Cant might like to elaborate.

Ms J. Cant: The minister is quite correct. We have an increase of \$22.9 million and it is mostly for one-offs around native title compensation and the remote Aboriginal communities initiative, so we would not expect it to impact the services.

Mr V.A. CATANIA: Can the minister describe those one-offs?

Dr A.D. BUTI: Yes. There is \$8.2 million for native title compensation for the Ashburton North Strategic Industrial Area; \$6.2 million for the remote Aboriginal communities initiative; \$4.9 million for finalising the remediation of the lead tailings termination at the Northampton town site; a \$2.7 million increase for the system for the state development assessment unit; a \$2.6 million increase in funding for the WA recovery plan initiatives, including for Parry Street, Fremantle Prison, the Arthur Head cliff face restoration and investment in Aboriginal communities; \$300 000 for Mirning part B native title compensation; and \$245 000 for the Ashburton North Strategic Industrial Area native title compensation in relation to area 3.

Mr V.A. CATANIA: I refer to page 727 and the new initiatives. There is a line item for "Action Plan for Planning Reform—Phase Two". What is this and how has stage 1 gone?

Dr A.D. BUTI: That relates to the Minister for Planning, not to my portfolio.

Mr V.A. CATANIA: So it has nothing to do with the Minister for Lands' portfolio?

Dr A.D. BUTI: It is the Department of Planning, Lands and Heritage and it is planning and land use, but I am the Minister for Lands so that question has to be asked of the planning minister.

Mr V.A. CATANIA: So it has nothing to do with the Minister for Lands?

Dr A.D. BUTI: No; it is about the action plan for planning reform.

Mr V.A. CATANIA: I turn to page 733 and service 2, "Land Administration Services". The second dot point refers to unlocking the land potential for the state. Can the minister elaborate on what land he is unlocking? As the minister knows, there is a shortage of housing, particularly in regional WA, where there is a lot of land but it

simply has not been unlocked because of various issues, whether it be services or native title negotiations. I will give the minister one example in my electorate. In Exmouth, there is plenty of land, but the minister's department does not seem to be allowing the land to be subdivided and therefore sold off for building. What land is the minister looking to unlock around the state, particularly in regional WA, and does he have a list of those parcels of land, given that we have a massive housing shortage in this state?

Dr A.D. BUTI: If the member had been here during the division on DevelopmentWA, he would know that we spent a considerable amount of time talking about unlocking land or making land available in the regions. That is being done through the Regional Land Booster program, with \$166.3 million plus \$4 million per annum in regional development—I am not sure of the title of it. A considerable amount of money has been put forward and DevelopmentWA is working on making land available. Often it is not land availability that is the issue; the cost of construction has become more of an issue in recent times. Considerable work has been done and lots are being released all the time.

Mr V.A. CATANIA: Lots are being released all the time! Can the minister show me where in WA those lots are being released?

Dr A.D. BUTI: I do not have the file in front of me now, but if the member reads the transcript of the previous session, he will see that I went through the regions where the lots are available as a result of the Regional Land Booster scheme. It is already available. I mentioned it during the division on DevelopmentWA.

[3.20 pm]

Mr V.A. CATANIA: That may be the case, but I was not part of that division.

Dr A.D. BUTI: I do not have it in front of me. I said it during a previous division. The member can put it on notice or read *Hansard* tomorrow and he will find it.

Mr V.A. CATANIA: I refer to the third dot point under “Land Administration Services”, which says —
managing the risk of Crown land, including managed and unmanaged Crown land;

Can the minister elaborate what the risk is to the government?

Dr A.D. BUTI: I might ask Mr Darcey if he can possibly answer.

Mr M. Darcey: It is primarily related to bushfire risk mitigation. We work with the Department of Fire and Emergency Services and the Department of Biodiversity, Conservation and Attractions to manage the bushfire risk on the crown land estate. There is royalties for regions money for that purpose.

Mr V.A. CATANIA: How much has been allocated to managing risk on crown land?

Mr M. Darcey: There is \$15 million for the bushfire management program over the forward estimates.

Mr V.A. CATANIA: There is \$15 million over four years to manage the risk on crown land throughout the whole state; is that correct?

Mr M. Darcey: That is correct; through that program.

Mr P.J. RUNDLE: I refer to the second last line item on page 727, “Coastal Erosion Hotspots (CoastWA)”.

Dr A.D. BUTI: That is for the Minister for Transport or the Minister for Planning.

Mr P.J. RUNDLE: That is for the Minister for Transport rather than the Minister for Lands.

I will move to a new question. I refer to the Fremantle Prison master plan.

Dr A.D. BUTI: That is for the Minister for Heritage.

Mr P.J. RUNDLE: This is division 44, Planning, Lands and Heritage.

Dr A.D. BUTI: As was mentioned earlier this morning, when sections go across different ministers, members have to ask the minister in the chair questions that are relevant to that minister. I am sure that the member is a reasonable man and does not expect me to answer questions that go into the portfolio of another minister. That is a heritage question for the Minister for Heritage.

Mr V.A. CATANIA: I refer to the fourth dot point on page 733, “delivering primary land tenure for strategic infrastructure projects”. What primary land around the state needs to be delivered for strategic infrastructure projects?

Dr A.D. BUTI: That refers to providing a legislative framework to ensure that we can provide land tenure that will assist in the development of strategic projects. We are not talking about the identification of that land; we are talking about the legal structure. Work is being done on amendments to the Land Administration Act, which will provide a system that will help with the land tenure for strategic infrastructure projects.

Mr V.A. CATANIA: When will those amendments be introduced—this year, next year or future years?

Dr A.D. BUTI: Obviously, it is a very comprehensive set of amendments. I know the member is very keen on consultation—we want to make sure that proper consultation takes place before they are introduced into Parliament.

Mr V.A. CATANIA: Have those amendments been drafted?

Dr A.D. BUTI: I will not discuss what might be going through a cabinet process.

Mr V.A. CATANIA: Are we likely to see those amendments in this term of government?

Dr A.D. BUTI: Yes.

Mr P.J. RUNDLE: I refer to carbon farming on crown land, at paragraph 8, second from the top, on page 729. What support is the department providing for this initiative?

Dr A.D. BUTI: I defer that to Mr Darcey.

Mr M. Darcey: The department has been working across all agencies to develop some policy principles around carbon farming. The carbon farming issue is focused particularly on human-induced regeneration at the moment. That requires eligible interest holder consent from the Minister for Lands. There is a whole suite of policy parameters around that. Part of it is that the land has to be put aside for a minimum of 25 years. It is primarily on pastoral land, so it is really a policy piece of work.

Mr P.J. RUNDLE: How many sites have been chosen for carbon farming use?

Dr A.D. BUTI: At the moment, 74 projects have been registered with the emissions reduction fund and 53 proponents thus far have been contracted to deliver 11.4 million tonnes of abatement.

Mr P.J. RUNDLE: How much income is the minister projecting for the government to generate through these sites?

Dr A.D. BUTI: None; that is not the purpose of it.

Mr P.J. RUNDLE: Is the government not engaged in the carbon credit arrangement as part of this?

Dr A.D. BUTI: We are setting up the legislative and policy framework.

Mr P.J. RUNDLE: What companies are engaged with the carbon farming initiatives and what are the time frames of the agreements? Are they 25, 50 or 100-year agreements?

Dr A.D. BUTI: They are individual agreements with pastoralists and so forth. I do not have that information.

Mr P.J. RUNDLE: Is the minister happy to provide that information through supplementary information?

Dr A.D. BUTI: It is private information; we do not have it.

Mr V.A. CATANIA: I refer to the fifth dot point under “Land Administration Services” on page 733, which says —
ensuring that in the case of land subject to Native Title rights and interests, security of land tenure is provided by dealing with Native Title appropriately depending on the use and type of tenure proposed;

Can the minister explain that? I give an example of a business in Exmouth that wants to purchase land next door to enable it to expand, but it is subject to native title. Can the minister explain what he means by “dealing with Native Title appropriately” and the costs associated with someone who wants to expand their business on land adjacent to their existing business?

Is a methodology used whereby the department says that if the land is worth \$1 million, the native title settlement is worth half a million dollars? Can the minister explain that process?

[3.30 pm]

Dr A.D. BUTI: I will make some general comments first before I ask Mr Darcey to elaborate. Native title is a very important issue that has been hard fought over a long period of time by traditional owners. When governments or individuals deal with native title owners, their rights have to be respected. A legislative framework emanates from the Native Title Act that a conservative Liberal–National government in Western Australia tried to abolish. It lost 7–nil in the High Court of Australia when it tried to abrogate native title rights in Western Australia. We respect native title rights. I will hand over to Mr Darcey.

Mr M. Darcey: I am not sure whether it is determined as exclusive possession or not, but irrespective of that, we would encourage the proponents wanting to deal on that land to set up an Indigenous land use agreement with the native title parties. The state is resisting compulsory acquisition of native title rights now, so the way forward is for the land to be taken by agreement between the native title party and the person who wants to access the land.

Mr V.A. CATANIA: In the example of a business that wants to expand onto a piece of land that is owned by the state, that business has to pay the Department of Lands for that land. Can the minister explain the methodology for that process in terms of a native title settlement? I am not saying that there should not be native title settlements.

How is that settlement figure arrived at? My understanding is that if the land is worth, for example, \$1 million, the advice is that the business pays half of that cost to the native title holder. Is that correct, or is the business told, for example, that the land is worth X, so therefore the settlement should be half or three-quarters that amount, or a matching amount of \$1 million each for the state and the native title group? Can the minister explain that process?

Dr A.D. BUTI: These agreements are determined between the traditional owners and the business.

Mr V.A. CATANIA: My understanding is that advice is given by the minister's department to the person or business that wants to purchase the property on how they can proceed to purchase the land off the government. A figure is generated and given to the purchaser so that they have an understanding of how much it will cost them to purchase the land and also pay out the native title holders.

Dr A.D. BUTI: My understanding is that the member is not correct. The advice that I have been given is that the actual monetary compensation value is not given out by the department. In any case, if someone wants to expand onto unallocated crown land, they have to reach an agreement with the prescribed body corporate on what they want, irrespective of the purchase price.

Mr V.A. CATANIA: I want some clarity on this. This is often a major problem in regional Western Australia. It inhibits the growth of any regional town. I am not against native title—do not get me wrong—but when the cost of building in the regions is in the order of 40 to 50 per cent higher than in Perth and the banks make it difficult to get a loan, because the evidence is not often there in the regions, trying to acquire land owned by the state will often end up costing double what it would normally cost in Perth because of the native title settlement requirements, and, therefore, the project does not go ahead. Is there a way in which the government can set some parameters for the settlement in terms of a percentage, rather than having a negotiated outcome, which then blows that potential development out of the water? That is the reality of what is happening in regional WA. If I want to purchase land that is subject to native title and owned by the state, can the minister explain the process involved? Does the department instruct the proponent to negotiate an Indigenous land use agreement before a negotiated price outcome is worked out with the state?

Dr A.D. BUTI: I think that, fundamentally, the member does not understand native title. I will make a couple of points. Firstly, if the state is to provide advice, it provides advice that an agreement must be reached that is beneficial to the traditional owners or the PBC. The government cannot say what the land value is because its value is different to different native title owners—it depends on the land and the significance of the land to that particular Indigenous group. When we say that an agreement must be reached to the benefit of traditional owners, that does not mean just a monetary benefit—it may include a partnership, jobs or enhanced cultural programs. The government does not have a formula to work out the monetary value of the land that would allow it to advise a private owner in negotiations with a PBC.

Mr V.A. CATANIA: Therein lies the problem. Regional development, which mean jobs, progress and growing regional communities, is not occurring because this process simply does not stack up financially. As I said, there are issues with the cost of building and with banks not lending, because the evidence is not there, or they require a 40 to 50-plus per cent deposit before a person can borrow money. When we add it all up, it just does not pay to invest \$1 million or \$20 million. This process is stifling growth in regional WA. Has the minister thought about a way to set parameters, to draw a line in the sand or to negotiate with realistic outcomes, whereby the government, instead of charging \$1 million for the land, charges half a million dollars and the native title settlement is half a million dollars? The government technically owns the land, but it does not own the land because it is subject to native title, so perhaps the state and the native title holder should be the ones to reach an agreement that enables that private development to occur.

Dr A.D. BUTI: I will note a few things in the member's expansive commentary on his question. Firstly, he mentioned that native title is a problem. Native title owners would not consider native title to be a problem; they see it as an opportunity in recognition of their long-held ownership of land. The previous Premier from a conservative Liberal–National government saw it as a problem and tried to wipe it out in Western Australia. It is part of a national scheme that is recognised by the High Court and embedded in native title legislation. Secondly, we are talking about native title rights; there is no line in the sand. Thirdly, the government does not charge for the use of the land. Fourthly, we provide a template in the form of an ILUA, but it is up to the proponents to negotiate.

[3.40 pm]

Mr V.A. CATANIA: I am trying to say that yes, the government charges for the land if I want to purchase some. I have given the case in Exmouth as a classic example of a business wanting to expand. There has been a significant amount of money, but, of course, it does not stack up because of what the minister's department wants to charge for that piece of land plus negotiating native title, which also makes it financially undoable. At some point there needs to be that line in the sand so we get development and jobs. That could perhaps be by ensuring that the department negotiates with the native title holder that the land is worth a million dollars, and perhaps there is half a million dollars each, if the minister knows that I am trying to say.

Dr A.D. BUTI: I will stand corrected. We do charge for land. I repeat what I said: the member's solution is the abolition of native title.

Mr V.A. CATANIA: No, it is not.

Dr A.D. BUTI: We have native title. It is not up to the government to negotiate. It is up to the person who wants to use the land, which has native title rights over it, to negotiate with the traditional owners. That is what the system has been set up for. The member is asking the government to provide a monetary value for native title rights, which will vary according to the significance of the site for various people. As I said, we provide a template and it is up to the private owner to negotiate with the traditional owners on settlement, which may not just be a monetary issue, but an issue of jobs, partnership or so forth.

Mr P.J. RUNDLE: I refer to the second line item "Land Administration Services" in the service summary on page 730 of budget paper No 2, volume 1. The estimated actual for 2020–21 is \$66 million, and then the budget estimate for this year has gone to \$76 million. Can the minister explain the difference there? Why is that figure dropping by \$10 million next year, \$15 million the year after and then \$21 million the year after that?

Dr A.D. BUTI: That relates to carryovers.

Mr P.J. RUNDLE: Can the minister explain to me how those carryovers work?

Dr A.D. BUTI: Basically, between the 2020–21 budget and the estimated actuals, there has been a carryover in regards to, for instance, the Northampton lead tailings project, Wittenoom asbestos management area, Yamatji Indigenous land use agreement, south west native title settlement and the remote Aboriginal communities transformation program. They were delayed and then they were carried over.

Mr P.J. RUNDLE: Is any of that to do with administration of pastoral lease fees?

Dr A.D. BUTI: That is not related to that item.

Mr V.A. CATANIA: I refer to the sixth dot point under "Land Administration Services" on page 733 of the *Budget statements*, which states —

- administering the Government's Land Asset Sales Program, whereby surplus or underutilised Crown land assets are identified and prepared for sale. Sale of land enables the assets to be used for a higher and/or better use in a way that unlocks the full potential of the assets for the benefit of Western Australia ...

Can the minister provide a list of land asset sales, land surplus or underutilised crown land that the government is preparing for sale? I am happy to take that by way of supplementary information. It could be the first time the minister does it. He could give provide information about where that land is to be sold.

Dr A.D. BUTI: It is on the website, but if the member wants to put it on notice, I will give him the information.

Mr V.A. CATANIA: On the website is the detail of the government's land asset sales program? Is that correct?

Dr A.D. BUTI: Yes.

Mr V.A. CATANIA: Is surplus or underutilised crown land identified on the website as well?

Dr A.D. BUTI: Only the land that has been identified. That is the only land on the website, because it is the only land that has been identified.

Mr V.A. CATANIA: Is all the identified land the government is preparing to sell on the website? Is that right?

Dr A.D. BUTI: Yes.

Mr V.A. CATANIA: Has the government sold any of the land detailed on that website?

Dr A.D. BUTI: When we do sell it, it is not secret. Usually there is a press statement and it is on the website.

Mr V.A. CATANIA: Does the minister have a list of land that was sold in the last financial year, what has been sold to date and what its net worth is?

Dr A.D. BUTI: There is 472 South River Road, Carnarvon; Scarborough, Reserve Street; lot 5235 Twelve Mile Creek Road, Pippingarra; 41 South Terrace, Fremantle; 72 South River Road, Carnarvon; 21 Atkin Street, Jarrahdale; 11 Hickory Road, Quinns Rock; and lot 500 Wyatt Road, Bayswater.

Mr V.A. CATANIA: What is the value of the land sold?

Dr A.D. BUTI: That is not disclosed. It is sold at market value.

Mr P.J. RUNDLE: I have a further question about the property at 41 South Terrace.

Dr A.D. BUTI: Did the member buy it?

Mr P.J. RUNDLE: I did not, but I would love to know what it is.

Dr A.D. BUTI: I do not know what relevance it really has.

Mr V.A. CATANIA: We want to see whether the minister sold it to his mates!

Dr A.D. BUTI: I do not have that information.

Mr P.J. RUNDLE: Does the minister have a value on that property at 41 South Terrace?

Dr A.D. BUTI: It sold for \$3 231 818.19.

Mr P.J. RUNDLE: That is not the South Fremantle power station by any chance?

Dr A.D. BUTI: Not 41 South Terrace, Fremantle. Gee, that would be cheap!

Mr P.J. RUNDLE: I refer to the third item on page 734 under “Explanation of Significant Movements”. It says —
The increase in Employees between the 2020–21 Estimated Actual and the 2021–22 Budget Target is due to an increase in full-time equivalents to meet growing demand for land use management actions and to implement the South West Native Title Settlement.

Could the minister tell us how many FTEs that has increased by and what their roles are?

[3.50 pm]

Dr A.D. BUTI: There are 20.

Mr P.J. RUNDLE: What are the roles of those extra 20 employees pursuant to implementing the south west native title settlement?

Dr A.D. BUTI: I will ask Mr Darcey to answer.

Mr M. Darcey: Thank you, minister. There are 20 FTE for the backlog of land transactions. In addition to that, nine FTE are for the south west settlement land estate and four for the Yamatji Nation Indigenous land use agreement.

Mr P.J. RUNDLE: How is it progressing? Would the minister be able to put a time frame on that?

Dr A.D. BUTI: How is what progressing?

Mr P.J. RUNDLE: The implementation of the south west native title settlement. Where are we up to?

Dr A.D. BUTI: That is not my responsibility. I am not the Minister for Aboriginal Affairs. The member will have to ask the Minister for Aboriginal Affairs.

Mr P.J. RUNDLE: It is listed here that the department has put more FTEs on to implement the south west native title settlement.

Dr A.D. BUTI: The actual negotiation itself, though, comes under the purview of the Minister for Aboriginal Affairs.

Mr P.J. RUNDLE: How long does the minister foresee that the completion of the implementation of the south west native title plan will take?

Dr A.D. BUTI: Five years.

Mr V.A. CATANIA: I refer to the “Explanation of Significant Movements” at the top of page 734. Under “Notes”, paragraph 1 states that the Wittenoom town site closure has expenditure of \$2.8 million. Can the minister explain in detail what that \$2.8 million is being used for? I know it is for the closure, but what is the detail of that \$2.8 million?

Dr A.D. BUTI: I will ask Mr Darcey to answer that.

Mr M. Darcey: Certainly, minister. That money is provided for the acquisition of the last of the properties owned in the town. That is what is left over. There was previously a larger budget. This money has been put aside for once the bill has passed and we can compulsorily acquire those properties and manage to pay compensation for those.

Mr V.A. CATANIA: How many properties out of that \$2.8 million has the government acquired?

Mr M. Darcey: I am sorry; I do not know the answer to that. There are still 14 to go. I do not know the answer of how many we have acquired to date.

Dr A.D. BUTI: If the member wants to put it on notice, we will provide it.

Mr V.A. CATANIA: I think it is worthy of a supplementary.

Dr A.D. BUTI: If the member wants to put it on notice, we will provide it.

Mr V.A. CATANIA: Is that \$2.8 million for the Wittenoom closure solely for buyback or compulsory acquisition of land to make the town—it is not a town anymore—safe or to prevent people from travelling there?

Dr A.D. BUTI: That money is for the compulsory acquisition of those 14 remaining privately owned properties and also the subsequent demolition of the Wittenoom town site. In other words, it will stop encouraging people to go there.

Mr V.A. CATANIA: Like I said, it is part of my electorate. I have doorknocked Wittenoom, which I probably should not have done but a few people were still living there. How is the minister going to prevent people from visiting Wittenoom given that the cost to the Shire of Ashburton, which is a defendant with the state, now amounts to \$5 million a year in compensation being paid for those people who may have visited Wittenoom for half a day or an hour? The cost to the ratepayer is starting to be significant. How will the minister prevent people from going there to stop those actions against the state, the Shire of Ashburton and James Hardie into the future?

Dr A.D. BUTI: The member raised an important point. It is very frustrating that people still feel a need to go there. Obviously, part of the plan is to close many of the roads leading into Wittenoom so that people will not be able to get there, and also to have multilingual signage to significantly discourage people from going there. It is not possible to completely prevent people from going. We hope the closure of roads and signage will go a long way towards that.

Mr V.A. CATANIA: I do not know whether the minister is aware that there are a lot of resources around that area as well and there are still truck movements going through Wittenoom. Is the minister going to prevent those haulage roads from being able to go through Wittenoom?

Dr A.D. BUTI: We closed a lot of the roads, so it will not be very accessible for trucks to go through.

Mr V.A. CATANIA: My understanding is that there are still roads that are utilised and will be utilised.

Dr A.D. BUTI: We cannot close all the roads; we are just trying to do as much as we can. The government cannot do everything. We are doing everything we possibly can, and then we rely on the common sense of people not to go to Wittenoom. The member's party is different, but his alliance party does not like a nanny state. I know that the member's party is an agrarian socialist party—it is a bit different—but the Liberal Party does not like the nanny state. We will be doing everything that we possibly can, but we cannot prevent people from being stupid all the time.

Mr V.A. CATANIA: Given that the state has benefited from Wittenoom in terms of royalties through mining activity, and reports from traditional owners, who want tailings dams and Wittenoom to be cleaned up to make it safe, will the responsible minister finance the clean-up of Wittenoom once and for all to ensure that it adheres to the wishes of traditional owners, who want to see it cleaned up? They are the native title owners of the land. Since the minister's party is a very big advocate of native title —

Dr A.D. BUTI: Which the member was not a minute ago.

Mr V.A. CATANIA: — will the government look after traditional owners and clean up the land as they have requested?

Dr A.D. BUTI: The Wittenoom steering committee will be meeting with traditional owners and others to work out what can possibly be done by the state.

Mr V.A. CATANIA: That is not a no and not a yes; is that correct, minister?

Dr A.D. BUTI: The steering committee will be having meetings with the traditional owners on the issue.

[Mr S.J. Price took the chair.]

Mr P.J. RUNDLE: I refer to paragraph 2 on page 734, which states —

The increase in Income between the 2020–21 Estimated Actual and the 2021–22 Budget Target can mainly be attributed to the final phase of pastoral lease rent increases resulting from the last review in 2019.

Can the minister tell me how much that increase in income is?

Dr A.D. BUTI: It is \$3.75 million.

Mr P.J. RUNDLE: Does the minister perceive that there will be more pastoral lease rent increases to come?

Dr A.D. BUTI: It is up to the Valuer-General to determine the valuation.

[4.00 pm]

Mr V.A. CATANIA: I have a further question on that. Under paragraph 2 —

Dr A.D. BUTI: Can I just add to that. Obviously, we are looking at amendments regarding the methodology of rent review.

Mr V.A. CATANIA: With that, the minister also has land tenure and a potential bill coming in to reform the Land Administration Act. Is the minister consulting with pastoralists and land users at the moment? When will a draft of the bill be put out to the public so proper consultation can occur?

Dr A.D. BUTI: I have a couple of points to the member's question. We are consulting and we have been consulting. A lot of consultations have been done over the years. As the member knows, his former colleague Hon Terry Redman tried to bring a bill through Parliament. Regarding the second part of the member's question, he has asked me that

previously, and I said that I will not disclose matters that have to go through a cabinet process, so I am not able to give the member dates.

Mr V.A. CATANIA: When does the minister anticipate the Land Administration Act reform —

Dr A.D. BUTI: I just gave the member the answer. It has to go through a cabinet process.

Mr V.A. CATANIA: When does the minister anticipate that? Is it this year or next year when we can expect to see it introduced into Parliament?

Dr A.D. BUTI: I really do not know whether I am speaking English. Maybe I am not! I just told the member that it has to go through a cabinet process, and I am not in a position to give the member a timetable.

Mr V.A. CATANIA: Is the legislation a priority of the government?

Dr A.D. BUTI: It is a priority of the Minister for Lands.

The appropriation was recommended.