The income tax treatment of payments under native title agreements has been a matter of concern to stakeholders. In May 2010, the federal Treasury Department released a Consultation Paper on Native Title, Indigenous Economic Development and Tax (the ‘Treasury Paper’). This article summarises the key issues and discusses the three main options for reform that are canvassed in the Treasury Paper. These are:

1. An income tax exemption for payments under native title agreements;
2. A new, tax-exempt Indigenous Community Fund; and/or
3. A native title withholding tax.

The Treasury Paper is one of several important consultation papers on Indigenous issues that were released by the federal government in 2010. Others include Leading Practice Agreements: Maximising Outcomes from Native Title Benefits; the Indigenous Economic Development Strategy; and Indigenous Home Ownership.

INCOME TAX EXEMPTION FOR NATIVE TITLE AGREEMENTS

UNCERTAINTY IN CURRENT TAX LAW

The Treasury Paper states, correctly, that ‘applying the current rules of the income tax system, payments provided under a native title agreement may or may not be assessable income’ for a native title claim group. Payments, property or other benefits received under native title agreements may be assessable if the payment (or the market value of property or other benefits) is ‘ordinary income’ or is taxed by a specific provision or as a capital gain.

Many payments under native title agreements will not be ordinary income as they are payments for a one-off disposal (‘mere realisation’) or extinguishment of property rights. However, payments under agreements that share profits or enable the claim group to receive an income stream linked to commercial use of the land, for example in a mining operation, may be income.

A native title payment that is capital in nature may be taxed under the capital gains tax (CGT) rules. Native title is a unique property right recognised at common law. As such, it is likely to be a CGT asset and a taxable capital gain may arise where the payment received by a native title holder exceeds the cost of that asset. For example, a native title agreement may involve the ‘disposal’ of a CGT asset or the ‘termination’ of a right which is a CGT asset. If an asset is ‘pre-CGT’ (it was acquired or created before 20 September 1985 when CGT was introduced), gains will be exempt from tax.

TAX TREATMENT OF COMPENSATION PAYMENTS

Payments for native title are, fundamentally, compensatory in nature. Native title holders are entitled to compensation ‘on just terms to compensate the native title holders for any loss, diminution, impairment or other effect of the act on their native title rights and interests’. The right to compensation arises as a result of the operation of the Racial Discrimination Act 1975 (Cth). The Native Title Act 1993 (Cth) (‘NTA’) recognises this right and introduces mechanisms for determining compensation.

The Treasury Paper states that ‘compensation payments for the extinguishment or voluntary surrender of native title rights would generally be regarded as compensation for the loss of a pre-CGT capital asset’ so that any gain would be exempt. It relies on Tax Ruling TR 95/35 issued by the Commissioner to ‘look through’ a settlement agreement to the ‘underlying asset’ and assumes that the underlying asset (the native title or right to compensation) is pre-CGT. However, the analysis is complex and there is uncertainty as to whether this approach is correct. Further, TR 95/35 does not refer to native title at all.

In Goods and Services Tax Ruling GSTR 2006/9, the Commissioner confirms that compensation for native title relates to ‘the loss suffered by the claimants on the extinguishment of their interest in the land’. However, this ruling deals only with a government authority compulsorily acquiring native title rights under a statute, with the effect that every interest in the land is extinguished...
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Paper), such as those of South Australia and Victoria.
settlement frameworks (not referred to by the Treasury
by reference to the relevant provision in the NTA under
A specific exemption could be legislated in the tax law,
other stakeholders) need clarity at the
beginning of a native title negotiating process that payments
will be exempt. Making a tax exemption conditional on
agreement outcomes, registration or surveillance at the
end of agreement-making would work against providing
certainty and fairness upfront in native title negotiations.

The Treasury Paper also considers whether there should
be any restrictions on the use of tax-exempt native title
payments. This article suggests that as long as an eligible
agreement making process has been done, there is no
warrant for restrictions on the use of payments. So, for
example, the exemption should extend to a payment
received by an individual under an eligible native title
agreement.26

The exemption should not be conditional on payments
being made into a regulated tax-exempt entity (see
below). The native title claim group should be entitled
to determine the best short and long term use of native
title payments. The communal nature of the underlying
asset and the requirements of the NTA should provide
sufficient safeguards.

A tax-exempt payment or property received may be
invested to generate further income or gains for the claim
group. These would be taxable under normal rules unless
the asset was owned by a tax-exempt entity (see below).27
A TAX-EXEMPT INDIGENOUS COMMUNITY FUND
Charitable trusts or other entities that have obtained tax exemption as Public Benevolent Institutions (‘PBI’) are commonly used for holding benefits and managing payments under native title agreements, largely to ensure tax-exempt status. However, charitable trusts are ‘imperfect’ for Indigenous purposes in several respects.  
1. Charitable purposes are restricted and there are problems with listing multiple purposes; 
2. There are difficulties relating to accumulation of funds for the long term; 
3. The definition of ‘public’ or ‘public benefit’ may cause problems with benefiting native title holders ‘related by blood’ (by virtue of defining the group by their ancestors); 
4. There may be conflict between broader community purposes and the specific obligations of native title holders in law and culture; 
5. The Commissioner of Taxation’s view that a purpose of commercial activity is not generally allowed, even where this is to enable a community to become economically sustainable in the longer term.

A TAX-EXEMPT INDIGENOUS COMMUNITY FUND
The Treasury Paper considers the option of establishing a new tax-exempt entity that it calls an Indigenous Community Fund (‘ICF’). An ICF could be established by inserting a new category of exempt entity in the income tax law. Endorsement by the Commissioner of Taxation may be required and special conditions may be included in the statute or regulations.

This article supports the establishment of an ICF. The fundamental goal should be to support an Indigenous community in converting a communal benefit made under a collective agreement into economic development and relief of economic disadvantage for current and future generations. The purposes of an ICF should be defined in consultation with Indigenous communities; for example: 
• Addressing economic and social disadvantage through direct provision of community services and payments to individuals; 
• Provision for long term wellbeing, for example contributions towards individual superannuation; 
• Accumulation for future generations; 
• Supporting administration costs for native title Prescribed Bodies Corporate.

An important purpose, which is missed by the Treasury Paper, is to facilitate business development. This is acknowledged as central in the government’s Indigenous Economic Development Framework. For example, the ICF could use a portion of funds for business loans and may prioritise Indigenous business ventures in collaboration with other organizations such as Indigenous Business Australia.

ICFs of various scales could be established, ranging from a small local group to a regional or State based Fund covering a number of groups. An ICF established for a limited group of beneficiaries would likely delineate that group on the basis of Aboriginal law and custom. A larger scale ICF might accommodate some pooling of resources to achieve economies of scale and better returns.

USE, INVESTMENT AND GOVERNANCE OF AN ICF
An ICF should be required to use its funds for the purposes set out above. In general, tax-exempt treatment requires that an entity be ‘not for profit’ in the sense that it cannot make distributions to individual members. However, there is a case for allowing an ICF to make limited cash payments to individuals, for example elders in a community, without putting at risk its tax exemption. This provides some recognition of individual claimants’ interests and can contribute to the agreement-making process because they enable individuals to benefit immediately, in a small but visible way, from the native title agreement.

The Treasury Paper suggests that a particular legal form, such as a corporation established under the Corporations (Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander) Act 2006 (Cth) (‘CATSI Act’), could be required for the ICF. However, this article suggests that the form of an ICF does not need to be limited in this way. An ICF should also be an optional alternative to other entities including charitable trusts, which remain suitable as potential vehicles for investment of native title payments for purposes such as educational scholarships.

To achieve the key purpose for the long term benefit of a community, an obligation to accumulate some funds for the long term could be required. This obligation might not apply where the annual revenue stream is below a certain amount. Bearing in mind the purpose of long-term accumulation, an appropriate regulatory authority might be the Australian Prudential Regulatory Authority (‘APRA’), which regulates superannuation funds. Other limits on investment or distribution of funds, such as a cap on the proportion of capital in an ICF used to support commercial activity, would also be required because of the risk of such investments.

The decision-making processes of the ICF should reflect Indigenous law and custom, contributing to effective collaboration with other organizations such as Indigenous Business Australia.
participation and legitimacy. Administrative burdens must be balanced with good governance, especially for smaller funds. Possibilities include at least one director experienced in corporate and financial management; a minimum number of representatives of the community; for ICFs of a certain size, independent responsible persons on the board; audit, returns and plans to be prepared in line with good funds management. Many of these governance issues arise with respect to charitable trusts at present; they cannot be avoided but processes could be streamlined and structures made more suitable.

As many existing agreements rely on charitable trusts or PBIs, transitional rules would be required to enable “migration” of existing assets to the ICF without attracting tax consequences.

**NATIVE TITLE WITHHOLDING TAX**

The Treasury Paper also considers the option of a native title withholding tax. This could be modeled on the current Mining Withholding Tax (‘MWT’) levied at four per cent on ‘mining payments’ made to Aboriginal people or a distributing body such as a Land Council, in respect to the use of Aboriginal land. It is collected from the mining company.

The MWT is simple and generates no further tax consequences for the recipients. It operates in a well understood manner in the Northern Territory. Consequently, some have suggested that this is a good option for reform.

However, the model may not translate well to the diversity of payments and agreements in the native title context, which are summarized above. More fundamentally, the premise of this model is that tax is owed on the payment. As is clear from the discussion above, it is a matter of principle that payments related to native title should be tax-exempt.

**CONCLUSION**

The link between taxation of native title payments, maximizing outcomes from native title agreement making and Indigenous economic development is strong. It is important that the government address the tax issues raised in the Treasury Paper holistically.

This article welcomes the Treasury Paper on the tax treatment of native title and supports the enactment of both a specific tax exemption for payments under native title agreements and a new tax-exempt ICF. These are complementary options that together have the potential to improve agreement making and enhance native title outcomes. It will be crucial, to ensure the best design and full acceptance of any reforms, that there is significant further consultation with traditional owners, Native Title Representative Bodies, industry and other stakeholders.
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