**Senate Economics Legislation Committee**

ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS ON NOTICE

**Treasury Portfolio**

Budget Estimates

2016 - 2017

| | |
|---|---|
| **Department/Agency:** | **Treasury** |
| **Question:** | **BET266-274** |
| **Topic:** | **FIRB Policy** |
| **Reference:** | **Written - 5 May 2016** |
| **Senator:** | **Chris Ketter** |

**Question:**

266. Can Treasury confirm that if the investor who was proposing to acquire Kidman came from the United States, FIRB screening would not have been required?
267. What about if the investor had been from New Zealand or Chile – would FIRB screening have been required for this proposed acquisition?
268. So under the Government's foreign investment policy, the reason this acquisition was required to go to FIRB was because of the nationality of the investor?
269. What is the policy rationale for a FIRB screening policy that treats investors differently based on their nationality?
270. When potential investors are required to submit applications to FIRB for consideration, does it create additional costs for the investor?
271. Are some costs associated with potential delays for an investor?
272. Does an FIRB process present a higher regulatory risk for investors?
273. Is it correct that by lowering the FIRB screening thresholds for agricultural land and in agribusiness, the Government has effectively increased costs, delays, and risks for investors?
274. All else being equal, will higher costs, longer delays, and higher risks for investors make Australia less attractive as an investment destination?

**Answer:**

266-274. Similar questions asked and answered on Hansard pages 114 and 115.