

WESTERN AUSTRALIA

LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL

QUESTIONS

No. 59

FRIDAY, MAY 9 2003

Questions appear according to the date on which notice was delivered.
When a reply has been printed, the question and its answer are removed from the supplementary notice paper.

QUESTIONS ON NOTICE

748. Hon John Fischer to the Parliamentary Secretary representing the Minister for Indigenous Affairs:

Further to question 842 on April 9 to the Parliamentary Secretary representing the Minister for Indigenous Affairs -

- (1) Can the Minister advise me of the names of the Heritage Consultants for the Broome area who -
 - (a) were responsible for the Heritage Survey Reports pertaining to Yardagarra 1 and 2 (17756) and Yardagarra 3 (17757); and
 - (b) provided Heritage Survey Reports for the Broome area for 2002?
- (2) For the information of the DIA, who claimed no knowledge of Reference number AU-RPGSR-47755#, it appears on the top right hand corner of the Register of Aboriginal Sites of the Aboriginal Affairs Department on a report run on April 16 2002 at 4.32pm. Can the Minister advise if the same heritage consultant/s, queried in part (1) of my question, were responsible for the placement of informants' names on the Broome register of Aboriginal sites bearing this reference number?
- (3) The Minister also stated that the Perth Department of DIA had not received a complaint from Aboriginal people in the Broome area regarding being registered as informants of Aboriginal sites. My information is that such advice, dated March 21 2003, was sent to the Premier with a copy to the Director General, Department of Indigenous Affairs, PO Box 7770, Cloisters Square 6855, via express post and was scanned in for delivery by Australia Post on March 26 2003 at 1.54pm at Cloisters Square, Perth (Tab CW3130874). Can the Minister explain how the Department was not aware of mail it has obviously received?
- (4) In light of the apparent reluctance, or lack of ability, of the DIA to answer straight forward questions, will the Minister express confidence in this Department?

749. Hon Christine Sharp to the Minister for Agriculture, Forestry and Fisheries:

- (1) How can the Forest Products Commission (FPC) claim State native forest as an asset (FPC Annual Report 2001-2002) when State forest land is not vested in the FPC nor does the FPC own, lease, control or manage it and the FPC does not own, lease, control or manage State forest products?
- (2) The FPC Annual Report 2001-2002 states that the Commission has access rights to a total State forest estate of 987 190ha. Whom does the Commission pay for these access rights and how much does it pay for them?
- (3) What was the valuation of State native forest when the FPC was created?
- (4) The FPC Annual Report 2001-2002 states that there has been an increase in the valuation of state native forest due to a decrease in costs previously attributed to the Commission -
 - (a) how much was this decrease and how was it arrived at; and
 - (b) what are these costs and who is now responsible for them?
- (5) With regard to the FPC Annual Report 2001-2002, what are -
 - (a) the 'current assets' of the FPC, which are valued at \$31.46m;
 - (b) the 'non-current assets' of the FPC, which are valued at \$308 460 000;
 - (c) the current liabilities, which are valued at \$20.2m;
 - (d) the non-current liabilities, which are valued at \$79.9m; and
 - (e) the components of the \$75m interest bearing liability transferred from CALM to the FPC?
- (6) The FPC Annual Report 2001-2002 shows an increase in both current assets and non-current assets between 2001 and 2002 and yet on page 9, it states there has been a decrease in the value of the natural resource assets of \$1.2m. Would the Minister explain the increase and the decrease?
- (7) Why don't the FPC's borrowings of \$80.76m from the WA Treasury Corporation show up in the financial overview given on page 4 of the FPC Annual Report 2001-2002?
- (8) Given that the FPC Annual Report 2001-2002 states that the Commission has current liabilities of \$20.2m, non-current liabilities of \$79.93m, interest bearing liabilities of \$75m (transferred from CALM) and borrowings of \$80.076m from WA Treasury Corporation, what are the FPC's total debts and is the FPC insolvent?
- (9) Regarding overdue payments to the FPC -
 - (a) how many native forest logs buyers does the FPC have;
 - (b) how many of them owe the FPC money (ie. they are more than one day over the 30 day payment period);
 - (c) how many of the buyers included under (b) are currently negotiating their exit from the industry;
 - (d) based on the FPC's credit risk management audit, how many of the buyers included under (b) are considered likely to pay the FPC the money they owe; and
 - (e) has any action been commenced against any of the outstanding debtors to seize logs and/or timber; and
 - (f) if action has not commenced, why not?

- (10) Given that, according to the FPC Annual Report 2001-2002, the FPC has access rights to 987 190ha of State native forest and the value of standing timber is put at \$66 534 000, how does the FPC justify the valuation of \$67 per hectare for standing timber in State native forest?
- (11) Given that, according to the FPC Annual Report 2001-2002, the FPC has access rights to 136 471ha of plantations and the value of standing timber is put at \$175 027 000, how does the FPC justify the valuation of \$1 286 per hectare for standing timber in plantations, or 19 times more than standing timber in State native forest?
- (12) In 2001-2002, what was the total 'harvesting' cost to the FPC for -
 - (a) native forests; and
 - (b) plantations?
- (13) Can the Minister explain why the valuation of standing sandalwood has declined from \$72.9m in 2001 to \$28.7m in 2002, a decrease of 60 per cent?