

Agricultural Competitiveness Green Paper Submission

Date submitted

20/11/2014

Name of Organisation/Individual

Moffat Falls Pty Ltd

What are the top policies from the Green Paper that the Government should focus on in the White Paper and why?

Working with States and Territories

Policy 4 - a. removing excessive native vegetation laws

Policy 5 - a. limiting the adverse impacts of mining on the agriculture sector.....

d. quarantining prime agricultural land from mining

Competition and regulation

Policy 7 - a. introduce options to increase price transparency throughout the domestic supply chain

b. introduce new marketing mechanisms that might restore balance of power to the producer

c. facilitate greater use of cooperative structures

Policy 8

Foreign investment

Policy 13 - Expanded to restrict Foreign investment to 49% share of agricultural land or agribusiness enterprises

Education, training, skills and labour

Policy 14 - Strengthening Agricultural education a.b.c.d.

What policies from the Green Paper don't you support and why?

Policy 9. a. AgVet chemical regulation - we are already allowing chemicals into this country that are banned in Europe. Strict regulation should be in place and the Minister is not qualified to make such decisions. The latest peer reviewed research (please see attached) is stating that the high use of chemicals in Australia are resulting in the high levels of Depression in farmers. DDT and like based chemicals used in the past have left many of our famers with many unexplainable diseases such as multiple sclerosis which only time will tell if there are direct links.

Policy 13. Needs to go much further to prevent 100% foreign ownership and control of our agriculture land and our agribusinesses. This may not be a big issue now, but many believe it will be

in the future due to the opening up of trade agreements with China. We seem in Australia to like selling off our ideas, our resources and our land! It would seem smarter to exporting value added product and encouraging joint ownership agreements whereby both countries benefit.

General Comment

What is lacking in this paper is any mention of removing the hurdles around building on-farm processing facilities, portable processing facilities (which would assist the small poultry industry) and making it less restrictive in Australia vertically own the production process. Most of our meatworks are 100% foreign owned. These organisations are often not prepared to change to the needs of the producers and merely focus on shipping product back to their country. The huge amount of value in the skins, hides and offal is kept by the processor with the producer not getting reimbursed. This "waste" product actually makes money for the processors. Producers want to be able to kill their own product and have more control along the production line. We used to have abattoirs in most regional towns, we are now finding we have to cart our livestock hundreds of kilometres away to get them killed at an enormous expense. We want our abattoirs and processing facilities back and we want ownership in them. We want the choice of killing on farm, which is far more humane for the animals. Much of the red tape with the food safety regulation is over the top. America is way ahead of us in this area, they have on farm and portable abattoirs everywhere giving some control back to the farmers.

The other missing area of this paper is the lack of debate about the ethics of live animal exporting. Many farmers do not agree with exporting livestock, believing it should be sold as chilled beef and chilled lamb. Ethically, we should have a say in how our animals are treated past the farm gate, particularly when other countries' standards are so much lower than our own.