



FEDERAL POLICY: PRIMARY / RURAL INDUSTRY

PRIMARY INDUSTRY and RURAL DEVELOPMENT

One Nation will protect our primary industries from deregulation; native title claims and withdraw from international treaties which put us at any disadvantage.

Our aims include:

- 1) Stringent Quarantine and Custom requirements.
- 2) Tariff protection in line with reciprocal trading partners, to offset foreign subsidised competition.
- 3) Re-regulate, to create efficient marketing agencies to maximise returns.
- 4) Encourage farm forestry.
- 5) Research into by-products utilization and value adding.
- 6) Australian products promotion and content identification of all products.
- 7) Urgent measures and financial support to reverse salinity.
- 8) Better infrastructure.
- 9) Environmental sustainability.
- 10) Population decentralisation.
- 11) Government Bank with local branches.
- 12) No privatisation of water.
- 13) No majority foreign ownership of Australian land or resources.
- 14) Curb investment speculations which drive up the price of land.
- 15) Public Assets are not for sale.
- 16) Regulated and uniform fuel prices to reduce costs.
- 17) Promote tourism.
- 18) **No** Genetically Modified Organism (GMO); (Traditionally Genetically Modified Only).

Australia's rural and regional communities are key contributors to our economy. We cannot afford losing their input and their skills. Without them, we would not stand a chance in times of crisis. One Nation firmly believes that a thriving rural and regional sector is vital for Australia's economy and future.

GM PRODUCE

One Nation's position on GM produce is one of concern and caution, although One Nation realises not all GM items are inherently the same or created in the same way. Indeed, while some areas such as Australian cotton, rice and now bananas appear to have had greatly beneficial effects and are deemed safe, and thus shall receive assistance to continue their endeavours, However as a whole we find in the vast majority of cases, the only advantage to GM produce is to the multinational seed companies, the UN and the supermarkets. Further to this point, there are warranted concerns about those kinds of GM produce.

What farmer would want a neighbour growing GM and contaminating their crops making them liable to the GM patent holder and destroying any chance of their crop sale because of this contamination? Harvesting machine contractors are finding it already burdensome, as their machines cannot move from a GM crop to a non-GM crop because of the impending contamination.

BACKGROUND BRIEFING OF AFFA ORGANISATION

Primary Industry encompasses the following departments, agriculture, animal and plant health, farmers, fisheries, forestry, grants, quarantine and inspection. The Commonwealth Department of Agriculture, Fisheries and Forestry - Australia (AFFA) has the dual roles of providing customer services to the agricultural, food, fisheries and forestry industries and addressing the challenges of natural resource management. It also helps build and promote the whole food and fibre chain from paddock to plate for domestic and international markets. AFFA's contribution to its customers is to help their industries become more competitive, profitable and sustainable.

- Natural Resource Management
- Innovation and Operating Environment
- Industry Development
- Food
- Product Integrity and Animal and Plant Health
- Market Access and Biosecurity
- Quarantine and Inspection
- Rural Sciences
- Economics

The Australian Quarantine and Inspection Service (AQIS) provides quarantine inspection services for the arrival of international passengers, cargo, mail, animals and plants or their products into Australia, and inspection and certification for a range of animal and plant products exported from Australia. AFFA's goal is to assist our forestry industry to grow, improve and capitalise on new opportunities while protecting the environment and contributing to the prosperity and quality of life in rural and regional Australia. While forests will continue to provide sustainable produced wood, it will increasingly provide opportunities to help reduce pollution control salinity and improve bio-diversity and preservation.

One Nation knows that our primary industries are a national asset and critical to our security. One Nation will support continued growth in our primary industries, encouraging environment-friendly economical sustainable production and ethical resource use.

Confident viable rural communities, safe food and protection against imported pests and diseases, innovation in science and technology and a sound return on investment for Australia. One Nation will protect our primary industries from deregulation, the flooding of foreign produce, native title, Globalism and treaties that threaten competitiveness. Energy prices and other costs of production will be reduced, new technologies will be soundly researched and if proven safe and viable, shall be encouraged for use in such things as the sterilisation of food packaging, to control insect pests and ensure water supplies. The Australian Government, in the pursuit of Globalism, has managed to destroy our rural industries to the extent that we now borrow money to import food we once produced here. ONE NATION, the one party to represent the farmers, will reverse this.

POLICY: PRIMARY INDUSTRIES

- The Australian fishing and aquaculture industries are Australia's fifth most valuable rural industry after wool, beef, wheat and dairy. Exciting opportunities exist for further growth through aquaculture and increasing returns from current commercial catches through value adding. The challenge is to develop these valuable industries while at the same time ensuring the sustainability of the marine ecosystem and respecting the rights of other users.
- Australia is capable of producing any agriculture product needed for use or consumption by its people. The livelihood of efficient traditional producers must not be destroyed by low priced imports. Tariffs (or adjustments) must be provided to protect endangered agricultural products. The USA, EEC and Japan will not stop protecting their farmers in order to buy Australian farm products. We must do the same. Imports that endanger the health of our primary industries must be excluded. Our ocean fisheries must be protected to exclude poachers and prevent overfishing.
- One Nation will re-establish marketing boards to ensure a fair price for rural commodities! Importation of food products will be restricted by "Tariffs" to protect local industry.
- One Nation believes value adding to rural produce to be a priority. Processing and manufacturing plants to be established in wheat and wool producing regions to add value to the products in those regions, within those regions. In particular flourmills and food processing factories, cotton gins, wool scourers and woollen mills. This will reduce the export of raw materials and reduce freight costs whilst value adding.
- One Nation supports the Australian farmers. Many true indigenous Australians, tracing back to our early settlers, have worked hard over generations to establish and develop their properties and improve farming practices and despite the odds, have become the most efficient producers in the world.
- Unfortunately, previous governments have subverted our constitution by signing foreign treaties and trade agreements. This has threatened and brought about much harm to our primary producers. Including the sugar, cotton, wool and wheat sectors that contribute \$13 billion annually in exports, it means their domestic market worth \$56 billion will be at the mercy of imports. One Nation will withdraw from these harmful treaties.
- One Nation's goal is to assist our forestry industry to grow, improve and capitalise on new opportunities while protecting the environment and contributing to the prosperity and quality of life in rural and regional Australia. While forests will continue to provide sustainable produced wood, we will increasingly reduce pollution, control salinity and improve conservation.
- Under One Nation, the AWB single desk will not only be reintroduced, but also overseen, assisted and used as a model for other rural entities. (Note: This does NOT mean One Nation approves or condones any corrupt practises or impropriety).
- One Nation, upon investigation of the live export of sheep, cattle etc, questions the possibilities of minimising this trade by enabling other avenues. A recent report estimates the total cost of the live export trade to Australia could be \$1.7 billion in lost GDP, around \$280 in household income and around 12,000 jobs. One Nation opposes this trade in the export of purebred breeding stock in substantive numbers. Our policy is to value add exports, thus creating Australian jobs and income, not trading losses. What should be considered in this argument is, apart from the humanitarian argument, the fact that the destination of the livestock are generally underdeveloped countries which lack the refrigeration means necessary to store the equivalent in pre-slaughtered meat.
- One Nation will ensure stringent quarantine inspection and treatment procedures to prevent the import of pests, diseases, noxious weeds and contaminated foods. All produce from contaminated countries shall be prohibited entry. Under a One Nation Government, if a country's produce has contamination or disease, it simply won't be permitted into Australia. No matter how safe it is claimed to be.

- One Nation supports timber production and harvesting in state forests providing it is conducted on an efficient sustainable basis and that management practices are in place to minimise environmental damage.
- One Nation supports the return to the regulated farm gate price of milk.
- One Nation will ensure the future of the Australian cane growers, (Sugar Industry) by returning the embargo on all imported sugar and a tariff on imported sugar products out of which an assistance package will be paid directly to the cane farmer in line with that of other sugar producing countries. Excise on by-products from Australian sugar will be removed.
- One Nation supports the Australian farmers who have worked hard over many years to develop their properties and improve farming practices, becoming the most efficient producers in the world. We will encourage them to continue and improve these long-term sustainable productive levels and will oppose any UN treaties aimed at destroying them.

RURAL DEVELOPMENT

Globalism has led to the depopulation of rural regions. Australia's remaining farms are 30% bigger than they used to be, but employ 30% less people, with the result that rural unemployment rises. Former farmers and unemployed rural labourers join in an 'exodus from the bush', gravitating to the cities in search of work. As the number of farming families living in an area declines, small businesses in the local centre are forced to close, further reducing job opportunities. Small towns begin to disappear, rural facilities decline, services are cut, rural employment opportunities erode and those with jobs remain in a decaying economic and social environment, trapped in semi-poverty. In 1947, 31% of Australians lived in country towns. By 1976 the figure was down to 14% and by 1987 it was a mere 12%. Between 1960 and 1985, one quarter of the jobs in country centres were eliminated. News Weekly reports that the population of bush shires in Australia fell from 884,000 in 1976 to 778,000 in 1996 and from 6% to 4% of Australia's population.

80% of the farms that existed in Australia in 1960 have disappeared. 40% of the farms, which existed in 1985, have now gone. The remaining farmers have been leaving the land (1997 figures) at the rate of 35 per week. Some sources place the 'flight from the land' even higher, reporting that the number of Australian farmers declined 15% between 1988 and 1996, representing a loss of 52 farmers a week. The Australian government's response has been to put up a \$600 million taxpayer-funded aid package, not to halt the trend, but to help farmers leave the land.

In the pursuit of Globalism, they have managed to destroy our rural industries to the extent that we now have to borrow money to import food that we once produced here. ONE NATION, (a party dedicated to representing farmers), will reverse this.

- One Nation proposes that development of our rural industries can come through value adding the processing, packaging and marketing of our rural products to the finished consumer level. This not only enhances the value of the product and its shelf life, it also adds to its attractiveness to the consumer and export costs are reduced. One Nation believes that value adding will restore jobs to rural communities, providing employment and opportunities for youth, stopping the drift from towns to big cities.
- One Nation will review live exports with the view that animals should be slaughtered in Australia in accordance with our quality control and health requirements, attractively packaged and shipped direct to world markets. There are less import barriers in most countries to finished products.
- One Nation proposes the setting up of farmer's co-operatives to process and market their products, this way they get a fair share of the products, eliminating the rip-off from multinationals. One Nation believes one way to save the Australian Sugar Industry is for farmers to set up their own co-operatives. This not only includes the growing and harvesting of cane, but ownership in the mills for crushing, factories for processing sugar products and by-products and the marketing of them and research and development for new by-products and their economical production e.g. CSR packaged sugar cubes sold in Australia are packaged in Singapore, this is an example of how large companies such as CSR exploit the Australian cane farmer.

- Another example is the large multinational soft drink manufacturer Coca-Cola. This industry is possibly one of the largest consumers of sugar. Their concern is to keep the price of sugar as low as possible to enhance their profits.
- The Australian Sugar Co-operative could well produce its own soft drinks. The import of alcoholic drinks is a multi-billion dollar business. Ethanol is the base of them and the flavouring is cheap. A very profitable industry for cane farmers.
- Ethanol is also the base for many industrial alcohols. This business is also worth millions of dollars, but at the moment the profits go to multinationals.
- These are a few examples of how the industry can profit. One Nation will subsidise the industry until such time that it is able to stand on its own feet. We do not believe in reducing our farmers to poverty in the pursuit of Globalism.

FACTS ON FORESTS: The forests are not disappearing!

- Australia has approximately 43,300,000 hectares of native forests.
- 7,100,000 hectares of this are State Forests managed specifically on a sustainable basis for wood production.
- About 1% of the 7,100,000 hectares is harvested and regenerated every year, which means that any area logged, on average, will not be logged again for 100 years.
- Australia has a permanent forest preservation system of over 10,000,000 hectares.

One Nation's goal is to assist our forestry industry to grow, improve and capitalise on new opportunities while protecting the environment and contributing to the prosperity and quality of life in rural and regional Australia. Forests will continue to provide wood and we will continue to reduce pollution, control salinity and improve conservation by eliminating waste of forest products (e.g. Biomass power plants/Ethanol production).

Associated industry, such as Australian honey production, which relies upon species of Trees that are important for pollen production and producing unique qualities in honey, One Nation will ensure that such trees are preserved and wherever possible, their numbers increased by State Forest Nursery propagation programmes.

FOOD PRESERVATION

In all parts of the world there is growing use of irradiation technology to preserve food. In almost 40 countries health and safety authorities have approved irradiation of many kinds of food ranging from spices, grains and grain products to fruit, vegetables and meat. **Although it is important to understand that the irradiation of food does not make the food radioactive, there is concern however, that it does alter the chemical composition and destroys the nutritional value, a loss of around 70 % of vitamins and the possible creation of carcinogens.** Given that it may be true, the alternative in substantive areas of the world is considered more of a threat.

Radiation is also used to sterilise food packaging. In the Netherlands, for example, milk cartons are freed from bacteria by irradiation. Note: The preceding paragraph does not apply here, as it is the carton and not the milk being irradiated.

Following three decades of testing a worldwide standard was adopted by the WHO, FAO and IAEA. The Federal Government has also given it the green light. One Nation's view is that the irradiation of packaging is fine, however, for domestic use; we would halt this method for food, as for the previously mentioned concerns. (Refer to D, Health Policy). All food that has undergone this process should be clearly labelled as such.

THE DECLINE OF FARMING

The citrus industry was one of the first to be decimated from imports, e.g. America and Brazil flooding the market here. Imports of food now total \$12.5 million each day so what future do our farmers have. Many will be financially forced to accept the package to leave their land. Under the current circumstances, who would buy a farm? As the market is collapsing, farmers will face repossession, as banks demand their money. Foreign interests will step in and acquire fertile lands at bargain basement prices. That's Globalism. Governments still promote green energy programs as an alternative whilst blaming South American countries (that are among Kyoto's most vocal advocates) who are burning down rainforests to clear land to grow cane so they can flood world markets with sugar.

The same Howard Government that makes out that it is handing the farmers a generous package on one hand, rips them off with the other hand by charging them ten times as much for fuel than is sold by Australia to foreign competitors. The media portrays a few farmers celebrating the Prime Ministers deal, but realistically the paltry few dollars he has handed them will soon be gone along with their future. Australian produce is under threat from imports as the Agriculture Department's Bio-security Australia is proposing to allow imports of apples, bananas etc following the release of a new draft Import Risk Analyses (IRA). Under the Australian Constitution, this organisation has no power to negotiate any treaties or trade deals, beyond issuing reports.

Farmers should be aware One Nation wants to save their industry and future.

PORK INDUSTRY

Forty years ago there were 40,000 pork producers in Australia; there are now 3,000. The sharp decline in recent times has been achieved by the removal of import restrictions on the importation of pork from Canada and Denmark, which was confirmed by an independent report produced by the University of Queensland. This means that in the climate of so-called global "free trade", some industries have to be sacrificed so that others can survive. When Australia's pork producers complained, the federal government's response was to put up yet another rural assistance package. ONE NATION sees it as ignoring the plight of pork producers and their families and treats with contempt the communities who depend on the pork industry for their survival. The federal government remained unmoved.

One Nation will re-impose restrictions on imported pork and associated products.

SUGAR INDUSTRY

Introduced into Australia in 1788 on the First Fleet, sugar did not make headway until 1862 when a cane plantation was established near Brisbane. In 1870 a system of large central sugar mills was introduced by the Colonial Sugar Refining Company, (now CSR). After the resettlement of Pacific Islands labourers (Kanakas) was prohibited in 1901, 40 years of indentured labour in the cane fields ended and the industry became dominated by small family operated farms, as it is today. In 1996 Australia was the seventh largest sugar producing nation in the world, producing more than five million tonnes of sugar a year, of which about 85% was exported. Raw sugar earnings in 1995-96 were more than \$1.6 billion. Queensland was responsible for 95% of raw sugar production and all raw sugar exports.

That production was the result of the efforts of about 6400 cane growers on farms, which averaged 75 hectares in size. They supplied 25 raw sugar mills located in four major regions along the Queensland coast. 19,000 people worked directly in the industry, cane growing, sugar milling, refining, storing and marketing, and a further 26,000 people were employed indirectly. The industry had been very successful. It has even been expanding, growing by 40% between 1990-1996 with the first new mill in 70 years planned for Atherton in far north Queensland.

To protect the industry from foreign competition there had once been an embargo on all imported sugar. This was replaced in 1989 by a tariff initially of \$150 a tonne, which was progressively, reduced to \$55 a tonne unless the sugar came from developing countries in which case the tariff was \$37 a tonne. At those levels the tariff was already below Australia's obligations under the Uruguay Round of international trade talks. The tariff was also significantly lower than the tariff in force in all other major sugar-producing countries. Australian producers were already the only producers depending entirely on world prices with all their competitors receiving government assistance of one sort or another. The Howard government, as part of its election policy issued in February 1996, promised not to reduce the tariff further. Once elected, as usual, promises are broken, and the tariff was abolished on the 1st of July 1997.

Many excuses were put forward to justify it but those who benefited most were foreign confectionery and soft drink manufacturers. This transferred \$26.7 million a year out of the pockets of sugar producers into those of foreign companies and investors who pay less than 2% tax on their Australian profits. By mid-2000, Australian producers were receiving less for sugar they sold domestically than any other sugar producers in the world were. The prices received by growers according to "The AUSTRALIAN SUGAR DIGEST" showed Queenslanders were getting per tonne \$180, Brazil \$315, Indonesia \$380, India, \$403, Thailand \$545, China \$578, South Africa \$593, USA \$632, EEC \$1092,

There is only one conclusion and that is that our farmers, after years of hard work and efficient contribution to the nation's wealth, are forced off their farms.

Monday 26 August 02, the Howard government put the final nail in the coffin for cane growers with an assistance package of \$100 million. This was conditional on them selling their farms and retiring from the industry. They sold the industry out to Globalism, which was the initial cause of the problem. Our foreign owned banks produce their own money, which they lend back to the government with interest. This has devalued our currency, allowing them to buy out Australian manufacturing industry at half price. With much of the industry foreign owned and controlled, the cane farmer receives little for his efforts. In fact, the situation is the same as the destruction of the rest of our farming industry. The foreign owned banks will eventually take over their land when they are no longer able to pay back their ever-increasing loans.

The government, as usual blames the efficiency of the industry when those of us who have been involved in it know this is not so and provided with a true level playing field, it can compete. Refer to story of Tofts and the local manufacture of possibly the world's best and most efficient cane harvester. However, the final chapter came June 03, when the current foreign owners announced its closure and transfer to Brazil. Our government, against the constitution and will of the people, having committed us to treaties, trade agreements and deregulation, over saw the destruction of Australian industry. They instead gave us the GST and excise tax, which force up Australian produced fuel prices by 500%.

DAIRY INDUSTRY

In Australia, 85% of dairy farmers did not want deregulation; in NSW 83% and WA 66% opposed it. Despite that, Australian governments set about sacrificing the industries in three states, leaving a couple of co-operatives in Victoria to supply the entire continent.

In January 1999, the Queensland dairy industry was deregulated. Farm quotas, which are limits on amounts the government allows farmers to produce, remained in place though, but regulation would cease at the farm gate. In other words, it was another one of those funny deregulations, the ones that make life easier for big business, but more difficult for the Australian producer. A flood of imports has destroyed much of the rural industry. The Federal Government's reaction (predictable) was another taxpayer-funded 'package' to help the farmers leave the industry. It offered \$1.8 billion 'repackaging' fund to be funded by an 11 cents per litre levy on milk, over four to five years. In other words, remaining farmers and consumers will, between them, fund the hand over of the Australian dairy industry to foreign multinationals. The payments made to displace farmers will be taxable, so the Federal Government will reap \$460 million in taxation from a fund paid for by producers and consumers.

Some dairy farmers who have been in the industry for many generations have refused to capitulate and have set up their own bottling plants and distribution. One from the town of Nanango 'Same Day Fresh Milk' has been run off their feet by demand. Some retail outlets are refusing Paul's milk in favour of the local producers; however the large supermarkets are opposite. Prior November 2000 to 2007, dairy farmers have seen their incomes drop by up to 40% as the price paid to producers plummeted. Farmers who requested assistance hadn't seen a penny of it and de-regulation was already having adverse impacts on local communities. However, consumer milk prices escalated along with the profits of multinationals.

The Australian Milk Producers' Association Ltd condemns the Federal Government's attempt to cover up the disaster of dairy deregulation. The best the Government could do in using the ACCC to justify deregulation was to focus on a product which comprises less than 12% of total drinking milk sales and chose only a nine month period out of a five year deregulation process. Contrary to the ACCC implication, farmers producing drinking milk only received 4.4 cents of the 11-cent consumer levy.

The Federal Government can not hide from the facts that consumers Australia-wide are conservatively paying \$275 million a year extra for their milk and farmers receiving \$500 million less for the supply of that milk. ONE NATION condemns deregulation and is the only party committed to take up the cause of the dairy farmers, ensuring they remain in business.

ETHANOL PRODUCTION

One Nation's current research reveals perhaps we have not been told all the facts about ethanol. However, at this time (on available information) we cannot discount the viability or possible importance of this industry that could have huge benefits to our Rural Industries. One Nation will continue to follow the US model and to bring all the latest data into the open for discussion. We therefore support the E5% and E10% program. One Nation believes if it benefits our farmers then we will support it 100%.

Ethanol is also the base for gin, vodka, bourbon, rum and all liqueurs. The flavourings to produce these alcoholic drinks are cheap and readily available. We would do better to have our own industrial chemists study and blend our own. If we produced Australian Scotch and other alcoholic drinks, the profit would come here rather than to the foreign corporations who now own Bundy Rum and just about everything else. Excise and taxes on Australian produced alcoholic drinks is about 70%.

Our policy is one of import replacement, to protect our vital industries, backed up by fair and equitable tax and energy policies to ensure it is Australians who benefit from our natural resources. We would withdrawal from all treaties and trade agreements that harm our industries, the return of the embargo on all imported sugar and a tariff on imported sugar products, out of which an assistance package will be paid directly to the Australian cane farmer, in line with that of other sugar producing countries. Excise on bi-products from Australian sugar will be removed.

ETHANOL, AN EVER MORE ATTRACTIVE FUEL / ADDITIVE

OVER 11 MILLION U.S. CARS USING UP TO 85% ETHANOL SINCE 1992

On current available information, Ethanol is a logical and viable progression. Now the Prime Minister has given the green light for 10% content to be used in Australia. On current available information and research One Nation presently believes that even E85% Ethanol conversion not only can be, but also, should be pursued in Australia. The USA is not only converting to Ethanol but it has been preparing for it since 1992 and is now in full swing, manufacturing "FFV's" (Flexible fuel vehicle's) that just love all blends of ethanol and petrol combined. The USA is not only converting to Ethanol, it has been preparing for it since 1992 and is now in full swing, manufacturing "FFV's" (flexible fuel vehicles) that just love all blends of ethanol and petrol combined.

What is the difference in FFV's compared to the regular petrol-only model? Are different parts used?

Response: There is only one major additional part that is included on FFV's - the fuel sensor that detects the ethanol/gasoline ratio. A number of other parts on the FFV's fuel delivery system are modified so that they are ethanol compatible. The fuel tank, fuel lines, fuel injectors, computer system, anti-siphon device and dashboard gauges have been modified slightly as "alcohols" are corrosive. Therefore, any part that comes in contact with the fuel has been upgraded to be tolerant to alcohol. Normally, these parts include a stainless steel fuel tank and teflon-lined fuel hoses.

Does it take more energy to produce a gallon of ethanol than the energy we get out of it?

Response: No. This has been a common misconception of the ethanol industry, that it takes more energy to make ethanol than is available to the final consumer.

Remember that ethanol is produced from plant matter, today dominated by cane, corn, wheat, potatoes, sorghum, etc. Plants grow through the use of energy provided by the sun and are a renewable resource. In the future, ethanol will be produced from waste products or "energy crops." In fact, a partner of the NEVC, BC International (BCI) is currently constructing an ethanol production plant in Louisiana that will use sugar cane waste to produce ethanol. Additionally, BCI is considering the establishment of ethanol production facilities in California that would use the waste husks from rice growers and wood waste from the forest industry to produce ethanol.

Energy crops such as perennial switch grasses, timothy, and other high-output/low-input crops will be used in the future. Current research prepared by Argonne National Laboratory (a U.S. Department of Energy laboratory), indicates a 38% gain in the overall energy input/output equation for the corn-to-ethanol process. That is, if 100 BTUs of energy is used to plant corn, harvest the crop, transport it, etc., 138 BTUs of energy is available in the fuel ethanol. Corn yields and processing technologies have improved significantly over the past 20 years and they continue to do so, making ethanol production less and less energy intensive.

U.S. petrol sells for \$2.00 per gallon. (Approx. Aus\$0.50 ltr) What is the price of E85?

Response: Typically, E-85 is priced to be competitive with 87-octane gasoline. E-85 should be less expensive than regular unleaded fuel, however, the cost of ethanol is very high at this time so there is a tax credit on every gallon of ethanol thus enabling a "Subsidy" to pass on to the public making it slightly less than unleaded.

How will mileage and fuel economy be affected?

Response: A gallon of E-85 ethanol fuel contains about 2/3 the energy of a gallon of gasoline. This presumably means the E-85 vehicles should get about 2/3 the fuel mileage of the gasoline versions of these vehicles. However, the E-85 vehicles in the Illinois fleet were gaining 5-10% above what was expected, or 18-20 miles per gallon. Repairs and reliability of the E-85 Lumina's have been slightly better than their gasoline counterparts.

What is the expected useful life of an E-85 car in the three to five year cost of operation?

Response: Because E-85 ethanol fuel is cleaner burning than petrol, it was expected that the life of an E-85 built vehicle would be somewhat longer than a comparable petrol driven vehicle. The E-85 three-year lifecycle costs competed well with other alternative vehicle technology. Its competitiveness of course was enhanced because it came ethanol-ready from the manufacturer and had no conversion costs.

Over the last 25 years US farmers have formed the AMERICAN COALITION for ETHANOL, or (ACE) the grassroots voice of the U.S. ethanol industry, a national, non-profit organization of more than 1200 members in 45 states, including; ethanol producers, farmers, investors, commodity organizations, businesses supplying goods and services to the industry, rural electric cooperatives, and others supportive of the increased use of ethanol across North America.

The NEVC, National Ethanol Vehicle Coalition and RFA Renewable Fuel Assoc. are also involved. Subsidized by the U.S Govt. many are growing and distilling on farm their own 10% and 85% Ethanol and Bio-Diesel, supplying their own needs and the public. There are now 97 Ethanol refineries in the U.S. Farmers own over 50% of them and are currently erecting 37 more. In 2005 alone they largely contributed to the 15 billion Gallons (Approx. 70 billion litres) of 10% and 85% Ethanol products to the U.S. market. The Australian fuel market alone in 2005 was 20 billion litres of ULP and rising. In 2005 our Government gave the Q.L.D based foreign owned B.P. Refinery, Bulwar Island, a massive \$8.8 billion Australian, to set up the industry by 2012.

One Nation believes this should have been used for our own farmers to form their own Cooperative. This money is only paving the way for this foreign oil company and others to control and dominate the industry as they have with oil and gas.

Our farmers and related industry should investigate the U.S. Farmers Coalition model where to perhaps take control of this industry as our North American counterparts have and who over 10 years now enjoy a 13% return on their investment. ONE NATION urges you to consider this before the chance is lost to foreign oil companies. B.P. is already building a second refinery near Gunnedah NSW.

U.S. Farmers largely control this industry through their own on farm co-operatives, through their own initiatives and non profit organisation, A.C.E. Subsidized by the U.S. Government to the tune of \$1.6 Billion in the 2007 Farm Bill passed by Congress. Supposed plans lodged with the NSW Government for a \$120 million Ethanol plant by a Foreign Company called "Agri Energy Ltd." These plans include plants for the southern Riverina at Oaklands, north-west of Albury, also Coleambally, Condobolin, Murtoa, and Swan Hill.

One Nation is not against our Country following the USA into full Ethanol production, but we are against the multinationals controlling this Industry when as with the US Ethanol Coalition "ACE" they themselves can be in full control in the form of a National Coalition, or (Cooperative).

The following statistics are from the recently released 2007 U.S. Farm Bill, and 2007 RFA Conference, When as part of the coalition to extract the Ethanol on their own farms, were in 2006 responsible for producing 5.5 billion gallons on their own. There are another 78 plants under construction. These plants will add another 6 billion gallons of capacity within 18 months, - 3 billion gallons this year. As these on farm industries grow, it is expanding beyond the traditional grain belt, with plants currently under construction in Washington, Texas, New York and in Arizona. As the industry has grown, so too has the industry's footprint on the economy.

In 2006, the ethanol industry increased gross output by \$41 billion, supported the creation of 163,000 jobs, including 20,000 in the manufacturing sector, put an additional \$6.7 billion into the pockets of American consumers and Added an extra \$2.7 billion in new tax revenue for the federal government and \$2.2 billion for state and local treasuries. From such numbers it is clear the nation's investment in domestic renewable energy is paying off. The U.S. ethanol industry used 1.8 billion bushels of grain to produce 4.9 billion gallons of ethanol and 12 million metric tons of distillers feed last year. The industry used 17% of the corn crop and 26% of the sorghum crop, adding more than \$4 billion to net farm income. Ethanol is today the single most important value added market for North American farmers.

One Nation asks our farmers not to rush into contracts with these foreign multinational companies, but to explore the US Co-operative model for themselves, one that puts them as a National body in control of their own Industry. Only they can do this, as our Governments will favour the foreign multi-nationals as they always have. One Nation, on the other hand would subsidise our farmers to the equivalent of their U.S. counterparts, and furthermore, would assist them financially in order to bring them up to speed in the formation of their own co-operative.

To find out more contact: Kevin Mitchell. Vice President, One Nation- Singleton Branch Ph: 02 65 776 164 E-Mail: kgmonnews@dodo.com.au Researched and compiled from W W W. "ACE" "NEVC" and "RFA" "U.S. Ethanol Coalition" sites: - by Kevin Mitchell

BIO DIESEL

As with Ethanol, Bio Diesel has also been making advances in leaps and bounds. Bio Diesel is normally made from vegetable oil, but now trial production of tallow is expected to produce a far superior fuel utilising this animal by-product of the red meat industry.

Adelaide retailer / research and development company director, Mr Andy Fischer, of Australian Farmers Fuel (AFF); refers to it as “super diesel.” - “The cetane rating, (Measure of quality and performance) of traditional diesel fuel is 45. The rating of ordinary bio-diesel is around 50. But bio-diesel from tallow has a cetane rating of 57.” The aim is to produce and retail a pure-tallow bio-diesel that freezes at Minus, - 10 Degrees Celsius, a freezing point that’s even lower than conventional diesel. Bio-diesel is petroleum free, so it is non-toxic, it’s biodegradable, low in sulphur, increases lubricity and combustion smoothness, is renewable and produces minimal gas emissions because it contains oxygen. Currently 600,000 tonnes of tallow is produced annually; its current use includes the manufacture of soap, synthetic rubber and the extraction of glycerine. Those involved in this exciting new endeavour are world class scientists and the facilities of the Flinders university school of chemistry, physics and Earth Sciences, who have been contracted by, Meat and Livestock Australia, Australian Farmers Fuel, Midfield Meat International and the Australian Meat Processors Corporation.

This project has the 100% support of One Nation and our full blessing.

TOBACCO INDUSTRY

The foreign tobacco companies have replaced Australian grown tobacco with imports. This farming sector, to the knowledge of One Nation, no longer exists in Australia. Unlike other parties, One Nation has not accepted any money from the tobacco industry. According to the AEC, of the Coalition parties, the Liberals received from Philip Morris \$187,760. BAT \$25,000. WD & HO Wills \$10,000. National Party received from Philip Morris \$55,000, BAT \$10,000. Labor Party received from Philip Morris \$94,000, BAT \$61,000, WD & HO Wills \$75,000 (Note Philip Morris is part of a US industrial corporation which includes KRAFT Foods with annual revenues of more than \$50 billion. They were the sponsors of the Liberal Party National Conference in Brisbane.) With this in mind, Globalism, deregulation and other moves by them to sell out the Australian farmer becomes clear.

WINE INDUSTRY

This industry was, until recently, rapidly growing. Australian growers and producers are still mainly small family-owned companies. Globalism and the resulting taxes are really hurting them. Foreign-owned multinationals, due to our weak dollar, have been able to buy many of Australia's major wine producers, allowing them to control the retail industry and shelf space in most retail outlets. Under the 1953 tax agreement, foreign companies are not taxed here, however the small producer is now hit with 29% excise (equalisation tax) on top of which they must pay 10% GST, the total reality is 41% tax. The other major cost is fuel, ironically Australia’s major gas and oil fields produce Autogas for around \$120 per tonne or 3 CPL. Oil price currently is a federal issue and One Nation has policy to reduce it. Government has the power to regulate the domestic fuel price and we will pursue this to set a nationwide maximum pump price. This will greatly assist our primary industries. At the federal level we will scrap the GST and replace it with the Electronic Debit Tax, eliminating all excise and GST on Australian produce and replacing it with a ONE- PERCENT tax that all will pay. This will then put the Australian Wine Industry back on an even playing field.

LIVE EXPORTS

One Nation questions the economic viability of this trade. We are also concerned about the cruelty of it, as a humane Christian country. The ship MV Cormo Express with around 52,000 sheep on it was stranded in the Gulf in horrific conditions because Saudi Arabia decided not to accept the shipment due to playing politics. It appears that the Australian taxpayer funds most of this business, as we no longer own any ships. All exports of animal products should ideally be slaughtered here under humane, hygienic conditions, packed and preserved by refrigeration, salting or smoked. Our export income is increased and the cruelty ceases.

The final cost of the MV Cormo Express bungle was \$10 million for the sheep and shipping and \$1 million plus to bribe Eritrea to take them at our expense. One-report estimates the total cost of the live export trade to Australia could be around \$1.7 billion in lost GDP, around \$280 in household income and around 12,000 jobs. The “honourable” men call this good business. One Nation does not.

THE AGRI-FOOD CHAIN

To understand the economic position of the family farm, one must understand the farm in its context, within the agri-food chain. At one end of the chain are fuel, oil and gas companies. At the next link, fertiliser companies turn gas into nitrogen fertiliser. Next come chemical and seed companies, machinery companies and banks. In the middle sits the family farm. Continuing down the chain we find grain companies and railways, packers and processors, retailers and restaurants. With the exception of the farmer link, every other link of the agri-food chain is dominated by between two and ten multi-billion dollar transnationals and perhaps not coincidentally, every one of these links is characterised by large profits.

Competition and profit are inversely related, the higher the level of competition, the lower the level of profit. All economics textbooks concur; at one end of the spectrum a high degree of competition will reduce prices and profits while at the other end of the spectrum, the complete lack of competition. Monopoly will lead to very high prices and profits. Large corporations known; to maximise your profits, you minimise your competition. As the NFU detailed in ‘The Farm Crises’ (February 2000), even as farmers earn small returns and often endure large losses, the handful of corporations that dominate each of the other links in the agri-food chain earn large profits.

These corporations enjoy large profits because they have consolidated to an extreme degree in order to avoid competition and its downward pressure on their prices. They have consolidated with little interference from government. Instead, Canada’s Competition Bureau has granted approval for merger after merger. As an example of its acquiescence to corporate giantism and monopolism the Competition Bureau allowed Canada’s two major LPG distributors, ICG and Superior, to merge to form a virtual monopoly. The Competition Bureau also seems almost certain to approve Maple Leaf Foods’ bid for a near-monopoly on hog (pig) slaughter and processing in Saskatchewan and Manitoba. Such evidence indicates that the government encourages the reduction of competition in most sectors. The government’s policy prescription of aggressive competition is one that it recommends and applies almost exclusively to family farms.

Of all Australian government policies; the one that most affects farmer competition level and the level within the rest of the agri-food chain is the policy of global integration and free trade. As trade and investment agreements have torn down the economic barriers between nations, these agreements have thrust all the world’s farmers into a single, hyper-competitive market. At the same time, Globalisation and trade agreements have spurred the dominant transnationals to merge into ever larger, less numerous mega-corporations. Globalisation and trade agreements have increased competition levels for farmers, driving down farmers’ prices and profits and the effects for the dominant agribusiness transnationals have been just the opposite.

Other policies similarly increase the level of competition for farmers and decrease competition among transnationals. For instance, governments are dismantling farmer marketing boards. In Canada, until the latter-1990s, hog farmers in Saskatchewan and Manitoba sold their hogs through each province’s farmer-controlled marketing board. Farmers had the benefit of “single-desk selling”; packers that wanted to purchase hogs in that province had to buy from a single marketing board. Single-desk selling gave farmers price transparency, equal access to the market, equal prices for products of equal value and market power when dealing with packers. Today, those marketing boards are gone and one company, Maple Leaf Foods owns 80% of hog processing capacity in both Manitoba and Saskatchewan. The deregulation policies of the Manitoba and Saskatchewan governments, coupled with corporate consolidation, has transformed farmers’ competitive landscape from one defined by a single-desk seller to one defined by a single-desk buyer. Two transnationals kill and pack the bulk of Canadian beef. Three transnationals make most of the cereal. Five retail, most of the food.

THE LIE OF OVERPRODUCTION

“Low prices are caused by oversupply,” farmers are told. To the contrary, the data may indicate a looming shortage. Stocks/use ratios are the most commonly quoted measures of supply and demand. These ratios compare grain on hand at year-end (stocks) to the amount used that year (use). 2003's world wheat stocks/use ratio will be 22.27% which is the lowest level in 30 years. The world total grains stock/use ratio will be 16.87%, which is the second lowest level in 30 years. There is little evidence of an oversupply so vast and burdensome that we would expect it to lead to the grinding farm income crises that are destroying farmers around the world.

MYTH OF TOO MANY FARMERS

Today farmers make up about 3% of the Canadian workforce. This does not seem like an unreasonable number to devote to food production. It leaves 97% of Canadians to build cars, run banks and watch hockey. At one time, the portion of the Canadian population working on farms was large. Moving most of those people to the cities allowed Canada to industrialise and may have increased the standard of living. Less certain is whether this change has increased the quality of life given the tiny fraction of the population that farms today, however, it is unlikely that Canadians or the economy would reap any similar benefits by moving a portion of that small remaining population into the urban workforce.

MYTH OF OVER EFFICIENCY

There is no question about the efficiency of the Canadian farmer, however the question is what happens beyond the farm gate. Numerous studies document how North American food travels thousands of kilometres to get to the plates of the consumers. Jets loaded with lobsters, chilli peppers, tomatoes and many other perishable foods daily cross-oceans and continents. Giant food retailers have centralised their distribution centres so that food is trucked back and forth needlessly throughout our food system, multiplying the consumption of expensive fuel. Would efficient food system ship vegetables thousands of kilometres by ship, truck and plane when much of that food could be grown locally? Would an efficient system transport lamb from New Zealand to Toronto while it simultaneously bankrupts Ontario lamb farmers? In the face of increasing fuel costs, is it efficiency to force the fraudulent Kyoto Accords on farmers that will eventually force up farm cost and eventually drive them off the land? Farmers in Canada and other developed countries now retain just one dollar from every ten they generate in sales—the transnationals take the other nine.

CONCLUSION

Inefficiency rhetoric is nothing more than a smokescreen. A propaganda tactic deployed against farm families, workers and rural communities while corporate and government policies extract the vast wealth we create. When this extraction impoverishes those farms and rural areas, the corporations who purloined the wealth decently proclaim that the problem is farmer inefficiency, All the while, governments are pursuing policies—deregulation, market integration, destruction of marketing boards, seed patenting—that supercharge the corporations' extractive capacities. And then governments join the corporate chorus of “farmer inefficiency”!

But no one dares utter the notion that, “the farm and rural crisis is caused by an aggressive bleeding of rural wealth by the transnationals”. No one dares suggest that “farmers are making too little because others are taking too much”. The problem isn't too little efficiency. The problem is too much theft!

If the Canadian situation seems similar to Australia, its no accident as our benevolent government handed our sugar cane farmers a pittance to encourage them to leave their farms and destroy the sugar industry. The same people are now proposing to destroy the Australian banana industry as they have destroyed the dairy, pig, fruit and most of our other rural industries. The Australian two party system of government is well funded by the transnationals. Their 'honest' men have even set up slush funds to ensure the destruction of anyone who opposes their politics of globalisation.

There is only One Nation left to oppose them, a party that is not funded by and subservient to the multinationals; but instead represents the farmers and the hopes of the Australian people.

Ref: Globalisation, Demise of the Australian Nation, by Graham L. Strachan.
The Live Export Trade: An Economic Dead End for Australia. By R. Nicholson.
Australian Milk Producers' Association Ltd.

Edited and formatted

By

Andrew Webber Federal Policy coordinator NSW



**FIGHTING
BACK!**

"Your democratic solution to the two party system"

Join One Nation and help fight for a brighter future for our country.