

16 May 2011

Senate Economics Committee
Parliament House, CANBERRA ACT 2600
Tel: 02 6277 3171 | Fax: 026277 5719

Questions on Notice Inquiry into Foreign Acquisitions Amendment (Agricultural land) Bill 2010

Federation questions. I am conscious of time. Firstly, we had at evidence earlier today from the New Zeala Overseas Investment Office about their threshold They have 75 to 100 applications a year. A lot	QoN No.	Hansard Page Reference	Senator	Witness/ organisation	Question
cent rejection rate, subject to judicial review. The have had four or five judicial reviews in the last for years. The investment office's decisions have been upheld. What have you heard from your Note a colleagues, your brother or sist organisation in New Zealand, in terms of the effectiveness of their foreign investment reging which is completely different from ours in the work they approach things? How has that impacted farming, confidence and the like? Mr McElhone—We have not had any feedbar.	16	E58	Xenophon		questions. I am conscious of time. Firstly, we heard at evidence earlier today from the New Zealand Overseas Investment Office about their threshold. They have 75 to 100 applications a year. A lot of them are turned over within 15 working days and some take as long as six months. There is a two per cent rejection rate, subject to judicial review. They have had four or five judicial reviews in the last few years. The investment office's decisions have all been upheld. What have you heard from your New Zealand colleagues, your brother or sister organisation in New Zealand, in terms of the effectiveness of their foreign investment regime, which is completely different from ours in the way they approach things? How has that impacted on farming, confidence and the like? Mr McElhone—We have not had any feedback at this point from our New Zealand counterparts. Mr Laurie—We could find out for you.

NFF Response – The NFF has written to Federated Farmers in New Zealand following the Senate Inquiry but at the time of writing had not received a reply.

17	E59	Xenophon	National Farmers'	Senator XENOPHON—My final question relates
			Federation	to the review that is being undertaken by the
				Australian Bureau of Statistics and ABARES, working
				separately but with some overlap. What input has
				the NFF had into it because the concern I and, I
				think, others may have is that the quality of the
				information being gathered may be questioned in
				some cases as to how deep they are going in

looking at who owns what land, and look behind trusts. Do you look at the issues, as Senator Heffernan has raised, as to whether or not a state owned enterprise has been guaranteed by sovereign wealth funds, so you could argue de facto control? What input have you had? What concerns have you got that this audit, this survey, will be robust and give us useful information?

Mr Laurie—The information has to be right. It is a total waste of time if we do all this work and it really does not relate to anything. If we get to a position where Australians actually want to start setting some policy, we need to get it right. As far as going through and having a look at the depth that you are talking about to make sure that we get that right then obviously we have not had any discussions with them at this stage.

Mr McElhone—In terms of the parameters up front we have discussed some of the things that we have talked to you about today, the ownership versus control, the state owned versus the foreign ownership and the importance of transparency in the price-setting arrangements. It has been more about the broad parameters that we are keen to see through this whole process.

Senator XENOPHON—On notice, can you let us know how you go with that. I am concerned that you have not seen the methodology.

Mr Laurie—I do not think anybody has really seen enough. We certainly have not seen enough apart from general discussions but that is about as far as we have got.

Senator XENOPHON—If you have not seen enough of this survey then I am concerned.

Mr Laurie—We will go through it and find out. We will get the stuff from New Zealand for you too.

Senator XENOPHON—Thank you.

NFF Response – The NFF provided input to the Government at the start of the process asking that a number of issues be taken into account within the Government's program to strengthen transparency of foreign ownership of rural land and agricultural food production. The NFF suggested that the study needed to include the following:

- Undertake analysis on the extent of foreign investment in the Australian agricultural supply chain. This should include factors such as:
 - o The level of foreign investment in Australian agriculture.
 - o The level of foreign investment broken down by agricultural commodity.

- A breakdown of the countries undertaking foreign investment within Australian agriculture.
- A breakdown between how much of this foreign investment has been undertaken by state owned enterprises.
- Undertake analysis on the amount of 'control' foreign entities have over Australian agricultural resources (as distinct from 'ownership').
- What role do other countries see Australia playing in delivering food security to their people?
- Explain how the drivers for foreign investment within Australian agriculture may have changed over time. How much is food security now a driver?
- Discuss the potential benefits and the potential risks for Australian agriculture (and the Australian economy more broadly) that have resulted or may result from foreign investment within Australian agriculture.
 - o Are the risks greater in certain commodities?
 - o Is there potential for foreign investment to undermine the existing marketing mechanisms and pricing transparency needs of Australian farmers where these underpin farm gate price determination?
- Analyze and compare other international foreign investment regulatory regimes and discuss the pros and cons of these.
- Analyze the role of the Foreign Investment Review Board (FIRB) and the Australian Competition and Consumer Commission (ACCC) in providing assurances that foreign investment within Australian agriculture is in the national interest. How could these systems be improved? For example:
 - Are the FIRB notification thresholds appropriate?
 - o Is the FIRB national interest test appropriate?
 - Should there be a transparent register listing foreign investment in agricultural land and supply chain assets?
 - In what circumstances could FIRB parameters be an unwanted deterrent to foreign investment within Australian agriculture and its supply chain?
- What implications may there be for the Australian Government in its own considerations about our own national food policy?
- Other considerations that the Australian government should consider in its policy deliberations on foreign investment within Australian agriculture and its supply chain.

The NFF understands that the ABS Survey into foreign ownership will have limitations in addressing all of the issues outlined about by the NFF and that the survey will largely focus on discovering the top line level of foreign ownership of agricultural businesses, land and water resources. We have received advice from the Government that has been clear about these limitations. However, the NFF believes that this survey will still provide a level of information that far exceeds what we have had in the past and will assist in the broader review process.

Yet the NFF hopes that the second track of the review process, undertaken by ABARES and RIRDC, will be able to analyse the remaining elements outlined by the NFF through a combination of quantitative and qualitative information. We will continue to put pressure on the Government to ensure that this is the case.