

## **Submission from Mr. Edmund Marriage – British Wildlife Management**

**27<sup>th</sup> February 2007**

Dear Peter Freeman,

Please may I respectfully ask that the Competition Commission in its deliberations on issues relating to the Farming Industry looks at the big picture of Government action, and more often inaction, in its duty of care to the inhabitants of this country.

Above all to the Food Security of the Nation, Trade Deficits, Fair Value of the Pound, and Long Term Planning - in as much as failures to address these individual issues will ultimately effect the quality of life of the people and our future as a nation.

The fact that you have received so few submissions from farmers giving evidence against unfair practices of supermarkets, is because this is such a complicated issue, which runs across so many factors. within which our man made economy works, or more often, does not work.

By hanging its hat on Global Competition the Government has failed to calculate or understand the real and fair short and long term costs and benefits within our own economy, of such Global thinking and Planning.

Efficient core industries in Britain are producing strategically and environmentally important commodities and products, well below the cost of production, and have been doing so for some years.

This fact alone should ring alarm bells at all levels.

I would ask you to review the evidence attached which I sent to you in May of 2006, and the attachments below.

I would also ask for a meeting to discuss differences between us.

Kind regards,

Edmund Marriage - British Wildlife Management.

Dear John Fingleton,

I am writing to you in response to statements allegedly made by you and reported by the Western Morning News on 16<sup>th</sup> May - I have attached a copy of the press report.

I have been asked to make representations to you on the many issues of unfair trade faced by members of the farming community, and in my capacity of representing the interests of some 150,000 full time job units in dependant industries.

You will be aware that your alleged comments have created a storm of unrest and unhappiness within a national core industry, which unnecessarily and unfairly is losing irreplaceable skills and other crucial national strategic resources.

I claim to prove within the attached ten issue document, that British agriculture has been misled and abandoned by a hostile and destructive Government, which has demonstrated a complete failure to audit comparative viability, or to understand the many ways in which British agriculture has been hugely disadvantaged financially over some 20 years.

The British Government's target in 1962 was for the creation of the most efficient food production industry in the world. In reality, this has been largely achieved, without further overall loss of wildlife habitats,

and massive progress in the quality of wildlife and food friendly farm technologies, together with increased productivity. The current destruction of this core, supply side technological base, is of huge detriment to the future of Britain.

Britain's unique climate ensures all year round growth of grass and other vegetation, which for generations has been profitably utilized by grazing animals. The land was maintained in good order by high standards of grazing management skills by farmers, graziers and commoners. A vested interest ensured that little of the abundant growth was wasted, being equally important to avoid over-grazing, as it was to allow land to become neglected and under-grazed. Cattle and sheep grazing provided an efficient cycle of low cost vegetation being converted into quality meat, with a by product of dung and urine being returned to the ground, thereby creating a fertile soil structure and conditions under which insect, plant and bird life thrived.

The lowering of the acid run off from the hills contributed to river systems rich in life. Large variations in the underlying geological structure of the soil, moisture, elevation, aspect, acidity, and the distribution of hefted animals, created an extraordinary variation of unique and beautiful landscapes for which upland Britain is famous. The establishment of 80% of the world's heather moor-land in the British Isles, was encouraged some 300 years ago, as a direct result of the demand and production of beef and lamb from a thriving and growing population in the industrial areas of Britain. Wildlife and upland communities flourished under good management practices.

We now face the situation where bad Government is destroying upland Britain, which makes up some 50% of the total land area.

I would ask you to address each of the ten issues attached and the other points raised, explaining to those who disagree with you, the Office of Fair Trading position on each of them.

In addition I have also attached the EU Milk Producer Price Averages over three years calculated in euros. These figures and those for the previous seven years show UK Average Milk Prices at the bottom of the EU league table for this ten year period. With other farm products a similar distressing picture prevails.

I would welcome the reasons why this long list of self evident unfair injustices are not deemed to constitute unfair trade, and request a meeting as soon as possible.

Kind regards - Edmund Marriage – British Wildlife Management.

Mr Edmund Marriage  
British Wildlife Management

Your ref  
Our ref  
Date 31 May 2006

Direct line (020) 7211 5810  
Fax (020) 7211  
Email chris.jenkins@oft.gsi.gov.uk

Dear Mr Marriage

Thank you for your email to John Fingleton of 23 May. He has asked me to respond on his behalf.

You refer in your email to comments attributed to Mr Fingleton in the Western Morning News. These comments were based on remarks reported in the Mail on Sunday on 14 May, which gave a misleading account of his position with regard to the policing of the Supermarkets Code of Practice.

The OFT is committed to pursuing proactively breaches of the Code, as stated in the conclusions of its Supermarkets Code audit in August 2005. Supermarkets have a clear responsibility to deal fairly with their suppliers and to honour the terms of their contracts. The Code is, however, not designed to prevent buyers from obtaining the best possible price from suppliers. Competition means that some suppliers will go out of business, while others win new business; it is not the job of competition authorities to devise market rules which would distort this process, to the detriment of consumers and the economy as a whole.

In your email, you identify ten concerns in relation to agriculture in the UK. Unfortunately the OFT is not in a position to comment on most of the issues you raise. The OFT's remit is to make markets work well for consumers, by ensuring effective competition across the economy. Most of your concerns relate to wider government policy which is beyond the scope of the OFT's activities.

On your fourth point, the OFT would, of course, be concerned by evidence that businesses are engaged in anti-competitive practices. But our remit is to safeguard the competitive process, not to protect businesses when market conditions go against them or to shelter them from competition from abroad.

The OFT has recently completed a detailed investigation of the grocery sector, which gave grounds to suspect that there might be some features of the market that distort competition. As a result, the OFT has referred the market to the Competition Commission for a full investigation, which could take up to two years.

The issue of the supermarkets' buyer power was among the features of the market which led the OFT to make this reference. The CC has invited interested parties to submit evidence, in writing, by 6 June. You may therefore wish to bring your concerns about this issue to their attention. If so, you should write to:

The Inquiry Secretary (Groceries market inquiry)  
Competition Commission  
Victoria House  
Southampton Row  
London WC1B 4AD

Please do not hesitate to contact me if you want to discuss further the issues raised in your correspondence.

Yours sincerely

Chris Jenkins  
Supermarkets team

# Fury as OFT chief back supermarket supremacy

**Western Morning News – 16 May 2006-05-18**

BRITAIN'S competition chief John Fingleton sparked an angry backlash in the Westcountry last night after he suggested he would be happy to see farmers and other suppliers driven out of business in order to keep supermarket prices down.

In an extraordinary interview Mr Fingleton, the chief executive of the Office of Fair Trading, made it clear that he was far more interested in ensuring low consumer prices than in tackling the complaints of suppliers who say they are subjected to a barrage of unfair practices by the big retailers. He said goods could always be imported from abroad if British suppliers went bust.

"It would be ridiculous to keep prices artificially high to placate suppliers. There are always winners and losers. If one company goes out of business there will soon be another to take its place. Even if everyone goes bust and business shifts abroad, those trucks importing goods will need to be filled up in the other direction."

Mr Fingleton also said there was no need for rigorous policing of the voluntary supermarket "code of conduct", which is supposed to ensure fair play between supermarkets and their suppliers, but which many farmers have condemned as toothless.

He added: "It is not good for consumers to protect the suppliers, and our job is to protect consumers."

His comments sparked an angry reaction last night in the Westcountry, where there has been growing concern about the impact of supermarket buying practices on the region's crucial farming industry. There was also astonishment that he had chosen to speak out just days after the Competition Commission confirmed it was launching its third inquiry in seven years into the activities of the supermarkets.

Liberal Democrat MP Andrew George said Mr Fingleton's comments would inevitably raise concerns about the value of the new inquiry, which could take up to two years to complete.

"It worries me tremendously," he said. "The past seven years of inquiries have resulted in nothing more than piles of reports and dashed hopes. If these views are followed through I fear we could have another two years of the same."

Mr George, the MP for St Ives and a founder member of the "Breaking the Armlock" campaign, said farmers accepted that they had to be competitive on price. But he said there was widespread concern about other aspects of supermarket behaviour, such as late payment of suppliers, charges for stocking goods and short-notice price changes.

Cornish farmer Michael Hart, the chairman of the Small and Family Farms Alliance, said many farmers would now wonder what the point of the inquiry was. "I am gobsmacked by this," he said. "The inquiry is only just starting and he has already made his mind up as far as I can see."

Ian Johnson, spokesman for the National Farmers' Union in the South West, said farmers would be dismayed by Mr Fingleton's arguments. Mr Johnson said: "If that is what he really believes then they should change the name of his organisation to the office of consumer protection. Fair trading implies trading fairly with both suppliers and customers."

<http://www.mdcdatum.org.uk/milkprices/euprices.htm>

### EU Milk Producer Price Averages

(euros/100kg)	2002	2003	2004
Italy	38.8	35.2	35.0
Finland	36.2	36.2	35.4
Sweden	33.2	33.8	32.1
Portugal	33.0	32.9	33.4
Denmark	34.2	32.6	30.6
France	30.8	30.4	28.7
Netherlands	32.8	31.5	29.4
Germany	31.1	29.7	29.0
Spain	28.7	28.7	30.8
Austria	31.5	29.7	29.6
Ireland	26.9	27.5	28.4
Belgium	29.1	27.3	28.8
UK	26.6	25.5	26.8
EU weighted average*	31.3	28.9	28.8

Over the last 10 years our self sufficiency in food has declined:

**Pigs: 83% > 54%**  
**Beef: 107% > 71%**  
**Sheep 113% > 84%**

Why did we accept an insufficient Milk Quota for our needs in 1984 ?

To what extent can the decline in British Agriculture be attributed to:

1. Our own Government - 1984 to 2006.
2. EU Directives gold plated by our Government.
3. So called environmental schemes whereby the public pay for their food twice; once in taxes, which pay the farmer not to produce food, and again when he buys *Imported* produce, which generally is not produced to our own high standards, and whose economic and strategic viability is never properly costed here or abroad.

**Please Note – UK Milk Producers have been at the bottom of this milk price league table for 10 years**

## Farming Forum – A View of the Issues

- 1 Government does **not take good advice** on the range of problems and economic factors, which are complicated by strong currency, devolution, EU politics, and unjustified hostility towards the countryside. Problems are compounded by both a lack of practical knowledge and genuine communication skills. Confusion is fed by increasing amounts of poor quality research, and a raft of unsound lobbying organisations, many who obtain money by misleading, or deceiving, public and Parliament. Doubling of overall Government expenditure in 8 years, without real benefits, is hugely **deflationary**. The current size and ambitions of Government, as in the EU, are not sustainable. In removing support for the production of food, Government is set to waste larger sums on un-costed environmental management schemes, which ignore best practice, and have an uncertain future.
- 2 Our taxpayers have contributed each year as much as £15bn per annum to EU farmers, whilst production subsidies in Britain of some £2.2bn have been removed. Subsidised agricultural production exists all around the World, amounting to some £200bn. However trade agreements sanctioned by Government encourage **cheap subsidised products to be dumped in Britain**.
- 3 There is **no realistic long term Strategic Planning and Incentives** (not **compulsion**) for the efficient home production of food, adding value in processing that food, facilitating competitive exports, and raising standards of food, disease, and energy security. There is an influential, misguided belief, that agriculture is a side show, and should go the same way as the fishing industry. Those dealing with Government feel betrayed by lack of progress, and conflicting messages. In consequence, the good management and sound stewardship of countryside, especially in the uplands, is not achievable under current plans. Master craftsmen are ignored.
- 4 Government and the Office of Fair Trading are **having difficulty in defining and implementing fair trade**. They are allowing efficient businesses to put out of business by unfair competition, the buying power of cartels and monopolies, and mafia styled activities. Food miles and fuel costs are ignored. Good farmers, with the crucial skills to pass on to future generations, require a safety net and support, not closure. Action now is a national priority. The absence of a level playing field ensures that nobody wins, be it Home Food Production, Third World Fair Deals, or the Tax Payer.
- 5 **Lack of Competitiveness** through the expense of **unnecessary Government Red Tape**.
- 6 British Agriculture has been hugely disadvantaged by some £30bn over 20 years by the political **failure to pass on the EU Payments Rebate**, which was negotiated on their behalf to compensate for currency losses, one reason why British farmers are at the bottom of the earnings league table.
7. The **artificially High Pound and relative High Cost of Money** has set a dangerous precedent for future economic stability. Most supply side industries and tourism have suffered permanent damage as a consequence, and we are also left with an **Unsustainable Trade Deficit**.
- 8 50% of our **Food Processing Capacity and Technology has been lost**. This situation has to be reversed, encouraged by Government, in order that real value is added to efficient food production, as has been implemented in New Zealand. Adding value need not increase cost.
- 9 Agriculture in other countries also benefit from a range of Discretionary Payments, incentives, and benefits, beyond production subsidies. **Relatively low levels of Discretionary Payments are available in Britain**, but they tend to be diverted unfairly to areas not needing priority support.
10. The illusion that we can somehow blame the EU and CAP for the collapse of our farming industry was dispelled by EU Minister Hans Fischler, who stated that, as in the case of other European Governments under CAP, we can treat our farmers as fairly as they do. Any blame therefore rests fair and square on our own successive Governments. **Britain can have its own superb Agricultural Industry - without severance of the ability to give good advice to the EU.**

## HILL SHEEP

### Q1: What is a “Hill Sheep”?

A: A “Hill Sheep” is one that can live all the year round on its mountain or moorland “Heaf” or “Heft”, with minimal input or interference from man and still bring in a fleece at Midsummer and a strong healthy lamb in the autumn.

### Q2: So, what is the “heaf” or “heft”?

A: (etymology: Old Norse vb. Heftda (inf) Heftdadr (past) “... acquired by right or prescription.”)

The “heft” or “heaf” is the finite area occupied by “the flock” (on open moor or mountain). It is also used to describe the territory of the individual sheep, within the flock boundary, which varies according to season and weather.

The sheep is attached to the heaf both by heredity and genetically.

### Q3: In what way is the “Hill sheep” different from other types?

A: A “Hill sheep” is genetically and physiologically different from her lowland cousins in that:

- She is better able to utilise poor vegetation to produce milk for the lamb and increase her own body weight.
- She is able to lay down internal fat (in late summer) which can be utilised as a bodily food reserve, during lean times in winter, in a way that would kill a lowland sheep.

### Q4: Do all “Hill sheep” have this ability in equal measure?

A: No. Under “traditional” management systems, practised by countless generations of shepherds/flock masters, sheep that did not have this genetic ability to a high degree would die during the winter or fail to breed; either way the line would die out.

### Q5: What is the effect of “modern” management of the “hills flocks”?

A: Modern, rigid management systems, as exemplified by the so-called “environmental schemes” are slowly, but inexorably, destroying the traditional hefted flocks.

### Q6: How is this happening?

A: The policy-makers do not understand the subject.

- They do not know what a true “Hill Sheep” is (see Q1)
- They do not understand what a “heaf” or “heft” is, especially the “genetic” connection of sheep to heft (see Q2) (Though since 2001 they have learned to use the words!)
- They cannot comprehend the sheep’s dietary preferences.

### Q7: How can a sheep be connected “genetically” to a tract of land?

A: The altitude, aspect, local climate and most important the underlying geology all affect the soil type. This in turn determines the vegetation and minerals (trace elements) available to the grazing animal.

Accept it: no two moors or mountains are exactly alike.

A flock established on a hill “beyond living memory” will thrive. They have come to terms with their environment.

Move that flock (as I have done) to a geologically and climatically different hill. All the neighbouring flocks, established “beyond living memory” thrived. The newcomers did not. They encountered, what was to them, a mineral imbalance: lower levels than they were used to of copper, cobalt and selenium exacerbated by a high level of manganese.

Result; “swayback” in many lambs and “pine” in many of the ewes caused unprecedented mortalities or failures to breed.

Remedy; supply copper, cobalt and selenium supplements? Tried that; the high level of manganese negates the sheep’s ability to utilise these beneficial” trace elements”.

Conclusion: 15 years on, the families that were unable to adapt died out. (The losses were hard to bear)

Twenty-five years on the descendants of those survivors are now as healthily established as any other sheep on the hill.

Charles Darwin would agree, there is a genetic connection between the animal and the territory, my vet certainly does.

**Q8: What are a sheep’s dietary preferences?**

A: As food of first choice; sheep eat short, sweet grass.

**Q9: But, don’t sheep eat heather and isn’t that “a bad thing”?**

A: Sheep eat heather; in summer, as food of second choice if there is no suitable grass available; in the winter because there is no fresh grass so heather shoots are then both palatable and digestible. And no, it is not “a bad thing”. Sheep can eat up to 20 percent of a season’s new growth of heather shoots with no detriment to the health of the heather.

*(Progress towards defining ecologically-sustainable grazing management: the 'Moorland Biomass' and 'Heather Suppression' projects Aspects of Applied Biology 58, 2000: Vegetation management in changing landscapes By FW KIRKHAM 2000)*

**Q10: So, where is the “lack of understanding”?**

A: In order to “protect” the heather (a laudable aim in itself) from the effects of perceived “overgrazing” (debatable) farmers/shepherds are paid to reduce the stock numbers on the hills: in most cases dramatically. What might be considered a sensible level of winter stocking is now imposed on us in summer, with further paid reductions in winter.

**Q11: What is the problem? You are paid aren’t you?**

A: If insufficient sheep are on the hills in summer to keep on top of the growing grass the more rampant varieties grow long, coarse and unpalatable, in the process smothering the more delicate plants thus reducing the biodiversity, at the same time forcing the sheep to eat heather; the very plant that the conservationists want to protect. The more sheep that are taken off, the faster this occurs.

Two other problems have cropped up; one completely unforeseen. In parts of the Central Lake District so many sheep have been removed that the heaving system seems to have broken down. Sheep are straying for miles, turning up in valleys where they haven’t been seen before. It seems that there is a critical flock mass below which it is inadvisable to go.

The second problem was foreseeable; it’s just that no-one bothered to ask the men on the ground. By reducing sheep numbers, and by sending them away, the ewes become fitter.

The fitter the ewe the more lambs she will conceive (the contrariness of sheep). Twins are an embarrassment on a hill farm. They cannot be put onto the hill, the grazing isn't good enough. Therefore they must be kept on the "inbye" all summer. But, the inbye is to provide grazing for cattle and grass to be conserved for winter keep. To grow the extra grass to support the twins and their mothers we have to use more fertiliser...which the conservationists would much rather we didn't!

Yes, we are paid. We are paid to do something we know is wrong and that hurts. But, such is the state of British Agriculture we cannot afford not to take the money. That is an even more painful pill to swallow.

**Q12: Surely it cannot be bad to be paid to remove sheep from the hills in winter?**

A: Well done! Full circle: go back to Q1.

By removing sheep from the hills in winter and sending them to the lowlands we are keeping alive those strains that nature would not otherwise permit to live. We will then have no choice but to breed from them and their offspring thus accelerating the process of decline.

In another three or four sheep generations (six to eight years) the hills will be populated by a lot of Hill Sheep "look-alikes" that will be unable to fulfil their proper function should the "environmental money" run out, or the nation realises it needs affordable home produced food once again.

Richard Mawdsley M.R.A.C

The Dash,  
Bassenthwaite,  
Keswick  
Cumbria.

## **A Brief Fact Sheet on Britain and the Future of the Planet**

by Edmund Marriage

The world has now only 70 days supply of wheat. While politicians still seem to be complaining about CAP, EU grain mountains, and subsidised food in Britain, the world and events are moving faster than their thinking, as usual.

Along with other grain crops, food security has rarely been such a major problem globally, for 6 billion people and growing towards 9 billion in 50 years, until starved to death by the mismanagement of the planet, and inevitable natural catastrophes.

Theoretically, we need to produce a increase of 1.7% annually in grain crop yields, on a diminishing supply of suitable land, over the 50 years, to feed the 9 billion.

Water, disease and energy security run on a similar high risk path. Britain, despite its higher rainfall than other countries in Europe, has the lowest available supply of fresh water for its people than any other European country. Incidents of new diseases, for plants, animals and humans has broadly doubled over the past twenty years. We are now too late to be sure of securing our future energy needs, through worrying about nuclear radiation risks, which have been greatly over-stated, and new fusion technologies which virtually eliminate them.

We are now, over the next 100 years on high alert, because of the much higher risk of the inevitable natural planetary catastrophes such as cosmic radiation, comets and cometary debris, which have totally disrupted life on earth over the past 50,000 years, on a cyclical or episodic basis.

The sun is getting hotter, that is the primary cause of global warming.

The related increased cosmic radiation turns water vapor to clouds, which offsets increases in CO<sub>2</sub> emissions.

Approximately one third of CO<sub>2</sub> emissions relate to fires on earth such as man made peat, accidental, and natural forest fires.

Methane released by earthquake represents by far the largest source of uncontrolled CO<sub>2</sub> emissions, placing human factors as a low priority, unless considered as good house keeping.

Even if it were possible to find the money to make a significant impact on CO<sub>2</sub> emissions, it should be clear that there are other more important priorities.

Good management of the planet requires a much broader and more knowledgeable approach than is currently being made.

In the current rich areas, the biggest personal cost and threat from food is eating too much.

In the poor areas, the biggest threat is not having it at all.

Fussy diets and ignorance on nutrition result in brain damage to at least 50% of the population. This may seem a harsh statement, but in comparison to our over-engineered brain's potential, specialists now use the term brain damage to accurately report on the problems, which occur from poor diet, a wide range of substance abuse and external factors, which create real problems. Many of the basic conditions can be healed. However, attention span, spatial memory, concentration; practical, artistic and analytical ability, emotions, reactions, energy and common sense will be among the many problems experienced, which have not yet been associated to poor nutrition and lack of exercise.

Some consider that the biggest mugs are those paying up to 50% more for organic food, for which there is no scientific supporting evidence, or a satisfactory system of regulation to ensure that it is genuine. If it was genuine and beneficial, there is a price to pay on food miles and extra space utilized to produce it, which more often negates any residual advantages such as freedom of choice.

Our chicken industry, which has led the world on welfare and product quality, is being closed down, as is the dairy industry, by cheap, inferior and heavily subsidised competing produce from abroad, and an un-level commercial playing field, through lack of knowledge on the economic factors, or the security risks involved. Even our largest and best run farms face closure, with the loss of a wide range of crucial skills. The overall impact of EU and Labour Government agricultural policy is allowing Britain to be hugely disadvantaged when compared to our foreign competitors. This is not in the public interest.

The food scares industry unnecessarily costs the taxpayer billions of pounds, which could be better spent on good management, best practice and encouraging individual responsibility. Just encouraging people to wash their hands, makes a big impact. Closing down the production of upland meat from our native breeds of cattle on spurious BSE grounds is delivering its own special national catastrophe, as is the grossly incompetent removal of crucial abattoirs for all UK meat and game processing.

In the British Isles we are removing more than 70% of our cattle and sheep from the hills, where they grazed on low cost grass and other vegetation all year round, providing a superb habitat for a very wide range of important species including man, and the best quality, low cost meat. The peril of under grazing and the understanding of so called over grazing is now sinking in at Natural England and RSPB headquarters, but certainly too late to stop the collapse in grazing animal numbers.

One product was 80% of the worlds heather moorland, once well managed by and for livestock, by now neglected and failing, aided by Government agencies re-classifying failed heather moor land as heathland in good condition, to meet their crazy performance targets.

The management of what woodland still exists is either totally absent, or in any event has failed on all counts to address the needs of our wildlife, in creating rich and balanced biologically diverse habits, and the capital investment required for future viability.

Our state environmental managers are charged by legislation to put people before wildlife. This has had catastrophic results, such as removing wildlife managers, who up to now have done their best to stop the public in general, adversely impacting on the countryside and its wildlife. Right to roam is making it impossible for farmers to farm and wildlife managers to manage. No formal Code of Conduct exists to ensure

that animals and birds are not shot, unless there is an efficient means of following up the wounded, or searching for the injured, sick and weak.

Wild red deer populations in the West Country, Grizedale, Brecon Beacons National Park, and other key sites are being wiped out by the growing army of out of control riflemen encouraged by both the shooting lobby and a Labour Government, who have never understand the difference between the selective management of wildlife and their indiscriminate slaughter.

Environmental schemes and subsidies now represent an almost total waste of tax payer revenue, without adding the cost of the army of state environmental supervisors, within the 14 million people now dependent on the State for a living

Chief sitting Bull said: *White man can make everything but cannot distribute it.* His high protein and high quality diet encouraged the practical skills and sound thinking of an advanced sustainable culture.

### **Management Neglect**

A vulture perches behind a young girl who is dying of hunger in the Sudan



Dear Peter Freeman,

I have attached further up to date figures and information on British Agriculture, which I would like added to my detailed submission discussed this morning.

Kind regards,

Edmund Marriage - British Wildlife Management

## British Agriculture – Facts and Figures – January 2007 (Not necessarily current)

British Contribution to EU for 2007 = £15 billion but we receive back only £4 billion.

(2006 figure)

EU member states import one fifth of the worlds' produce.

French farmers receive 4 times as much as British farmers in support.

There are at least 8 bureaucrats for each British farmer.

<b>UK Imports</b>	<b>2002</b>	<b>2003</b>	<b>2004</b>	<b>2005</b>	<b>2006</b>
<b>Beef &amp; Veal (Fresh/Frozen)</b>					
'000 tonnes	226.1	269.4	280.6	235.8	214.9
£ million	457.3	552.8	611.0	572.1	569.4
<b>Sheep meat (Fresh/Frozen)</b>					
'000 tonnes	101.8	111.5	116.2	109.7	105.8
£ million	228.0	252.1	283.1	290.4	262.1
<b>Pork (Fresh/Frozen) *</b>					
'000 tonnes	275.9	380.5	383.5	422.2	402.6
£ million	331.0	464.0	496.9	575.9	597.8
<b>Chicken (Fresh/Frozen)</b>					
'000 tonnes	278.1	303.6	351.7	361.3	304.4
£ million	480.2	559.6	641.9	664.7	548.6

**Notes:** Data for 2005 & 2006 is provisional and subject to revision. 2006 data is for Jan-Nov. only - Figures are subject to rounding

Source: Intrastat, Customs & Excise, GTIS (all these import figures supplied from the Meat & Livestock Commission) .

\* Other DEFRA figures of pig meat imports for the 10 years from 1994 are 362,000 to 738,000 - more than double. (The lower pork import figures may be due to the fact that meat produced outside the EU, but processed and packed in any EU member state and then imported into Britain, is not necessarily regarded as an import.)

\* *The UK sow herd has dropped in the period 1995-2005 from 784,000 to 463,000 - a 41% fall. For the same period the number of pig abattoirs has fallen from 332 to 183 - a 45% reduction.*

**Dairy Farmers** - 50 quit in November 2006. That left only 13,493. Nearly half have quit in the 10 years until 2006.

In a 10/11/06 edition on the Daily Telegraph a poll showed that 79% of people would pay more for milk to support dairy farmers. (Poland increased milk production by 11 % in the [llst 7 months of 2005 although EU statistics showed that CAP reforms had reduced milk production in most member states).

British farmers are getting 17 -18p. per litre for milk but supermarkets are charging 50p per litre or more. Our farmers are paid less than their production costs.

In 1994 we were 109% self sufficient in beef. This had fallen to 71 % in 2004. That same year 26,000 sq. kln of rainforest were burned, the 2nd highest on record & most of it driven by cattle ranching (NASA web site June 2004 figures).

## **Poultry**

In a similar Daily Telegraph poll of 29/1/07 78% said they would pay more for a British reared chicken. Broiler chicken meat now comes from Brazil and Thailand. Figures for last 10 year period until 2006 has risen from 1,000 to 70,000 tonnes imported. In the first 11 months of 2006 11,400 tonnes of fresh poultry meat from Poland was imported. Both Poland and Hungary are importing cheap fresh poultry breasts to leading supermarkets. As a result during 2006 UK chicken prices fell by 2.5%.

**Pig Farmers** - in the last 4 years (Nov. 2006 figures) 2,000 pig farmers left the industry. The sow herd figures in UK, for same period, has gone from 789,000 to 468,000.

December 2005 figures - **Every year 17 million tons of food from restaurants, stores and hotels is dumped in landfill sites.**

Since 1900 Europe has .lost 75% of its food product diversity including fruit & vegetables. For every 4 varieties of livestock there is now only just one.

The USA has lost 93% of its food diversity over the same period.

**Fruit and Vegetables** - The planted area of all fruit and vegetables in the UK in 1994 was 476,000 acres. In 2004 this was reduced by 22% to 373,000 acres. 95% of fruit and 50% of vegetables eaten in UK are imported. (June 2006 figures).

In 2006 DEFRA spent £170 million on consultants in 12 months.

## **NFU Figures for food supplied from UK**

In 1996 it was 60%. In 2006 it was down to 42%.

**DEFRA figures for UK self sufficiency in indigenous foods** was 87% in 1995 down to 70% for 2005. *(You will have to decide who is nearer the truth, the NFU or DEFRA, about these food self-sufficiency figures).*

**10 years drop in self sufficiency in livestock** (figures from Oxford Farming Conference 2006)

**Beef:** 107% down to 71%

**Sheep:** 113% down to 84%

**Pigs:** 83% down to 54%

**Import Figures for 2003** - 60% of red meat served in hotels, pubs, restaurants & by rest of catering trade is imported (Meat & Livestock figures).

**Fruit and Vegetable Imports** rose in 10 years since 1994 from £1.99 bn to £3.17 bn. (DEFRA figures)

**Trade Gap** - In 1997 the trade gap between the value of food and drink we import and that which we export has risen from £6 billion to more than £15 billion. This accounts for some 20% of Britain's entire trade deficit (figures quoted in August 2006).

But in 2005 EU funding on consultant organisations to promote local food increased by 18%.

**Food Transport** - A report by DEFRA for year 2005/6 estimated the environmental and social impact of transporting food at £9 billion a year. It accounted for 25% of all HGV vehicle miles in the UK. The quantity of food transported by HGVs has doubled since 1974. The report said consumers travel an average of 898 miles annually by car to shop.

If all foods were sourced from within 12.5 mile of where they were consumed, the country could save £2.1 bn in environmental and congestion costs.

**Air transport of food** accounts for 1 % of food miles, but 11 % of food mile CO2 emissions. The amount of food air-freighted around the world has risen by 140%.

Buying food from countries that fell rain forest to plant crops is not sustainable. An area of rain forest equivalent to 10 football pitches is destroyed every second.

12.5 energy units are wasted for every energy unit of food transported per thousand air miles. £50-78 million go directly into the pocket of farmers trading in some 200 established local UK farmers markets. It generates twice as much for the local economy as buying food in

supermarkets. (Figures from Institute of Science in Society published (April 2005).

## **Water**

Water is fast becoming a dangerously scarce source around the world. It is essential for agriculture and food production. The pressure for this will grow due to industrialization in the Far East, India and other emerging markets. Added to this pressure is the growth of the worldwide population from 6.5 billion to 9.1 billion by mid century, and higher temperatures due to climate change.

There is no more water on the planet than there was hundreds of years ago, but as standards of living rise worldwide so does water consumption. A few decades ago in India water was pumped by animal or human power and the water table was a few feet down. Now with the extensive use of electric pumps, the water table has dropped to 400ft or more.

Britain, despite it having a higher rainfall than other European countries, has the lowest available supply of fresh water. The disgrace of leaks by the water companies continues. A number of huge new reservoir projects would not be necessary if this problem is dealt with effectively.

Water leaks in 2005 were 3.6 billion litres per day. This equated to 270 litres per household per day.

China is building hundreds of power stations, many of them nuclear, requiring huge amounts of water. It has also embarked on a massive programme of water distribution via enormous dams to transfer water from major rivers to very dry areas of the east of the country where the main populations are situated. Only 12% of China's land is suitable for agriculture and 70% of it requires irrigation. In the 5 years until end of 2004 the area of cultivated land there dropped from 92 million hectares to 76 million, more than a fifth. China has very recently begun importing grain and within less than 5 years will have to import 50 million tons annually.

In 2004 the United Nations Food & Agriculture Organisation that the gap between the world population and consumption of grain has widened to more than 5%, the largest every recorded. It was reported that grain stocks have fallen to 60 days of consumption. Since then there have been higher temperatures, long term droughts continue, and many serious fires.

February 2007

### **Sources:**

DEFRA  
Meat & Livestock Commission UNFAO  
Daily Telegraph  
NFU  
Commercial Farmers