

I would like to make some comments regarding the position paper on the Proposed management of diesel/biodiesel blends.

1. I own a diesel vehicle and I am dismayed at the idea that my options for buying biodiesel blended diesel will be limited by this proposal. Personally, I would buy 100% biodiesel (B100) if it was readily available.

But, the Government's support of the biodiesel industry is so woefully inadequate that there are no outlets in my vicinity. In fact, I believe there is only one commercial outlet in Sydney !!

2. Regarding the effects of biodiesel blends on vehicles ; I think it is a matter of choice. If the respective blends are labelled according, I think it should be up to the provider to supply whatever is demanded by the end users. That is how most commerce works. To deliberately put restrictions in place, regardless of the demands of end users, is a restrictive practice.

I, personally, accept responsibility for the possible effects of biodiesel on my vehicle, and would happily buy higher ratio blends.

3. The Government should be doing everything it can to promote biodiesel.

THIS IS THE WAY OF THE FUTURE !! Restricting blends to 5% is doing nothing to promote the long term use of biodiesel, and in fact, will discourage the development of blends higher than 5% - which is precisely where, as a nation, we need to go. The Government should be encouraging and fast-tracking the development of blends higher than 5% ... not holding back. The biofuels industry is struggling in a time when we should be doing everything we can to encourage this, and other alternative technologies.

(The Government's support of the solar power industry is equally inadequate !).

4. The position paper makes no mention of the benefits of biodiesel - which are many. The Government should be telling the general public the whole story. If more people were aware of the benefits of biodiesel, I have NO DOUBT the acceptance of biodiesel would rise. As it is, there has been NO promotion of biodiesel, AT ALL !!

5. In the position paper, it makes mention of the Cumming engine development, and that "In the U.S. blends up to B5 are accepted in the marketplace and blends up to 20% (B20) biodiesel are used where agreements between suppliers, users and vehicle/engine manufacturers have been established." This demonstrates that Canada and the U.S. are taking biodiesel more seriously than Australia, and are pushing the development of higher blend ratios. Surely, the Government of Australia can do more than take the conservative approach, and join (if not LEAD) the development of biodiesel.

6. It is hard not to believe that the limiting of biodiesel blends is not as a result of lobbying action by oil companies and vehicle manufacturers, who have nothing to gain from the advent of a strong biodiesel industry.

There is a much more powerful voice than the biofuels industry, though is not necessarily in the best interests of the country.

7. It is well known that we have reached "peak" oil production in the world, and that oil supplies are already limited. It should, therefore, be the responsibility of any Government to look towards a future WITHOUT oil.

I cannot see how limiting biodiesel blends to 5% is moving rapidly to that position.

In short, I think we should be encouraging the biofuels industry, not discouraging production and thereby, the whole industry by putting limits on the blend ratio. I would like the Government to look at rebates for diesel vehicle users to use biofuels, as per LPG, and a much more comprehensive long-term strategy for the move to biofuels in the not-too-distant future.

Yours sincerely,