

**From:** [Sally Warren](#)  
**To:** [WaterReformPublicConsultation](#)  
**Subject:** Water submission.  
**Date:** Saturday, 25 January 2014 12:49:24 p.m.

---

Having grown up at a time when most if not all waterways were swimmable and mostly drinkable I am horrified at the suggestion that it would be enough to merely insist that the level of pollution allow boating and paddling but not swimming and certainly not drinking. If dairy farmers lowered the amount of urea they use and stocked a little lower their profit would not be much different and the quality of the water in our rivers would greatly improve. There are some farmers in the country who are doing this successfully and so using their ideas and insisting on water quality improvement the future of our land would be positive rather than facing disaster as appears to be the case at present. Short term profits are not worth ruining our future for. Of course it is not only rivers which should be considered. How much longer will the wonderful underground water in Canterbury still be potable. Having a bach in a small community Marlborough Sounds I find it laughable that the government is insisting hat we spend huge amounts of money upgrading our water supply when most is used for gardens and boat cleaning. Individual filters are all that it necessary. If the government put a similar effort into our public waterways we would have a lot more respect for it and feel that it is really interested in the greater good.

It appears that section 4.3 is of real concern. It must read swimmable/safe immersion levels.

Yours in hope.

Sally Warren

[ withheld ]