

# Your submission to Clean Water

David Willetts



## Clause

What are your thoughts on the proposed swimming targets, for example, on the timeframes and categories?

## Notes

The swimming targets are a joke. This ludicrous proposal has seen Nick Smith become a laughing stock. Rivers should be clean. Every time a visit a river these days I am appalled by the radical degradation of freshwater quality over my lifetime. Nick Smith's clever use of words and statistics does not fool anyone.

## Clause

What do you think about the proposed amendments to the Freshwater NPS?

## Notes

The proposed amendments can easily be summarised: Too Little, Too Late. Our fresh waterways are dying and Nick Smith is presiding over it. His demotion is a sign of how politically toxic his support of the intensive dairy farming industry has become. Any bureaucrats who thought they were backing a winner by pandering to Nick Smith should think again. Stop muzzling the freshwater scientists. Start to get serious about freshwater quality.

## Clause

What are your thoughts on the proposed stock exclusion regulation, for example, the timeframes and stock types to be excluded?

## Notes

The DairyNZ lobby has spouted some spurious nonsense about cities also being a source of pollution of our waterways. That of course is a joke. Each cow deposits the equivalent of 7-8 people every time it defecates and urinates. Cows do it on the ground. People in cities excrete their wastes into infrastructure worth billions of dollars. How DairyNZ thinks this is equivalent to cows taking a dump on ground adjacent to waterways I don't know. There should be limits on the number of cows per hectare. A proper polluter pays system would soon sort things out. I have to pay for wastewater disposal every day, through Watercare. The intensive dairy industry should also pay for the provision of wastewater services, or equivalent pollution mitigation. Only then could DairyNZ seriously suggest that there is equivalence in the contributions to freshwater pollution. The current timeframes for stock exclusion are weak and show bureaucratic complicity with the intensive farming industry's push to destroy ecosystem values in our fresh waterways by 2025. The agriculture lobby clearly wants our waterways converted to open, no-cost sewers for farmers to dump excrement into.

## Clause

Do you have any other comments on the contents of the Clean Water discussion document?

## Notes

The NPS needs to be directive to Regional Councils. Published research by Guy Salmon shows that the agriculture lobby has successfully installed councillors who are prepared to stymie Regional Council regulatory frameworks intended to prevent freshwater quality degradation. The only way to get the Regional Councils to perform as intended is to establish clear overarching regulations which Regional Councils must adhere to. Clear standards covering Nitrogen and Phosphorous should be established in the NPS. The NPS should specifically include the requirement for regional councils to meet water quality targets within specified timeframes. In overview, I think the Clean Water discussion document is a sad example of how good intentions can get watered down by a well funded set of lobbyists for the intensive agriculture sector. There is a welter of evidence recently come to light which shows the lie of clean intensive agriculture, and the amendments to the NPS must get serious about restoring degraded fresh waterways