

I have only just become aware that the plan for change/Healthy Rivers was quietly put through under the Treaty of Waitangi. Does that mean it applies to Maori only? I note the Maori are the main ruling power and apparently are able to dodge responsibility if they have multiple ownership of land. That is rubbish. If you can't charge all the multiple groups, then charge the tribal iwi governing the area. It's too easy to sit on the fence and dictate ridiculous requirements on others if they themselves have no consequences.

If these very same top expenses are forced on farmers then compensation must be made for loss of income and loss of value in the land. I believe compensation has been accorded affected farmers around Lake Rotoma or Taupo?

The need to swim and harvest food in rivers is mainly a Maori call so they should be paying compensation.

Why are you chasing farmers almost exclusively? I understand towns and cities have a 30 year consent to continue pollute the rivers. If this is so, farmers should be afforded the same timeframe. Towns and cities discharge wastewater, have sewage leakages, industries discharge + tips both directly into the rivers. The birdlife - ducks swans and general birdlife are the main pollute of E. Coli. Don't blame farmers, but surely this is a mutual problem.

If you were serious in reducing the problem I think the first point of call would be removal of carp and maintenance of riverbanks where the willows are being excavated.

by the camp on the banks and falling into the rivers.

How many tourists, actually want to swim in our rivers? Many countries are too polluted. It is rubbish to think NZ should be the "stand out" clean water country - at any cost. Advertising says the people of Waikato "want clean water". Well this Waikato resident doesn't want to swim or eat from the river. How many others are like minded?

Then there is the reported huge spend so far for this area. Crazy stuff - who has received all these millions? I bet much is for the Maori - they're good at putting out their hand to receive but not front up with the money to fix problems. Maori are ~~an~~ minority in numbers, and most are more non-Maori than Maori anyway and yet they seem to always be put at the top of the heap.

The farmers you are so intent on vilifying are making good inroads with stock out of the water etc. Encouraging the improvements which multiply, but don't keep trying to get high country gullies and water ways fenced. By the time the water gets miles down to broad rivers it will have cleansed itself. Have you tested the inflows to rivers from high country for pollution?

Your 24 seats on your committee are a farce. Landholdings should be on a per HA basis. I see 1 seat for sheep and beef, 2 for dairy, 1 for forestry, and yet three to Maori interests. I rest my case.

I don't suppose venting my spleen on these matters will make a ~~swap~~ difference, but I feel better for doing so.

If the farmers are unable to farm economically

who will provide the food the world requires
and the
income that NZ needs?

The greenies / SAFE plus the Maoris
need to come up with some solutions
very quickly. If any of these groups are
wishing to obtain cheap land when
farmers go to the wall, they should
absolutely be barred from doing so,
since they are the cause & I imagine
the suicide rates will rise, also, even
if these responsible won't bring these
poor souls back.

Mrs Judy Lance
RD 19, Tamihana
Waikato.

J. E. Lance