

IN THE MATTER of the Resource Management Act 1991

And

IN THE MATTER of Applications for Resource Consent by the Central Plains Water Trust and a Notice of Requirement for the designation of land by Central Plains Water Limited associated with the construction and operation of the Central Plains Water Scheme

Submission on behalf of Stephen Clarke, Lesley Barlow and immediate family.

1 We stand in opposition to this scheme for the sake of our grandchildren who have no voice but who will be most affected by the result of this scheme going ahead. We oppose this scheme, because it seeks to squander the richest of the earth's resources ...the one resource none of us can do without ...and because we view ourselves as citizens of this planet and wish to see it survive. The day of the grandiose irrigation scheme is past; we all have to learn to live with what we have and to seek a sustainable future. None of the earth's resources can be squandered again in the way in which we dealt to oil. The global issues concern us most, not because we are personally unaffected by this scheme; our home is directly in the path of one of the canals and we have no faith in C.P.W.'s fine words that they do not seek to destroy anyone's home, its just that we believe the wider issues are more important and if they are not addressed our wider home...New Zealand will not be safe.

2 Had these issues been addressed already there would have been no need to speak. The moral debate around the use of water should already have taken place in this country, our views collective and individual should already be known. That they are not is a measure of our youth and naivety as a nation. It leaves us in poor shape to face the rest of the world...a humanity increasingly exposed to the global water crisis.

3 What of the moral cost? We have an agreement with the first people of this land to protect the lands Mauri, its uniqueness. How can this be achieved when C.P.W. intend to mix the waters from the Waimakariri and the Rakaia, spray the resultant mix over all the lands and waterways down to State Highway 1 and bywash what they cannot use back into the parent rivers and the Selwyn. There will be no waterway from Malvern Hills to the Pacific that is untainted with this Waimakariri/Rakaia mix. The bywash into the Selwyn alone will create a flow into Lake Waihora not experienced in the past 1000 years. Waters flowing from the Rakaia alone, into Te Waihora, will be a unique experience. The colonial attitude, displayed by C.P.W. and their supporters to the land and its waterways defies comprehension in the modern world. It matters little that mixing water has happened elsewhere, this time the act flies in the face of all the accumulative wisdom we have in dealing with each other.

Should this commission allow this scheme to continue, it must do so in certain knowledge that a new grievance is being created.

4 While many Pakeha and the Crown refuse to recognise Maori ownership of natural resources, the courts have not specifically ruled this out. Maori have a legitimate claim to the water in rivers as a resource. Entities like C.P.W. claim the “greater good” and “economic advancement” as a legitimate reason why our treaty obligations should be set aside. A decision to grant consents to access the water in these rivers, that denies access to Maori for their own use or which damages the resource so customary use cannot continue, will come at a cost. If we are going to destroy all that Maori hold dear in this region “for the greater good” and if we are not mature enough as a nation to vote on the movement of water between watersheds as have the Canadians, then we should allow Maori to place a value on the water as compensation so that they can directly share in that “good”.

5 We have taken under the treaty everything of value but have honoured none of the spirit. Thousands of New Zealanders have died in foreign wars because of broken agreements yet we are singularly incapable of fighting for the sanctity of the founding document of this nation. It is morally reprehensible to merge the waters of these two great rivers. We have no right to do so... it should and will pick at the fabric of our society and no one in the future will thank us for it. The damage to the waters and the land they will collectively flow across will be terminal. Any uniqueness will be lost under this new ‘*Waikaia*’.

6 That C.P.W. through Dr Wylies opening address sought to squash this debate is most revealing. It highlights their awareness that a world water crisis exists and their fear that this debate may damage them. They hope we can still remain insular and disconnected from this crisis which is set to consume the rest of humanity. They seek to portray us as water rich with no need to tighten our belts around water use and in part they are succeeding. The good citizens of Christchurch, partaking in this debate obviously side with C.P.W. and see no need to review their use of water. In January 2008 they set a new world record in its use: 642 Litres of water per person per day, more than twice the US average over the same period, with a high point of 864 litres during the third week. This is not a record one can sleep easily with, when other nations are struggling to reduce personal water use. It is a long way from the record of 40 Litres per person per day (Israel) at the other end of the first world scale.

7 The world water crisis is exponential in its growth and is about to overwhelm the unprepared. This is a debate New Zealand must have and the nation’s views and position on this crisis must be known. In 2000 the UN declared that 1.7 million children died each year due to no access to safe water, one every 4 seconds and that 53 million life year equivalents were lost to unsafe water. Later that same year, in their Global Water Supply and Sanitation Assessment, UNICEF and W.H.O. reviewed that access estimate upward. Child mortality figures went to 2.2 million and L.Y.E. had grown to 500 million. Furthermore it was estimated that 2.4 billion people had no access to approved sanitation.

8 Predictions were decidedly worse after the review in 2003. This review prompted the UN to warn that by the middle of the century, 2 billion people at best would face water scarcity problems and to declare 48 nations at risk. The worst case scenario

currently puts 2/3rds of the world's population as the figure that faces drinking water scarcity by 2050. So serious is this issue that the UN report further suggested that resource wars of the future would be fought over water rather than oil...and stated : *"Water will be to the 21st century what oil was to the 20th".*

9 These problems are compounded when one views the impact we are having on global groundwater reserves and the effects of pollution. Dr Sandra Postel, Director of the Global Water Policy Project in 2003, estimated the overdraw of global groundwater reserves to be in the region of 200 km³ every year and the overdraw of this account is compounded by global waste water in the region of 1500 km³. Agriculture is far and away the largest contributor to global wastewater pollution. The US Congress funded E.P.A; the oldest government funded protection agency estimates that 79% of all water pollution can be sheeted home to agricultural activities. All these figures are now 5 yrs old...the situation has only deteriorated.

10 It is agreed by many agencies, including our Ministry for the Environment, as seen in their report to government in 2004 that for every litre of water polluted via agricultural activity there is a further loss of 8 litres of potable water due to pollution and dilution problems. Canterbury's contribution to global waste water should this scheme go ahead, is set to increase, conservatively, by 150 million m³ a year.

11 These figures are so huge there needs to be a human face placed upon the magnitude of what is being sought by C.P.W. Their stated desire in their prospectus is to hedge against years of drought. On the face of it there is little wrong in this, it all looks like sensible farming practice. But the figures they tout do not stack up. Should, the water sought, be applied to the land, it would amount to more than 5 times the average annual rainfall in Canterbury. This is sufficient water to cover the area between State highway 1, the Waimakariri, the Rakaia and the Malvern Hills to the depth of 3 metres every year. This is not hedging against drought or climate change...this is the creation of climate change. What possible good will be achieved by applying this much water, to this area, over the months of summer, especially when the downstream cost will be 8 times this volume of potable water lost to the Pacific.

12 C.P.W. claim often their average take will be 9cm/sec. This is to try and make the volume appear less significant. What does a 9cm/sec take from a river such as the Waimakariri or the Rakaia mean to humanity? How many people would this water save if we harvested it for good? In terms of drinking water at a generous 3 litres per person per day, which is in excess of non-sedentary needs, we could save the 2 million children who will die of dysentery, cholera and cryptosporidium's, within the first 11 minutes of a 9cm/sec take. The 53 million L.Y.E. 's would be satisfied before the 6th hour. The volume taken each day is enormous in human terms, sufficient drinking water for 259 million people, enough for the entire US, or the total water needs of sub Saharan Africa.....and we intend to wash it onto the land to grow grass for 100,000 cows.

13 To all those who consider themselves citizens of the world, this is an obscenity. The human misery caused by the lack of potable water will not go away unless we make an effort. We cannot change the geography of the world to ensure the equal distribution of this resource but the water rich can...some say must...redress the

balance. Unfortunately it will only be the water rich who say it cannot be done. Providing the worst affected on this planet with some of the potable water we currently waste on agriculture needs to be a priority.

14 The world has never been in a better position to transport water in bulk with the scrapping of the world's 1200 strong Suez class tanker fleet. Thanks to the US banning the entry of single hull tankers to US ports, it would require only 25 of these vessels and 2.2 cusecs from the Waimakariri to provide sub Saharan Africa with safe drinking water.

15 We agree this is an over simplification, very much in line with many of the over simplistic plans drawn up around the C.P.W. scheme. The cost would be astronomical at around 1.1 billion US. Critics will say it is a staggering amount of money to expend on world aid. The reality is this is less than half the US debt to the UN, unpaid since 1949. Were there a will amongst the water rich, this scheme could already be in operation. For New Zealand this could be a foreign policy tool of inestimable benefit.

16 It is the 20 century view of economics based on human greed and capitalist principles, which ensure water, would only ever be moved around the world when there was a profit in it. In 2001 Roger Grimes, Premier of Newfoundland and businessman Gerry White planned to ship 500,000 cm from Gisborne Lake, Newfoundland to Asia in tankers. Ultimately halted by Maude Barlow and the Council of Canadians, the Canadian High Court upheld the view that, "**Water is an essential need, a public trust, not a commodity.**" this debate while far from over, is a measure of Canada's maturity. Had the debate swung the other way, water would now be a "good", have a value and under NAFTA any other company in the US, Canada or Mexico would have been able to access Canadian water to do the same. This is another question New Zealand needs to confront before world events force our hand. FTA will open us up to the predations of the multinational players in the water game and we need to be aware of their intent and robustly debate our position in this area.

17 The big players in this field, Coca Cola, Nestles and Suez Lyonnaise des Eaux are already controlling domestic and industrial water supplies around the world. Anywhere where the building of infrastructure comes at too high a cost for the domestic taxpayer, the big players move in, extract water and on sell it. Domestic water supplies however are decidedly unprofitable even where charges for water exceeded the cost of food. Big business is in the business of pushing poor families at 3rd world water supplies of dubious quality. This is definitely a case of let them drink Coke. The invention of the PET bottle in the 80's accelerated the economics of water and ensured profitability for the water giants. Bulk water transportation is no longer a pipe dream.

18 Many see the selling of water as an obscenity but it has gained a strangle hold in economies opened up by F.T.A's, especially where foreign nationals have been given access to resources at the same cost as the domestic users. It isn't only impacting upon the 3rd or 2nd world as the Canadians found out to their cost, when they turned off water supplies to Seattle over non payment issues. The Washington Protocol, signed as an add-on to the US/ Canadian FTA forbade such events as "**restriction of**

trade". The naïve belief that this cannot happen here with our F.T.A. with China remains to be seen. All F.T.A's come with resource sharing protocols...it is the grease for the wheels of free enterprise. Some analysts are already suggesting that the Chinese could successfully argue in the world court, that our R.M.A. is a **"restriction of trade"**. We need to proceed with care. Allowing access to water for domestic users at no cost could place us in a position where we have to do the same for foreign nationals under a F.T.A.

19 Whether we like it or not water has a value. A value we need to recognise and to begin to charge for before we suffer the indignities of the likes of Kerala, India. It took action from the Indian Supreme Court before Coca Cola was brought to heel in Kerala, but not before they had polluted the village's water supply...terminally. It is of interest to view the activities of this single multinational, where in a cruel irony in March this year, USAID gave Coca Cola an award for "sustainable water management in developing countries."

20 The company is well known for using latest satellite technology to scope out water rich third world areas, seek entry to them and extract water. It currently operates in Chile, Columbia, El Salvador, Ghana, Guatemala, Haiti, India, Indonesia, Mexico, Nicaragua, Pakistan, Peru, Philippines, Russia, Turkey and Vietnam. Water is the business of Coca Cola fed by the bottled water market. This is a market that has grown by 18 to 20 % each year since 2002 and is worth to Coca Cola conservatively 5 billion per year and growing. Controlling 13 of the worlds 103 water brands Coca Cola will go to any length to grow its share, which in some nation exceeds 60%. While still only 24% of the total Coca Cola business it makes good sense for Coca Cola to divest of its soft drink market over time. Water is 5 times more profitable per litre, even after factoring in bottle construction which runs at 27 litres of water per 1 litre bottle and is 90% of the cost.

21 When Coca Cola marketed Dasani...its mineral water from India, into the 2 billion litre European market it must have felt it was onto a winner. But it didn't reckon on the consumer resistance to its **"purified London tap water, on its 11th journey through the human body"** when exposed by the BBC. This moved the C.E.O. to muse in their annual report that **"... All of us in the Coca Cola family wake up each morning knowing that 5.6 billion will get up thirsty that day. If we can make it impossible for these 5.6 billion people to escape Coca Cola then we assure our future success for many years to come. Doing anything else is not an option."** Will future F.T.A 's open us up to business attitudes like this?

22 If we believe we can escape this style of business we are fools. The bottled water economy needs clean fuel for its lucrative markets. Any first world nation with an F.T.A. that has no domestic charge for agricultural and industrial water access is exposed to the likes of Coca Cola, through add on protocols.

23 Water has no greater value than as water. At more than \$2000US minimum per cubic metre retail, and anywhere between \$4 and \$120US per cubic metre bulk wholesale, it compares more than favourably with any other resource, we have in equal abundance. As it requires a cubic metre of water for every 300mls of milk **"using best practise"** as M.A.F. so eloquently put it, the use of good Waimakariri water to grow grass, isn't living up to the historical possibilities of our age. If we are

going to use water to force feed agriculture we need therefore to look at its return to the nation. What is the added value? It is obvious that charging agriculture, including dairy anything per cubic metre for access to potable water is futile. Farmers are extremely unlikely to pay anything approaching the US\$4.00 we can obtain for the resource elsewhere. If they are unable to increase the value of a cubic metre of water and can only devalue it there is no point in this hearing continuing?

24 Even the calorific return to the nation offered by dairy is so low as to be inconsequential. According to Professor David Pimentel of Cornell University's Ecology Department, Wheat returns 27.50 Kcals of energy and 0.833gms of protein per litre of water used up to harvest. Beef returns 36 times less energy and 17 times less protein than this per litre. Milk, our current white gold, returns 196 times less energy and 27,000 times less protein to rank as the most expensive common foodstuff in the water use chain. All other agricultural areas fare better...even the growing of rice. Growing grass, to convert it to human energy as a foodstuff, is the industry of loss...on all counts. The energy lost to mankind in converting productive acreage to any form of agriculture that involves growing grass for protein is astronomical. It matters little that it currently absorbs the collective imagination of the farming community and their back pockets; they are failing us in every area that matters.

25 Currently the only thing that makes irrigation viable in this country is the lack of value we place on potable water. Assume for a moment that C.P.W's claims are correct and their profitable return to the nation will be in the order of \$600 million per year. Should they receive the water and basing calculations on Pat Morrison's oft quoted 9 cm/sec average take, the water immediately has a value of \$2.00 per cu metre. This is the nation's 'gift' toward their profitability. Placing this 9 cmsec take against the lowest international bulk potable water rate, C.P.W. stand to make the nation a sizeable loss. A loss in the order of 1.5 million US a day even with all the land available ploughed into dairy. It is an absolute certainty that water will rise in value over the 35 years of the consents...loses therefore will continue to climb. C.P.W is set to become to water what Tiwai Point is to electricity.

26 We must as a nation rapidly change our attitude toward water. Whether we like it or not it is set to become a commodity like no other on this planet and we need to debate how we are going to deal with this unpalatable fact. Will we continue to try and supply citizens, as of right, domestic water? Note C.P.W. at one stage suggested marketing its surplus to Christchurch City and this was viewed as a positive. Will we use water as a geopolitical tool, for the greater benefit of mankind or will we be pushed into the bulk international water market upon someone else making water a commodity? What role has agriculture in this landscape when it devalues the commodity, either through its unprofitable use of the commodity or pollution?

27 Yes we need agriculture to provide the nation's human energy needs but in a landscape where its life blood is also a commodity can we continue to 'gift' farmers water beyond this point? When will the water be turned off to the farm? When is it ten times more valuable than the agricultural product? Currently, water for domestic supply, is selling in the Maldives for US\$120 a cubic metre and it all has to be shipped in.

It also begs the question. When the value of water increases to the point where all that we have outlined becomes obvious, even to C.P.W., what is there to stop the shareholders harvesting water as a commodity and cutting the farming community loose? Or is that already a certainty. After all they are a company in the business of selling water.

28 Any sane society would immediately take steps to balance its requirements so that its energy needs were met sustainably, before exports. There needs to be a shift in our thinking that requires land use to be determined by soil type, rainfall, proximity to population and national priorities, not the whim of the occupier. It will require agricultural land and ownership returning to the nation. If we accept elsewhere that we have strategic resources and ownership of them cannot pass out of public hands, then this next unpalatable step is the most critical. It is in this light that the exile of families from the Waianiwiwiwa makes no sense. The wider community is being asked to pay for this scheme, which will see a profit returned to the current shareholders but at a huge loss to the nation. In productive land alone we lose 15% of the area irrigated to lake, headraces and canals, nearly \$3 million of shelterbelts have been torn out already and taxpayers are required to foot the external costs of dairy to the tune of \$196 - \$308 per hectare.(Peter Tait and Ross Cullen) No wonder dairying is so profitable. The exiles from the Waianiwiwiwa and the 1400 ratepayers who lose land to this scheme can look forward to continuing this contribution to dairy, even after their land has been flooded.

29 Allowing private entities such as C.P.W. access to the Public Works Act so that evictions from productive land can take place, is the politics of cowardice. This isn't a Public Works scheme, no matter how it is cloaked in Trusts and supported by councils, this is the seeking of profit by a few at the expense of democracy. In any less enlightened society this scheme would have fallen at the first hurdle. That we are dressing this up in a veneer of respectability and are forced to speak politely, leaves our system of politics open to further contempt. That the R.M.A. can expose good New Zealanders, like the citizens of the Waianiwiwiwa, to the threat of eviction and exile is saddening at best.

30 This scheme, should it go ahead, will create a dangerous precedent, where New Zealanders will become exiles in their own land. The people of the Waianiwiwiwa and all those evicted from the path of canals will be allowed to begin new lives, but are being given a harsh lesson in neo colonialist farming. The freedom they enjoy as citizens will only hold true so long as the new land they purchase is not coveted by another. The use of the Public Works Act to evict neighbours from their land is an abuse of citizenship and should be opposed by all New Zealanders of conscience.

We oppose the granting of any and all consents associated with this scheme.

Stephen Clarke

Lesley Barlow,

