

Primary Production Select committee: Submission- Organic Products Bill.

May 2020

ATTN: Primary Production Select committee.

Submitter: Geoff Smith; 31 papaitonga lake rd. Ohau, Levin ( [geof.smith@gamil.com](mailto:geof.smith@gamil.com))

*I will support this submission with an oral presentation at the select committee hearing*

**Introduction:** I am developing a 2.5 Ha commercial orchard of Kiwifruit/avocado/citrus

Majority of produce for export. Property under my control for 3.5 years, began OANZ certification process 3 years ago, soon to Biogro for export cert.

**After reading this Bill I would request that it is withdrawn with the recommendation that it not proceed..**

This bill in no way supports certified organic production of food, nor the certified organic model of land and water management.

- a) This bill is a very superficial, totally distanced from certified organic production. It is clearly a bureaucratic process to control, subjugate and charge the producers of higher quality food and those that manage land and water to a much higher standard compared to the conventional land management and food production benchmarks. The current system works reasonably well, may need a few tweaks but we do not need another layer of control and costs.
- b) This bill does nothing to encourage current or future certified organic producers to improve management, increase production ( i.e. higher value exports to pay for recent economic shocks)
- c) This bill seeks to punish the certified organic sector by a huge increase in a needless, non productive bureaucracy, with associated time and monetary costs, levies, fees decided at the discretion of another large unnecessary bureauracy.
- d) Specifically this bill adheres to the *out of date "user pays "* principle, BUT in this case the producer is not the user. There needs to be a shift to 'beneficiary' pays. Therefore apart from the whole bill which needs withdrawal I object to cl. 37, 51—59 and cl.62 ( powers of entry stonger than Police ?—I do not think so in *my* country)

**Beneficiaries of Certified organic Land use.**

- 1) Increased Carbon stored in soil ( proven by a number of overseas scientific research groups) Is not the govt wanting C. Sequestered?
- 2) Increased water holding capacity of soil (Flood mitigation, drought tolerance)
- 3) Improvements in quality of foods produced ( proven by overseas science )
- 4) With improved nutrition there is improved health ( huge decline overseas detected in foods at vitamin and mineral level)
- 5) Improved price received for exports over conventional commodities ( check Fonterra's price for organic milk powder compared to commodity milk powder)
- 6) Increases in soil biodiversity, above ground biodiversity.

AS can be seen above the beneficiaries are the govt. For C storage, lower drought severity, improved overseas earnings, and health budget, local councils for flood mitigations, consumers with better health outcomes, less or no chemical sprays on their food or environment.

The certified organic producer may obtain improved prices and pays for this with the large amount of time spent on research of improved methods of management, extensive record keeping to satisfy certifying bodies so should not be punished with more fees, levies or any other charge of monetary nature.

I have listened to 15/20 other organic producers who are all in agreement that this bill is not fit for any organic production or sale purpose.

I support the submission made by Natural sugars plus others of a similar nature.

Summary:

This bill is not fit for any productive purpose for certified organic management

This bill would increase the time and monetary costs of a sector that should be encouraged to flourish.

This bill will decrease the uptake of organic management of land and water.

The current legislation is working , but may from time to time need 'tweaking' a little.