

Greenpeace substantive submission on the Conservation Amendment Bill

Submitter Details

FULL NAME: Greenpeace Aotearoa
ADDRESS FOR SERVICE: 11 Akiraho Street, Mt Eden, Auckland
CONTACT: Genevieve Toop, Senior Campaigner
PHONE: 09 630 6317
EMAIL: gtoop@greenpeace.org

Executive Summary

We thank the Select Committee for the opportunity to submit on the Conservation Amendment Bill (the Bill). Greenpeace Aotearoa strongly opposes the Conservation Amendment Bill in full. We call on the Select Committee to reject the Bill in its entirety.

Public conservation land is an inseparable part of who we are as New Zealanders. It is defined by the snow-covered mountains, ancient forests, wild rivers, and native birdsong that make Aotearoa unlike anywhere else on Earth. It is where people from all walks of life go camping, tramping, fishing, and hunting. It is ancestral land to Māori, with immense cultural, spiritual and historical significance for iwi and hapū.

Conservation land is home to thousands of endangered native species on the brink of extinction and fighting to survive. It is one of our greatest natural defences against the climate crisis, because the huge tracts of native forests, remaining wetlands and undisturbed soils in the conservation estate store vast amounts of carbon.

Throughout history these lands have been protected, cared for and guarded by generations of New Zealanders from all walks of life.

It is appalling that this Coalition Government has introduced a Bill that attacks the conservation land that sits at the heart of our nation and is so cherished by our people. It is reprehensible that this Bill passed its first reading, with the support of 68 Members of Parliament.

We will not recommend any specific amendments in this substantive submission because it is our firm position that this Bill cannot be salvaged through amendments. It should be withdrawn.

We will only outline the most problematic clauses in this submission to illustrate the case for why the Committee should reject the Bill. The most egregious proposals are as follows.

Most shockingly, the Bill introduces mechanisms to make it significantly easier to sell off vast swathes of public land, putting a staggering five million hectares—around 60% of all conservation land in Aotearoa—at risk of being sold off or exchanged.

Even if the Government removes the land sale and exchange proposals, this Bill remains fundamentally unacceptable. It would still make it easier for open cast mines, private resorts, shops, gondolas and other inappropriate commercial exploitation to invade public conservation land, permanently degrading some of Aotearoa's most treasured wild places.

The Bill fundamentally rewrites the purpose of the Conservation Act and the Department of Conservation (DOC). Instead of putting nature first, it would require DOC to enable commercial exploitation of public conservation land "to the greatest extent practicable"—a complete departure from the purpose for which the Act was created.

Rather than place Te Tiriti o Waitangi at the heart of the conservation system in Aotearoa and ensure the Crown upholds its obligations as a Treaty partner this Bill deliberately undermines the practical effect of section 4 of the Conservation Act, and impacts existing Treaty settlements.

Finally, the Bill removes vital checks and balances on the Minister's power. It strips independent conservation bodies that represent the public voice of their statutory powers and reduces public oversight of how public conservation land is managed.

The entire Conservation Amendment Bill is utterly deplorable. It should be withdrawn, rewritten and replaced with a proposal to strengthen the protection of public conservation land, give full effect to Te Tiriti o Waitangi, dictate minimum baseline funding for DOC, permanently prohibit mining on all conservation land, and ensure nature—not commercial exploitation—remains at the heart of New Zealand's conservation system.

In several prior submissions to this Select Committee we have outlined the vast evidence of the degraded and deteriorating state of the environment in Aotearoa. We will not reiterate this as the information is freely available in the Government's own State of the Environment reports.

But, we would like to leave the Select Committee one final message.

The earth is sitting at the precipice of ecological collapse. It is decision makers in positions of power like **you** who bear responsibility for ensuring this collapse does not occur.

Your decisions affect not only the survival of the species that we share this earth with, but the survival of humanity - because we are all entirely dependent on nature for the water we drink, the air we breathe and the climate that produces a liveable habitat and secure food system.

There is only one choice that you can make in which you live up to your responsibilities and rise to the challenge you face as a decision-maker at this critical juncture in history. That choice is to **Bin this Bill.**

Selling and Exchanging Public Conservation Land

1. Given that [Ministers of the Crown](#) in this Government have either intentionally mischaracterised or are misinformed about the legal status of public conservation land (PCL) and stewardship land, we will begin this section by clarifying the following facts:
 - a. Public Conservation Land is not Department of Conservation (DOC) land. It is public land that is managed by DOC under a range of legislation.
 - b. Stewardship land is public conservation land managed by DOC under the Conservation Act¹. It is the category of conservation land that has yet to be technically assessed to determine exactly how high its conservation values are and therefore which other additional special protection classifications, such as National Park or Forest Park should be assigned to it. The scale, complexity, time and resources required to assess conservation values and reclassify land, has meant that most land in stewardship remains unclassified despite many areas holding significant conservation values.²
 - c. Despite having the weakest legal protections of all categories of conservation land, vast areas of stewardship land contain pristine forests, majestic rivers and endangered species. It is not “scrubby land” as some other [Ministers of the Crown](#) in this Government have described it.
2. The proposed Part 3C and new Schedule 5 of the Bill are deplorable proposals that would gut vital protections against the sale and exchange of PCL. Greenpeace opposes these along with the rest of the Bill.
3. Currently, there are stringent conditions on the sale and disposal of all PCL. Under the Conservation Act only stewardship land and marginal strips can be sold or disposed of and only after it has been thoroughly assessed and found to have “no or very low conservation value.”³ Reserves may only be sold or disposed of subject to the purpose of the Reserves Act, which in practice is a very high bar, as it should be.
4. There are also very stringent conditions on the exchange of land. Exchanges under the Conservation Act must enhance the conservation values of land managed by DOC and promote the purposes of the Act. For reserves there is a ‘like for like’ requirement (e.g. a scenic reserve can only be exchanged for land with similar scenic values).⁴

¹ [PCE 2013](#) Investigating the future of conservation: The case of stewardship land

² [Regulatory Impact Statement](#): Enabling more flexibility for land exchanges and disposals

³ Ibid.

⁴ [Regulatory Impact Statement](#): Enabling more flexibility for land exchanges and disposals

5. Should the Minister of Conservation have decided there was a desperate need to dispose of a metervice building in Wellington or other such “bits and bobs” of PCL he could have created a schedule of these specific bits and bobs, and his own map of the land areas that he wishes to sell or exchange and put that out for consultation. This Coalition Government did hand-pick its own list of favorite mining projects and put them on a schedule in the Fast Track Approvals Act, so we are sure that would not have proven too onerous for this Government to provide. However the Government did not do that, instead it has proposed a wholesale upending of the sale and exchange provisions.
6. Firstly, this Bill proposes to vastly expands the types of conservation land that can be sold or exchanged by the Minister to include:
 - a. Conservation parks, Forest Parks, High-country conservation parks, Scenic reserves, Historic reserves, Recreation reserves, Government purpose reserves, Stewardship land, some areas that are currently in Schedule 4 of the Crown Minerals Act, world heritage areas where they fall outside of areas listed in the proposed new Schedule 5.
7. The only areas excluded from sale and exchange in this proposal are listed in the proposed new schedule 5 and make up roughly 40% of the conservation estate.⁵ This means that the area that would become eligible for sale would be up to 60% of the entire conservation estate. That equates to five million hectares of public conservation land, which is nearly half the size of the North Island.
8. Secondly the Bill proposes to significantly weaken the test that must be met before PCL is sold. The Minister can sell or dispose of land deemed "not important" for threatened species or ecosystems, or if its ecosystem is not the "best example" or “one of the best examples” in the ecological district and if the Director-General recommends it. This is an exceptionally low and wholly inadequate safeguard against the sale of PCL.
9. The Government has not proactively provided any full modelling to the public to show which areas of PCL would meet these new tests and be able to be sold off. However DOC’s analysis states that:

“Examples of areas that could meet the proposed test include the following, which would not satisfy the ‘no or low’ test at present:

 - *Beech forest areas in the Lewis Pass area, that are well represented in the surrounding areas.*
 - *Hill country tussock/grasslands on the east coast of the South Island.*
 - *Patches of Podocarp forests on the west coast of the South Island.”*⁶
10. The changes to the exchange settings for PCL are also wholly objectionable. The Bill proposes that the Minister may exchange land if the Minister is satisfied “the exchange would result in a net conservation benefit”. This poses immense risk to locally endemic

⁵Ibid.

⁶[Regulatory Impact Statement](#): Enabling more flexibility for land exchanges and disposals

flora and fauna which are only found in certain geographic areas. Additionally, net benefit is an incredibly technically difficult to assess and little information is provided in the Bill to determine the methodology that would be used, nor its rigour, accuracy or precision.

11. Despite managing one third of the country's land, which brings in Billions in export revenue from the Tourism and Film industries, DOC receives a mere 0.45% of core Crown spending⁷. DOC has been so deeply underfunded by successive governments that they simply do not have the funding to actively manage the entire conservation estate in order to slow down the rapidly accelerating biodiversity crisis in Aotearoa. But even without active management the land, wildlife and waterways on PCL are still protected. As DOC states:

“Conservation land status is one of the most effective mechanisms for achieving biodiversity outcomes over the long term, and is far stronger than mechanisms such as covenants. Even where protection and management activities aren't being actively undertaken, ownership ensures that relevant values are held in perpetuity as the land isn't being developed or adversely affected”⁸

12. We understand the Select Committee will be removing land sale and exchange proposals discussed in this section of our submission. However, even if these provisions are removed we oppose this Bill in its entirety because it would still allow for more mines and commercial exploitation of PCL that pose significant risks to biodiversity, waterways and the climate. Furthermore, we do not consider that the removal of the new test and schedule adequately protects PCL from increased sale and exchange because of proposed changes to the purpose architecture of the Conservation Act, which are discussed in the next section of this submission.

Rewriting the Law: From Conservation to Commercial Exploitation

13. The Bill proposes to change the core mandate of DOC and the entire purpose architecture of the Conservation Act so that it is no longer a shield for nature, but a tool for private corporations to exploit public conservation land. Greenpeace strongly opposes this, along with the entirety of the Bill.
14. Currently the Conservation Act does not have a singular purpose section, rather it has a purpose architecture which includes the “definitions of conservation, preservation and protection (section 2), functions of the Department (section 6), and the purposes for which different categories of land are held.”⁹

⁷ [Regulatory Impact Statement](#): Modernising the Concessions Framework.

⁸ [Regulatory Impact Statement](#): Enabling more flexibility for land exchanges and disposals

⁹ [Supplementary Analysis Report](#): Amending the purpose of the Conservation Act 1987

15. Since its formation in 1987 DOC's primary mandate has been the protection and conservation of nature. Section 6 of the Act lays out these functions of DOC with section 6a-d focused solely on conservation and protection and section 6e setting up the following hierarchy of functions for the Department:
 - The management, for conservation purposes, of land and natural and historic resources is the primary function.
 - Recreation use is to be fostered where it is not inconsistent with conservation.
 - Tourism use is to be allowed where it is not inconsistent with conservation."¹⁰

16. The Bill fundamentally rewrites DOC's core mandate, and would force the Department to enable commercial exploitation of public conservation land. It does this through introducing yet another egregious clause - clause 6ea which states that DOC must:
 - a. *"recognise the economic opportunities that arise from the use and development of land and other natural resources and historic resources managed by the Department, and to enable this use and development to the greatest extent practicable under this Act and other enactments"*

17. The entire purpose architecture of the Act is changed because the Bill inserts this commercial exploitation mandate into three other consequential areas of the Act:
 - a. To direct and guide the new National Conservation Policy Statement (NCPS) under Section 13D.
 - b. To direct and guide all new Area Plan documents under Section 13H.
 - c. To direct decision-making on concession approvals under Part 3B.

18. There is no justification for these changes. Commercial operators already operate on PCL including film crews, tourism operators, farmers and even mining corporations.¹¹ The vast majority of concessions are already granted, even when they are highly destructive such as those concessions which allow for mining on PCL. As the supplementary analysis on these purpose changes states:
 - a. "Out of 2,810 concessions considered between January 2025 – October 2025, **only 2% (50) were declined.**"
 - b. "From November 2024 – October 2025, DOC processed 120 applications under the Crown Minerals Act to access PCL for mining-related activities. **Of these, 90% were approved;** 1.7% were declined; 6.7% were withdrawn; and 1.7% were returned."
 - c. "The Fast-Track Act provides a pathway for economically significant activities to seek a range of approvals through a single application, including permissions to operate on PCL."¹²

¹⁰ Ibid

¹¹ Ibid

¹² Ibid

19. No public consultation was undertaken on clause 6ea or other amendments to the purpose architecture of the Conservation Act. These changes were made after the consultation on the discussion document.¹³
20. The Conservation Act is fundamentally a public protection statute and must remain that way. Its purpose should not be to enable private commercial developers, or mining corporations to exploit the publicly owned natural heritage of Aotearoa. The purpose of the Act and DOC should be to protect and conserve Aotearoa's unique ecosystems, native species, wild landscapes and carbon sink capacity.

“Unleashing” commercial exploitation of public conservation land

21. The Bill proposes to deregulate the commercial permissions (concessions) framework. It removes vital protections that ensure that while commercial activity on PCL can occur it must do so with minimal impact to nature and to the recreational use of public land. Greenpeace opposes the overhaul of the concessions frameworks, along with the entirety of this Bill.
22. Under the current Act, most activities on PCL require authorisation in the form of a concession. As the RIS states “The concessions system helps DOC ensure activities on PCL and other uses of PCL are compatible with the overriding purpose of conservation.”¹⁴ And ensures that:
- a. “activities and other uses of PCL are compatible with the overriding purpose of conservation;
 - b. the services and facilities provided for visitors on PCL are appropriate and of a suitable standard; and
 - c. activities do not conflict with visitor enjoyment and recreation”¹⁵
23. The concessions framework in the Act currently allows for and regulates a wide range of activities including grazing, guiding and other tourism businesses, visitor accommodation, mining, filming, and research activities. There are different types of concessions and some can be granted for up to 30 years - only under ‘exceptional’ circumstances’ may a lease be granted for 60 years. As stated above, the vast majority of concessions are granted.¹⁶
24. The Bill proposes to empower the Minister to make certain or classes of activities exempt from requiring a concession and to pre-approve certain activities in advance, in the National Conservation Policy Statement (NCPS). Exempt activities would not require

¹³ Ibid

¹⁴ [Regulatory Impact Statement](#): Modernising the Concessions Framework.

¹⁵ [Supplementary Analysis Report](#): Amending the purpose of the Conservation Act

¹⁶ Ibid

concessions under new Part 3B, while pre-approved activities would be eligible for pre-approved concessions under new section 14ZI .

25. The guardrails around designating a commercial activity exempt from needing permission or pre-approved are extremely weak. Clause 13E(2) allows the Minister to make an activity exempt or pre-approved even if it contradicts the Act that the land is held or managed under, such as the Conservation Act or National Parks Act; and the purposes for which the land is held or managed.
26. The supplementary analysis report states that 20 activities will be exempted from needing a concession or will be 'pre-approved'.¹⁷ While some indicative examples are given in the Discussion Document, a publicly available list of these 20 activities could not be found. It is unacceptable that this information about concessions that would become exempt has not been made freely and easily available to submitters.
27. The Bill also proposes to allow leases to use PCL to be approved up to 60 years and completely removes public notification requirements for applications for grazing licenses. Agribusiness is not entitled to use public conservation land by default. There is no justification for removing public input into the use of PCL by this industry, particularly because, in many cases, grazing on PCL is detrimental to native wildlife and waterways.
28. Greenpeace opposes these changes to the concession framework on the basis that they pose unacceptable risk to the land, water and biodiversity present on PCL. While some changes to achieve efficiencies to the concessions framework in future may be required these must not come at the expense of good conservation outcomes nor of the Crown's responsibility to give effect to Te Tiriti o Waitangi. Furthermore, while there are indeed improvements that could be made to the commercial permissions framework to protect nature these are not proposed in the Bill. An appropriate change would be to remove mining as an activity that is allowed permission at all on public conservation land.

Building commercial exploitation zones in National Parks

29. The Bill also proposes to establish a new category of land known as visitor amenities areas (VAA's) which Greenpeace is of the opinion would be more aptly titled commercial exploitation zones. These zones are highly objectionable and are likely to lead to the permanent degradation and loss of public access to areas of the conservation estate, including areas inside our highly protected National Parks. We deeply oppose the VAA proposals, along with the entire Bill.

¹⁷ Ibid

30. The Bill proposes that the Minister can on their own initiative, and without a public hearing, establish one of these zones within a National Park and across most of the conservation estate. There are no clear ecological safeguards on the establishment of these zones and the Bill proposes the Minister can establish one of the zones irrespective of “the purposes for, or principles under which, the conservation park, stewardship area, national park, or reserve is held.” Clause 16A lays out a non-exhaustive list of commercial infrastructure that can be established within these zones including:
- a. toilets, visitor centres, accommodation, car parks, restaurants, and cafes; and
 - b. any other infrastructure that supports visitors and recreational activities; and
 - c. related services include tour operator services, catering, merchandising, guiding, transportation, and equipment rental.
31. It is absolutely clear that the VAA clauses of this Bill have been drafted to create a backdoor for inappropriate commercial exploitation in highly protected and ecologically fragile areas. It would enable gondolas, shops, private resorts, multi-storey hotels and more to be placed right in the heart of New Zealand's National Parks if the Minister of the day decides it. This is an egregious proposal. Once the Government has allowed a private company to fence off, pave over and build their private resort, or other infrastructure, on public conservation land then that land is as good as sold off anyway.
32. The RIS suggests that an example of one of these commercial exploitation zones / VAAs would be in Milford Sound Piopiotahi which is part of Fiordland National Park, and is within the Te Wāhipounamu UNESCO World Heritage site.
33. The National Parks and Conservation Act currently both enable the establishment of an amenities area, but under very different conditions. The National Parks Act (section 15) enables the Minister to set apart an amenities area as a form of special zoning but only on the recommendation of the NZCA.¹⁸ Four amenities areas currently exist (one in Aoraki/Mount Cook village, and three in Tongariro National Park for the Tūroa and Whakapapa ski fields and Whakapapa Village). The Conservation Act (section 23A) provision on amenity areas is restrictive; any development within the amenity area is for the protection of the natural and historic resources within that area.¹⁹
34. Tourists do not come to New Zealand to visit theme parks, they come to visit National Parks. Moreover National Parks, and PCL more broadly are supposed to be, and should continue to be, a safe haven for wildlife in Aotearoa where it can thrive. Already, the vast majority of native wildlife is either on the brink of or threatened with extinction. Allowing even more deforestation, paving over more habitat and essentially for all intensive purposes privatizing land within the public conservation estate is unacceptable and we strongly oppose it.

¹⁸ RIS amenities areas

¹⁹ [Regulatory Impact Statement](#): Amenities areas

35. It is important that with increasing visitor numbers to Aotearoa and to PCL, that new initiatives are considered and work is done to better manage the impact that increasing visitor numbers can have on the environment (e.g., erosion, trampling, disruption of wildlife) and on people's experience of PCL (e.g. crowding, loss of solitude and remoteness). However, what is proposed for the VAAs / commercial exploitation zones goes far beyond what is reasonable to manage the impact of increasing visitor numbers.
36. If certain high use visitor car parks are overloaded or there is traffic congestion on roads leading to PCL then the solution cannot simply be to continuously build more of them. This will ultimately lead to increasing disruption, degradation and negative impacts on wildlife on the very land that it is meant to be protected so that it can thrive. Other countries such as the U.S.A employ models such as a lottery permitting system for highly popular walks and this is one such model that does not appear to have been considered to deal with the policy issue of the impact of increased visitor numbers.

Undermining Te Tiriti o Waitangi and Treaty Settlements

37. Te Tiriti o Waitangi should sit at the heart of the conservation system in Aotearoa and the Crown must uphold its obligations as a Treaty partner. Yet this Bill proposes to weaken the provisions in the Act that give effect to the Treaty, particularly Section 4. Greenpeace opposes this and submits that the Government should be strengthening—not diluting—the Treaty obligations contained within conservation legislation.
38. The land that makes up the conservation estate is ancestral Māori land. It has immense cultural, spiritual and historical significance for iwi and hapū. It is connected to Māori identity through whakapapa, and it is where mātauranga Māori and customary practices can be practiced. This relationship long pre-dates the Crown's arrival in Aotearoa and the establishment of what we now call the conservation estate. The Crown took ownership of the land that forms the conservation estate through processes that often involved unjust means, dispossession and breaches of Te Tiriti o Waitangi.
39. As the Waitangi Tribunal observed in the Wai 262 Report:
- “Māori place enormous value on the conservation estate, at two levels. First, it is not only a vast landscape by New Zealand standards; it is also where most of the surviving taonga places can be found... And although it is owned by the Treaty partner, every inch of it is tribal territory. Landscapes and landforms evoke the old stories, and they in turn evoke whakapapa.”*
40. Section 4 of the Conservation Act requires the Act to be interpreted and administered so as to “give effect to” the principles of the Treaty. " This is one of the strongest Treaty principles clauses in New Zealand legislation. The Supreme Court has confirmed in the Ngāi Tai ki Tāmaki case that this obligation is mandatory. It applies across the

Conservation Act and the associated legislation, and is meant to ensure that Treaty principles are given effect to in decisions affecting the conservation estate.

41. The Government insists that section 4 is being retained but while it has kept the words it has attempted to change their fundamental interpretation. The Bill inserts a new section 4A which reduces the obligation to give effect to the Treaty principles into a procedural checklist to be applied to four of the most consequential areas of conservation decision-making: policy, planning, concessions, and land disposals and exchanges. It sets out steps such as inviting comments, consulting tangata whenua and considering those views. There is a fundamental difference between consulting Māori and giving effect to Te Tiriti o Waitangi. It is past time the Crown acknowledges that.
42. The implications of the Bill extend beyond the Conservation Act itself. Numerous Treaty settlements reference section 4 of the Conservation Act directly. Changing how that provision operates by adding section 4a risks weakening settlements that iwi have already negotiated in good faith with the Crown. The Government should not be rewriting the laws that affect those settlements without agreement from the Treaty partners affected.
43. Greenpeace therefore opposes the insertion of proposed section 4A and submits that the Conservation Act should instead be strengthened to better honour Te Tiriti o Waitangi, uphold the rights and interests of Māori, and recognise mātauranga Māori and indigenous conservation values as central to the purpose of conservation in Aotearoa.

Removing vital checks and balances on Ministerial power

44. This Bill proposes to remove vital checks and balances on the power of the Minister including by stripping the independent New Zealand Conservation Authority (NZCA) and Conservation boards of their statutory decision making powers and centralising those powers with the Minister instead. Public conservation land should not be able to be carved up, sold off or exploited at the whim of a fleeting government. It should be managed by and with the public and with iwi and hapū. Greenpeace opposes the proposed concentration of power with the Minister, along with the rest of this Bill.
45. The Conservation Act establishes the NZCA as an independent statutory body. Its membership reflects the public voice and it is made up of people appointed by the Minister following consultation with the Ministers of Māori Affairs, Tourism and Local Government, a representative of Ngāi Tahu, and appointments nominated by various environmental NGOs and from the public.²⁰ The statutory functions of the NZCA under the current system include; to approve conservation management strategies and conservation management plans; and to advise the Minister on statements of general policy at a national level.²¹

²⁰ [Supplementary Analysis Report](#): Amending the purpose of the Conservation Act

²¹ The Conservation Act 1987

46. The Bill proposes to strip these decision making powers from the NZCA and replace them with only being allowed to provide comments on the draft NCPS and draft area plans (which replace general policies, conservation management strategies and conservation management plans).
47. Conservation boards are independent bodies that enable local communities and iwi to contribute to the management of local conservation areas. They represent the public interest in conservation within their region. Their statutory functions include; to recommend the approval by the NZCA of conservation management strategies, to approve conservation management plans and to advise the NZCA and the Director-General on the implementation of conservation management strategies and conservation management plans for areas within the jurisdiction of the Board.²²
48. The Bill proposes to strip these decision making powers from Conservation Boards and replace them with only being allowed to provide comments on the draft NCPS and draft area plans (which replace general policies, conservation management strategies and conservation management plans).

Conclusion

Throughout this submission we have demonstrated that the Bill would; weaken protections against the sale and exchange of public conservation land, rewrite the purpose of the Conservation Act to favour commercial exploitation, make it easier for mining and other commercial activities to gain access to PCL, weaken the Treaty clause and concentrate unprecedented decision-making power in the hands of the Minister.

These are not isolated amendments. Together they amount to a fundamental assault on the principles that have underpinned conservation in Aotearoa for nearly four decades.

The Parliamentary Commissioner for the Environment observed that *"the permanence and protection of our conservation land now rests on our shoulders"*²³ We agree. The responsibility for protecting Aotearoa's forests, mountains, rivers, coastlines and the species that depend on them currently rests with this Committee.

Future generations will remember whether Parliament chose to defend our natural heritage, or to dismantle the laws that have safeguarded it for decades.

Greenpeace therefore urges the Committee to reject the Conservation Amendment Bill in its entirety. It cannot be salvaged through amendments. It should be withdrawn and replaced with legislation that strengthens the protection of public conservation land, gives full effect to Te Tiriti

²² The Conservation Act 1987

²³ [PCE 2013](#) Investigating the future of conservation: The case of stewardship land

o Waitangi, permanently prohibits mining on conservation land, and ensures nature—not commercial exploitation—remains at the heart of New Zealand's conservation system.

Appendix 1 - About Greenpeace:

Greenpeace is a global and independent campaigning organisation that acts to protect the environment and to promote peace. It is one of the world's largest and oldest environmental organisations, operating for half a century, and working in over 55 countries. Greenpeace Aotearoa was founded in 1974 and represents many tens of thousands of supporters.