

From: [Derrick Brown](#)
To: [DGR Inbox](#)
Subject: Treasury discussion paper on Environment Charities
Date: Thursday, 3 August 2017 12:08:03 AM

12. Stakeholders' views are sought on requiring environmental organisations to commit no less than 25 per cent of their annual expenditure from their public fund to environmental remediation, and whether a higher limit, such as 50 per cent, should be considered? In particular, what are the potential benefits and the potential regulatory burden? How could the proposal be implemented to minimise the regulatory burden?

This is a ridiculous proposal. Remediation work is required only when the environment has been allowed to deteriorate. I have travelled the length and breadth of Australia and have visited and examined scores of national parks. It is apparent that most of them have only become national parks because of public interest and agitation, after the areas had been overworked/overcropped/overgrazed to the point of exhaustion. If left to state or federal government then we wouldn't have most of them, as the preferred option would have been to develop/sell these areas for commercial use. In other words, historically this seems to be a feature of Australia's government - the inability to care and recognise when the environment needs protection. This is a fact that cannot be denied. We have the issue of climate change before us now where the governments of the day seem unable to recognise the issues that the population is concerned about and only now are belatedly trying to fix the issues in a half-heartedly way. Indeed we have parliamentarians who don't even recognise that climate change is real.

To propose therefore that supporters of environmental organisations be limited as to where their subscriptions may go is arrogant and undemocratic. I do not want to be told how my money may be spent. I wish to ensure that the correct policies are put in place, so that remedial work will not be required later. Let's get the priorities right! Just to quote one example - grazing. We are still paying the price of having cattle grazing allowed in NSW and the Victorian high country for many years, even after it was proved that damage was occurring. Ongoing remedial work is required because the wrong policies were put in place - and only changed after much protestation from the public and environmental organisations. Yes?

That's why this is a ridiculous proposal.

Derrick Brown



I subscribe to a number of environmental organisations, and I also take part in voluntary remedial work.