Senior Adviser Individuals and Indirect Tax Division the treasury Langdon Crescent Parkes ACT 2000

I wish to comment on the view that environmental organisations should commit no less than 25% of their annual expenditure from their public fund too environmental remediation and even whether a higher limit such as 50% should be considered.

I have been involved with both the local conservation group and the local catchment group for many years. Each has its own goals and purpose.

The conservation group lobbies the local council and governments to protect high value vegetation and natural areas from inappropriate development and destruction. Advocacy is its strength. A number of areas which it was instrumental in saving from destruction

and/or development have become tourist attractions. Better to save such areas than have to remediate which is very expensive. Over the years it has also been involved in reviewing EISs for mining developments and achieving improved outcomes for the environment.

The catchment group is involved in remediation and helping community members choose appropriate plantings for their properties etc. and has access to the appropriate plants. Pioneer Catchment and Landcare is the local group better placed and informed to achieve satisfactory environmental remediation

and Mackay Conservation Group Inc is better placed to determine environments that should be retained. It has well qualified members, both paid and volunteer, to assess the value of various environments under threat. They also help community members

to learn how they can approach the various councils and government departments to put forth their concerns. MCG has also been involved with other groups such as birdwatchers in research activities.(e.g. Eungella honeyeater). Lobbying, advocacy and research are what

donors to conservation groups expect, remediation is not their role except in exceptional circumstances.

Yours sincerely

Joan Fitzsimmons

