

From: [Barbie Hingston](#)
To: [DGR Inbox](#)
Subject: Submission - Mandated use of Environmental Donations (Comment)
Date: Friday, 4 August 2017 8:56:43 PM

To whom it may concern:

It's as simple as "**PREVENTION IS BETTER THAN CURE**".

My background is in Science, Biology and Education, and my university studies were broad enough to observe and identify the *overlap* of many areas of geography and land use, oceanography, meteorology, botany, zoology and ecology. I observed the subsequent *overlap of the effects of actions, and the ramifications of these actions*, in the areas of any interaction of living things, with each other, and with their non-living environment.

I understand that there has been suggested limitation of the use of donations to "Environmental Charities" for education, and a prescribed designation of 25%, or even 50%, of the donations to be mandated for use in "rehabilitation" of affected areas. *This is short-sighted in the extreme!* Why? Because it assumes that the problem that was causing the issue has been stopped, which in most cases is not necessarily the case.

Many *horrible, virtually irreversible* environmental effects are because of either ignorance or apathy, and are continuing to this day, and this is what must be stopped. Ways to do this are either by education, or by government intervention, or by less harmful practices being developed (through research) as a better alternative, or a combination of all these things. Limiting the funding needed to do all these things to only 75% of donations, or even only 50% of donations given, is reducing the harm minimisation by potentially half of what it could be.

I would also like to make the following points which may not have been thought of, nor taken into account, but which should be...

For example: What if the number of contributors is too small for 25% or 50% of their contribution to make a meaningful impact on remediation but enough awareness, from publicity campaigns, funded by the contributors' own donations, would?

What if *Education and publicity, not remediation, is the key to stopping the problem in the first place, or the key to stopping the problem from getting worse?*

What if decision makers in the past were influenced by old, not new theories, and now decision makers are facing pressure from lobby groups without necessarily understanding all the facts and environmental implications. With enough education and awareness less destructive, and more up to date practises could be developed and adopted.

What if the full environmental implications and "flow-on effects" have been downplayed by lobbyists and participants whose interests are short term profits and not long term environmental impacts? What if these lobbyists and other involved people or groups cannot see, or simply dismiss, the "big picture", with lobbyists having no interest in acknowledging or disclosing any long-term implications?

Publicity, awareness and education are needed to prevent problems in the first place.

And finally: Shouldn't the perpetrators of environmental vandalism or devastation, the people or organisations who caused the devastation in the first place, most probably making a profit as they did it, be responsible for the remediation?

Shutting the door after the horse has bolted is never good environmental policy!

Thank you for your consideration of this submission.

(Mrs) Barbara M. Hingston
B.Sc (Ed)



4 August 2017



Virus-free. www.avg.com