

**From:** [Peter & Wilma Western](#)  
**To:** [DGR Inbox](#)  
**Subject:** Treasury environment discussion paper  
**Date:** Wednesday, 2 August 2017 10:11:22 PM

---

Submission from Peter and Wilma Western

The proposal to direct environmental groups to spend at least 50 percent of income on remediation is a very bad idea.

The major reason many of us support such groups is to prevent the degradation in the first place.

Not only is this desirable from an environmental perspective it also makes sound economic sense.

How, for instance, does a group repair the damage done by giving a company such as Adani an unrestricted license to extract groundwater to the great detriment of surrounding landholders?

How can a group repair the damage created by large irrigators stealing environmental water thus damaging entire riverine systems.

They cannot but they can try to prevent the damage. This is the prime reason to exist and should not be inhibited in any way. To do so would be a crime against future generations.

Environmental damage should be paid for by the individual or company causing it even if a government has unadvisedly permitted it commonly against expert advice received.

This proposal cannot be allowed to go ahead. It is detrimental to both the immediate future and to all future Australians.

Peter and Wilma Western  


Sent from my iPad