

From: [Anna Wilson](#)
To: [DGR Inbox](#)
Subject: Treasury discussion paper re environmental charities
Date: Wednesday, 2 August 2017 9:29:37 PM

Dear Treasury,

I am very concerned to learn that the Government is proposing to introduce a requirement for environmental charities to spend 50% of their money on remediation works. This is of grave concern to me because there should be a divide between Government and Charity, and Government should not be dictating what Charity should or should not spend its money on. Each organisation that is a Charity should be independent of government and free to spend its money according to its objectives and priorities and its assessment of the costs and benefits.

Further, I am a financial supporter of environmental groups because I want them to advocate for better policy, such as clean energy, phasing out coal-fired power stations, addressing climate change and promoting infrastructure and projects that are not merely assessed for their economic benefit but also for their environmental and social impact. While I agree that remedial works are important, in my view the entities that create the environmental damage should be held to account to clean it up and undertake remedial works and this should not necessarily have to be left to environmental groups.

Demonising environmental groups by describing them as standing in the way of economic growth and jobs is a misleading characterisation that undermines the government's reputation. Any government worth its salt should not be afraid of environmental groups but should embrace their passion and commitment to protect Australia's natural assets. It is false to create a dichotomy between remediation and advocacy as effective remedial work requires government support and funding to ensure that any need for remedial work is minimised in the first place.

I strongly denounce the proposal and submit that the government should abandon it.

Kind regards,
Anna Wilson
