

**From:** [Brian Haynes](#)  
**To:** [DGR Inbox](#)  
**Subject:** Environmental Charities and Gift Recipient Reform  
**Date:** Tuesday, 25 July 2017 11:25:36 AM

---

I am writing to express my complete opposition to the idea that environmental charities should be required to commit some minimum amount of their funding to environmental remediation. I am opposed to any such requirement, and deeply concerned that a fraction of up to 50% is being suggested.

Environmental charities cover a wide range of activities, from very basic activities in the field such as tree planting to high level advice and advocacy as is provided by the Environmental Defenders offices around the country. It is a gross interference in my right to be able to support specific activities within this spectrum for the recipients of my donations to be obliged to direct any amount to other activities. Furthermore, such other activities may lie completely outside their reason for existing or their expertise so the exercise then becomes very wasteful and ineffective. It would be absurd, for example, for the EDO to take on tree planting when they are a public interest advocacy group.

At a time when we learn about how the whole charities sector is under scrutiny because of maladministration and corruption, I do believe that the definition of what is a charity and how it should be held accountable for its funding must be looked at. However, while I support this heightened attention, I am utterly opposed to the external imposition of spending targets. I demand that my right to choose the nature of the charity that I support be protected. It should not be diluted or distorted by political/bureaucratic motives.

Yours sincerely

Brian Haynes

[Redacted signature block]