

**From:** [Janet Watson Kruse](#)  
**To:** [DGR Inbox](#)  
**Subject:** Submission to Treasury discussion paper  
**Date:** Friday, 4 August 2017 12:23:15 PM

---

Dear Treasury

I write to respectfully submit that it would be uneconomical and unduly restrictive to insist that environmental charities be required to spend 50% of donations on remediation activities

I am sure members of the committee are familiar with the old story about an ambulance at the bottom of the cliff. Climate change is a worldwide problem that requires concerted and coordinated action at all levels of society and government. We place great trust in yourselves as part of government not to obstruct the work of prevention by insisting on ambulances. I'm sure Treasury is aware of the economics of prevention in the area of health care - mitigating a preventable international disaster does not stack up economically or logically.

A second issue is that to mandate a particular action for privately funded charities puts undue restrictions not only on the charities, but on the freedom of the individuals who donate to them. This would represent what I consider to be a rather outrageous limitation on my personal freedom to donate to the causes I choose. Such restriction would be inappropriate in a liberal democracy.

Evidence driven positive action is required in this space - please allow environmental charities to get on with their important work without unnecessary restrictions.

Sincerely

Janet Watson Kruse

