

Senior Adviser  
Individual and Indirect Tax Division  
The Treasury  
Langton Crescent  
PARKES ACT 2600

  
2<sup>nd</sup> August 2017

Via email: DGR@Treasury.gov.au

Dear Sir/Madam,

**Re: Submission: Treasury Discussion Paper – Environmental Charities**

I donate to a number of Environmental Charities including Bush Heritage, ACF, Environment Victoria, Greenpeace, National Parks Association, Total Environment Centre, and Greenpeace.

Some of these organisations (such as Bush Heritage) focus on on-ground remediation work, whilst others (such as Environment Victoria) concentrate on advocacy.

Both these activities are essential to achieving environmental outcomes.

I strongly disagree with any notion of mandating that a certain percentage of funds should be spent on remediation for the following reasons:

- Both activities go hand-in-hand and are essential to protect our environment
- Organisations have different skills and should be free to choose which path to take without restriction
- Advocacy aims to prevent adverse environmental outcomes which is a much more cost effective strategy than undertaking remediation work after the event
- Some major environmental problems like microplastic pollution of our bays and oceans can not be addressed by on-ground work.
- Limiting the ability of environmental groups to advocate would inevitably result in poorer environmental outcomes.
- The community expects environmental groups to be strong advocates for environmental outcomes.

Yours sincerely



Martin Lenard

  
