

From: [REDACTED]
To: [DGR Inbox](#)
Subject: COMMENT ON TAX DEDUCTIBLE GIFT RECIPIENT REFORM OPPORTUNITIES 15 June 2017 Discussion Paper
Date: Friday, 4 August 2017 3:56:12 PM

Dear Senior Advisor

I would like to comment on the TAX DEDUCTIBLE GIFT RECIPIENT REFORM OPPORTUNITIES 15 June 2017 Discussion Paper regarding the comments made concerning how environment charities should spend portions of their donations.

I support and donate regularly to many environment groups such as Environment Victoria, the Australian Conservation Foundation and Bush Heritage Australia. I believe any charity should be free to set its own priorities and to make an informed assessment of the best way to achieve those environmental outcomes, whether this is through advocacy or on-ground remediation. Any new restrictions or limitations should be strongly opposed.

Myself as a community member, I expect environmental groups to be strong advocates for environmental outcomes.

I believe in advocacy to improve environmental policy and preventing damage from happening in the first place, not only cleaning up the mess or fixing the damage after the fact. Advocacy for better policy can be the most efficient expenditure compared to the cost of repairing future environmental damage.

I strongly believe that limiting the ability of environment groups to advocate for our environment would result in poorer environmental outcomes. Some major environmental problems, like climate change, can't be stopped just through on-ground environmental remediation.

The Inquiry and discussion paper create a false dichotomy between remediation and advocacy. On-ground work often needs supporting policies or funding from government, which may only arise as a result of advocacy.

I urge the committee to rethink the discussion so that it supports environment charities endeavours to nurture and advocate for our environment in ways that is deems vital and necessary.

Thank you for your time.
Yours sincerely,

Adalita Srsen