

From: [d-j.williams d-j.williams](#)
To: [DGR Inbox](#)
Subject: Submission regarding Tax Deductible Gift Recipient Reform
Date: Wednesday, 2 August 2017 6:04:06 PM

Cleaning up or repairing our environment is incredibly important, but it is just one part of what should be done. **Another part is stopping our environment from being destroyed in the first place.**

The truth is that advocacy and on-ground environmental work cannot exist without the other. Both are needed to improve our environment and safeguard our natural heritage, but each organisation should be able to make its own decisions about which path to choose.

For Environment groups, restriction on advocacy would take resources away from campaigning to cut pollution, increase clean energy, phase out coal, protect our rivers and promote energy efficiency.

Key Points;

1. Each organisation 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.
2. The community expects environmental groups to be strong advocates for environmental outcomes.

3. Advocacy to improve environmental policy is about 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.

4. Limiting the ability of environment groups to advocate for our environment would result in poorer environmental outcomes.

5. Some major environmental problems, like climate change, can't be stopped just through on-ground environmental remediation.

6. 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.

Regards,

David Williams

Balwyn Nth
VIC