

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

The suggestion that environmental groups that argue for the interests of the natural environment should be able to receive tax deductible donations only for planting trees and the like but not for public debate and advocacy is deeply disturbing.

In effect this is saying they should concentrate on fixing environmental problems, not arguing for policy that could stop problems from happening in the first place!

As a 'stakeholder' in the climate on this planet, I cannot think of a more legitimate charitable purpose than advocacy for environmental protection. If the environment is not protected, then virtually all other charitable activities are ultimately futile. What use is there in, say, an agricultural program to assist farmers in some low lying country if we do nothing to prevent the sea-level rise that would inundate that land?

Environmental advocacy, if effective, has such broad global benefits, that it presents excellent 'bang for buck'.

The purpose of this suggestion does not seem to be about saving any substantial amount of revenue. Rather it seems to be about nobbling environmental groups whose advocacy is entirely consistent with the world's best scientific advice but inconsistent with the obsessions of a few politicians. .

Advocacy for policy that is in line with the urgent recommendations of every reputable scientific institution and international agreement is a more obviously appropriate charitable purpose than just about anything else!

I do not support the suggestions contained in the section of the Discussion Paper on the Register of Environmental Organisations. Their purpose seems to be only to burden and hamper the worthy work of environmental organisations.

Regards,
Peter Campbell

