

From: [Peggy Fisher](#)
To: [DGR Inbox](#)
Subject: Fw: Individual and Indirect tax deductions.
Date: Sunday, 23 July 2017 11:49:47 AM

Dear Senior Advisor,

I am extremely concerned about the innuendo in the review of the DGR status of 'Not for profit organisations'

While I agree there should be scrutiny a accountability for all groups in this category, I understand present regulations are sufficient for this.

It seems Environmental organisations are singled out for particular scrutiny.

In relation to 25-50% of funds in any environmental group to be used for remediation.

This proposal is totally unacceptable.

For a start it is assuming that damage will take place and the fundamental objective of environmental groups is to prevent that damage happening in the first place.

It is akin to telling health groups they must put equal funds into looking after a polio victim after they've contracted the disease, rather than giving vaccination for prevention.

Every-one knows prevention is far better than cure, as 'cure' is nearly always a much inferior out-come.

Replanting and remediation play a very important part in some small specific areas but it is certainly not appropriate across the board.

How do you remediate those suffering black lung disease

How do you remediate a species extinction;

How do you remediate bleached coral, a river polluted with mercury or other heavy metal, or a beach that is lost due to sea level rise.

How do you remediate lost upland swamps that have cracked and drained due to inappropriate mining. A dried up lost world heritage lake, (the Thirlmere Lakes) again due to inappropriate mining.

These things and many many more cannot be 'remediated' no matter how much money is raised to do so.

Education, awareness and prevention are far superior options.

Any-one suggesting that more money should be spent on remediation rather than

prevention is clearly not interested in the best environmental out-comes at all.

I volunteer for a number of bush regeneration groups and National parks as well, and the results of hours of back-breaking work can be satisfying but results pale into insignificance compared with those that can be achieved with prevention of the degradation in the first place.

I am happy to donate a great deal of my time for these projects that improve the environment degraded from past mistakes, but it is soul destroying to see 100 times the degradation occurring again because of similar mistakes; and will donate my money to prevent this.

If half the funds from these groups were to be spent on remediation I assume you are presuming that there would be paid staff to carry out the remediation.

There have been cries in the media from the Minerals council of Australia, regarding this issue and it seems treasury is bowing to their demands. The minerals council represents many huge multinational companies who have no long term interest in the health of the Australian people or the environment.

Regarding the right to peaceful resistance and demonstration.

This has been a fundamental right of democracies for centuries and I would hate to see Australia go down the path of people being disadvantaged by exercising this right. It smacks of fascism.

Those choosing to donate to the environmental groups do so for no profit of their own. It is always because of a sincere love of our natural environment, and a desire to see best practice when dealing with plants and animals that cannot speak for themselves.

I appreciate the opportunity to submit my opinions

kind regards

Peggy Fisher

██████████

██████████

██████████

