

**From:** [REDACTED]  
**To:** [DGR Inbox](#)  
**Subject:** I'm against changes to DGR tax arrangements that restrict conservation advocacy  
**Date:** Friday, 4 August 2017 4:00:48 PM

---

It is disturbing that the Government should be contemplating this legislative change: its effect will be to further advantage powerful and well resourced private sectoral interests at the expense of the broader public interest.

Corporations and large companies have the benefit of being able to afford large donations to political parties.

These gain them privileged access to government politicians to pursue their own specific vested interests.

Donations of this sort are tax deductible.

Where these interests conflict with those of the broader community, if not the nation as a whole, it is critical that recognised advocacy groups be given equal opportunity to represent the interests of the public in challenging them.

And it is essential and only just that those voices, representing a balancing view, are given equitable financial treatment.

Unless it can be unambiguously demonstrated that the operations of Not For Profit environmental advocacy groups are to the net detriment of the country and its citizens, rather than just to the financial interests of those lobbying for this change, the current charitable status of these Not For Profit organisations needs to be maintained.

Remediation of degraded environments is very important. The real responsibility for this rests with those who have caused that degradation: primarily the mining and other enterprises that have profited from the destruction of those environments in the first place. It is on these organisations that a government for all Australians, not just the big end of town, should be focusing. It is these organisations that should be legally required to set aside, ex ante, adequate funds to remediate the land that their operations have degraded. They are after all benefiting enormously from the exploitation of finite resources that belong to all Australians, a privilege for which the wider community appears to gain disproportionately little by way tax or royalty revenue.

I appreciate your taking my views into account

Yours Sincerely

Christopher McLelland

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

