

From: [tim.read](#)
To: [DGR_Inbox](#)
Subject: Submission: Tax Deductible Gift Recipient Reform Opportunities Discussion Paper
Date: Thursday, 13 July 2017 9:36:56 AM

ATT: Senior Adviser

Individuals and Indirect Tax Division

The Treasury

Langton Crescent

PARKES ACT 2600

**RE: Tax Deductible Gift Recipient Reform Opportunities
Discussion Paper**

To whom it may concern,

I wish to make a submission regarding the consultation paper which proposes potential reforms to Deductible Gift Recipient (DGR) tax arrangements.

I am writing as a father & grandfather with a deep concern about the impact of fossil fuel industries esp. on our climate and other natural resources such as biodiversity, soil and water and as a citizen who regularly stands up to defend community rights to strong environmental protection. At a time of escalating climate change & loss of biodiversity it is essential we do not hamper citizen and citizen based organisations in their capacity to stand up for the rights of communities & nature.

We owe the protection of many of our most precious nature reserves, environmental laws and systems to the work of numerous citizen led campaigns facilitated by ENGOS.

I strongly oppose the suggestion that DGR listed green groups be forced to allocate 'up to' 50% of their funds to "environmental remediation" – in other words, picking up litter or planting trees - instead of advocating for protection of the natural environment. There

are plenty of great organisations e.g Landcare groups, that already do this work. Equally, I believe it is essential we have organisations that can engage in community education, campaigns and advocacy to protect the environment.

This review process is obviously motivated by a political agenda, where corporate interests are driving politicians and parties to pursue policies and action for the benefit of their financial benefit and not for the protection of critical natural resources of primary importance to the wellbeing of the Australian people. While ostensibly it relates to management arrangements for all not for profits, it singles out environmental organisations (ENGOS) for particular scrutiny.

As a citizen I defend my right to civil action to protect natural resources and vulnerable communities from adverse impacts of business, government and corporate activities that undermine critical natural values. I oppose the dangerous recommendation that environmental groups should face administrative 'sanctions' for being in any way connected to 'unlawful' activity. This proposal would be unworkable (how can organisations be held responsible for the activity of people 'without formal connections to the organisation' who might be involved in 'illegal' activity?).

Shockingly the finger prints of the Minerals Council of Australia are obvious as this has been exactly what they are calling for – the government would be seen as following the lead of the fossil fuel and mining sectors if it placed specific sanctions against ENGOS.

Peaceful protest is a cornerstone of sustaining a healthy democracy. Being engaged in peaceful protests does not imply that an NGO is involved in 'illegal' activity.

I urge you to put aside the dangerous recommendations in the paper which are clearly politically motivated.

A legitimate and non political review of the governance arrangements for not for profits will be broadly welcomed, both by the community and the NFP sector, if they remove unnecessary duplication, inconsistencies in how different charities are managed, and reduce reporting burdens while ensuring transparency and rigor in the reporting process.

However, an attempt to limit or sanction environmental groups for working to protect the natural environment will be seen as being politically motivated and strongly opposed by my community here in

Central Victoria.

Yours sincerely,

Tim Read

A large black rectangular redaction box covering the signature area.A smaller black rectangular redaction box covering a line of text, likely contact information.