From: <u>Katherine Wilson</u>
To: <u>DGR Inbox</u>

Subject: how environment charities can spend MY donations

Date: Thursday, 3 August 2017 9:43:31 AM

TO Inquiry into the Register of Environment Organisations

To whom it may concern,

I am a longtime regular donor to various charities that I carefully select because I trust they do good work in areas of need that are important to me - areas where I believe governments do NOT do enough. Charities I currently support include Oxfam, Medicine Sans Frontiers, Red Cross, Environment Victoria, Climate Council and Market Forces/Friends of the Earth.

My carefully chosen charities have always focused on poverty, human rights, women and children, and now, increasingly the environment and efforts to mitigate climate change. I consider climate change the most urgent issue currently facing our country (and the world) - much more potentially devastating than terrorism, which is receiving far greater government attention - and financing from MY TAXES.

I am VERY DISTURBED by the Treasury Discussion Paper's recommendation to force all environment charities to spend up to half of their money on 'remediation'. Climate change cannot be stopped just through on-ground environmental remediation.

I believe that the organisations to which I CHOOSE to donate (unlike how my taxes are spent) should be free to set their own priorities and to make informed assessments of the best way to achieve those environmental outcomes, whether this is through advocacy or on-ground remediation.

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.

I strongly oppose new restrictions or limitations to their work.

Sincerely,	
Katherine Wilson (PhD)	