



## Additional comments—Mr Jason Wood MP

### **Recommendation 5**

I have concerns about this recommendation, as there are a number of groups with deductible gift recipient (DGR) status or future groups that want to apply for DGR status that would have no remediation work or would find it very difficult to prove the 25 per cent target. I do note that in paragraph 4.84 of the Committee's report, the Committee suggests that environmental DGRs should be allowed to provide funding to other environmental DGRs to meet the requirement. However, this would therefore be increasing the reporting burden on other groups, and in my view this would be counter-productive.

The DGR groups impacted, which would not reach this target or any target for that matter, would be groups solely focused on education and research, advocacy, including environmental law, and overseas activities. Then there are other groups which do not do specific on the ground work or would find it difficult to distinguish between on the ground work and other activities, and to prove some would be cumbersome. A list of groups has been included below which in one way or another would be impacted by the issues previously mentioned.

As a personal example of a group in my electorate of La Trobe which is in the process of applying for DGR status, has no on the ground work, and would not meet even a one per cent target, "For the Love of Wildlife" specifically focuses as per their constitution on education, exposing crimes against nature, and policy and advocacy, specifically supporting African lions, and actively worked with myself to stop the importation of African lion trophies into Australia, and accordingly would therefore not qualify for DGR status. It should be noted that For the Love of Wildlife actively lobbies politicians, nationally and internationally, and travels both interstate and overseas to increase awareness of the barbaric

practice of canned hunting, where lions are raised for one purpose and that is to be hunted.

Listed below are some of the current DGR groups that would likely not meet the 25 per cent target, or have raised other issues which would make reaching the 25 per cent target very difficult.

*Education and research*

- Beyond Zero Emissions, Submission 188
- Great Barrier Reef Foundation, Submission 279

*Advocacy*

- Environment Victoria, Submission 252
- Friends of the Earth Australia, Submission 297
- Greenpeace Australia Pacific Limited, Submission 354
- Australian Youth Climate Coalition, Submission 359
- The Wilderness Society, Submission 411

*Representation of member groups*

- Nature Conservation Council of NSW, Submission 369

*Environmental law advocacy*

- Tarkine National Coalition, Submission 181
- EDOs of Australia, Submission 403
- Environmental Justice Australia, Submission 443

*Overseas activities*

- Australian Orangutan Project, Submission 254
- Wildlife Asia, Submission 277

In addition, below are references to evidence given at public hearings where representatives of environmental DGRs discuss the distinction between on-ground work and other activities.

*Environmental DGRs that indicated that they do not specifically do on-ground work*

- Ecological Society of Australia, Brisbane, 14 July 2015
- Sustainable Population Australia, Adelaide, 1 September 2015
- National Parks Australia Council, Canberra, 18 September 2015
- Conservation Council ACT Region, Canberra, 18 September 2015

*Environmental DGRs that indicated that they do not (or find it difficult to) distinguish between on-ground work and other activities*

- Australian Marine Conservation Society, Brisbane, 14 July 2015
- Tasmanian Conservation Trust, Hobart, 21 July 2015
- Conservation Council SA, Adelaide, 1 September 2015
- Conservation Council of Western Australia, Perth, 3 September 2015
- National Parks Association of the ACT, Canberra, 18 September 2015
- Australian Network for Plant Conservation, Canberra, 18 September 2015
- WWF Australia, Canberra, 18 September 2015
- Farm Tree and Landcare Association, Melbourne, 21 September 2015
- Nature Conservation Council of NSW, Sydney, 17 November 2015

## **Recommendation 6**

I do have concerns about this recommendation. Firstly, drafting laws or regulations would be very complex and could only practically work if a DGR at the board or committee level made a decision to use violence or damage to property. In this case I would support sanctions against the DGR, however I also believe this scenario would be very unlikely and serious offences would more likely be made by individuals on a random basis. Also, for offences which are not sanctioned at the board or committee level, or do not involve violence or damage to property, current state laws would suffice.

Also it should be noted that it was due to environmental activists, through their efforts and through the use of a blockade, that major environmental disasters have been prevented. An example would be the Franklin River in Tasmania, where many activist groups openly supported campaigns to stop the damming of the river. These protests, which were actively supported by environmental groups, would be prohibited under this recommendation and history would now show

that, if it was not for these protests and national awareness, the World Heritage Franklin River would have been dammed.

I also see an issue with individuals who financially support DGR groups that protest each year in the Southern Ocean against whale hunting. Australians are horrified to see Japanese whalers kill whales in an area declared "The Australian Whale Sanctuary", and often provide financial support knowing that they are supporting a DGR group now or into the future that focuses on protecting whales. If these recommendations are approved, these supporters could be sanctioned because of their actions to stop whale hunting.

Mr Jason Wood MP  
Member