

[REDACTED]

DGR@Treasury.gov.au

2nd August 2017

I am extremely concerned about the suggestions being floated that charitable environmental organisations should be told how to operate and where to put their emphasis if they wish to maintain DGR status. This is clearly a crude political attack.

Each organisation should be free to set its own priorities and to make an informed assessment of the best way to achieve those environmental outcomes, whether this is through advocacy or on-ground remediation. I strongly oppose any new restrictions or limitations.

I, and the wider community, I am sure, expects environmental groups to be strong advocates for environmental outcomes.

It is much less good trying to clear up afterwards. Advocacy to improve environmental policy is about preventing damage from happening in the first place. Advocacy for better policy can be much better value for Australia compared to the cost of repairing future environmental damage, and limiting the ability of environment groups to advocate for our environment would result in poorer environmental outcomes.

We face major environmental problems like climate change, which can't be stopped just through on-ground environmental remediation.

The Inquiry and discussion paper create a false dichotomy between remediation and advocacy. On-ground work often needs supporting policies or funding from government, which may only arise as a result of advocacy.

L'shalom

Jonathan Keren-Black (Rabbi)