

From: [Steph Krunic](#)
To: [DGR Inbox](#)
Subject: DGR Submission
Date: Saturday, 24 June 2017 8:54:34 AM

The government have made it very clear that a primary target of their proposed reforms to DGR status is the environment movement, particularly charities that campaign against mining and other development. This concerns me deeply. Historically, critical environmental protections have been implemented only after strong environmental advocacy from environmental groups.

There may be many reasons why the government is seeking to audit environmental organisations and restrict their advocacy, but there is no doubt that Mining Industry lobby groups are active players.

In a recent newsletter, the Minerals Council of Australia have asked mining companies to make submissions in response to the Treasury DGR paper, providing the address and some suggested content.

In part, this newsletter suggests the following:

"Greenpeace, Lock the Gate and groups like them currently receive Deductible Gift Recipient (DGR) status which means that donations to them are tax-deductible. This assists them to raise funds for illegal protests."

"You can help by making a submission to the government. Your submission doesn't have to be long. A simple WORD document with your contact details is all that's needed."

The Minerals Council then went on to suggest responders highlight the following points:

"All environmental charities should be regularly reviewed to make sure they are abiding by the law. Any environmental protest group that breaks the law should immediately have their DGR status revoked. Taxpayers should not subsidise illegal protests by anti-mining groups. To be eligible for DGR status, the primary purpose of an environmental charity should be "on-ground" work that improves the local environment."

This clearly illustrates a direct attack against the capacity of organizations to raise funds and lobby FOR the environment and insist on environmental protections. Without these groups, environmental protections have no lobby group to balance the corporate lobbying.

The suggestion that the "primary purpose" of an environmental charity to be local and restricted to "on-ground" work makes the absurd assumption that environmental advocacy and lobbying is not a critical component of effective local environmental protections.

Entities with vested financial interests in lobbying unopposed for commercial projects and silencing community groups, particularly those insisting on legal environmental protections, are precisely WHY effective environmental advocacy can not be restricted to on-ground actions alone.

This is why I vehemently oppose restricting DGR status to exclusively "on-ground" groups.

Thank you
Stephanie Krunic

