

From: [Jamie McMahon](#)
To: [DGR Inbox](#)
Subject: Tax Deductible Gift Recipient Reform Opportunities - consultation response
Date: Friday, 4 August 2017 10:44:45 AM

Hello,

Please accept this email as a submission on the consultation for tax deductible gift recipient reform opportunities.

I believe the proposed reforms, while including some pure administrative improvements, seek primarily to justify the stripping of DGR status from environmental organisations. I sincerely object to this.

Overall the proposal treats tax revenue missed by government through donations to organisations with DGR status as a burden and implies that this is a 'favour' to those organisations. It should be noted that the public's decision to donate money to these organisations is purely optional and dependent on the organisation's overall support in the community. This ignores the fact that the administration of taxing that money otherwise is still substantial and imposes a cost on government.

More importantly however, I am deeply suspicious of the proposal to apply further scrutiny to environmental organisations in particular. This seems like more a bid to silence opposition than it is to genuinely examine whether the objectives of the policy are being met. This is somewhat confirmed by comments made by Matt Canavan such as:

"There are a large minority who are clearly engaged primarily in trying to stop fossil fuel development in Australia and I don't think it's right that Australian taxpayers, including people who work in the mining industry, are asked to fund those activities"

Leaving aside what exactly a 'large minority' is, Mr Canavan's remarks show a clear misunderstanding of the way funds are managed in such circumstances, as per my above paragraph. The Australian taxpayer is no way 'funding' these organisations - that claim is based on the erroneous assumption that every dollar going to a DGR would otherwise be taxed, which is simply not true. As such any claim that the Australian government is funding environmental activism is completely false. This fundamentally and categorically underlines the intent of this review - an attempt to cut funding to environmental organisations.

On a more philosophical level I personally consider environmental activism, such as that against the Adani Carmichael Coal mine, to be of great importance to our nation and our shared future. Such environmental campaigning has, at its core, views to preservation of environmental values and ultimately our way of life. These organisations have no interest in hobbling our economy unnecessarily - they merely wish to help us avoid catastrophic climate change or biodiversity loss, among a variety of other noble causes. This should surely be supported by any responsible government with even the vaguest of long term strategic thinking about our future and the potential costs of doing nothing.

In terms of this review I would like to know why particular attention has been placed upon environmental groups. Why aren't religious organisations being subjected to the same scrutiny? I would argue because these groups are not the thorn in the side to the government that environmental groups are.

I regard this review as a thinly veiled political attack on environmental advocacy groups in

particular. I strongly urge this review to leave all existing regulations, which I regard to be working adequately, in place and untouched.

Regards,

Jamie McMahon
Yarrawarra, NSW