

Greetings Australian Government,

Communities built on philanthropy are bedrocks of social cohesion. Historically, institutions such as RSLs and Rotary Clubs were centres of community identity. They provided an outlet for generosity, a space for altruistic activity, and a place where people feel like they belonged.

Young Australia is much less engaged with these groups. Their place in our cultural identity has slipped significantly, and unless charity incentive structures are updated to align with what motivates younger Australians, we risk losing these kinds of institutions and the community value they create.

This is not to say that philanthropy no longer plays a role in modern Australia's community structure. It just comes in a different form. A key example of these new networks are effective altruism groups, which are now at the helm of the philanthropic community amongst young Australians, with representation in major universities and cities. Effective altruism is not alone in being connected to these demographics, "One for the World" groups are similar. While tax-deductible donations can be made to Rotary, they can't be made to their modern equivalents.

Crucial for understanding the changing shape of the altruistic community is their shifting causes of interest. Rather than an internal or local focus, these groups consider global impacts and are concerned with long-term and catastrophic risk prevention. They also challenge the restrictive moral circles which governed historic philanthropic communities, by focusing on causes like animal welfare, the environment, and preventing human extinction.

We need reforms that seize on these trends and make sure the effective altruism clubs of today can become the Rotary clubs of the future. Strengthening community in this way requires reforming philanthropy to align with the interests and values of younger Australians. Recognising these shifting priorities is the key to both increased charitable donations and increased social cohesion.

In this Submission I raise 2 issues:

- 1) The availability of DGR status for high impact cause areas (Terms of reference 2.ii, 3.ii, 5, 6)
- 2) Removing arbitrary restrictions on Public Benevolent Institutions so they can better work across causes and support community groups (Terms of reference 2.iii, 3.i)

Although I'm a member of the community, not a charity, my views are representative of many of my peers. Further, I think the Productivity Commission should weigh the views of community members. Community members aren't bound by constitutions to make particular kinds of arguments and, ultimately, it is members of the community like me that Government wants to donate more and be more involved in community organisations.

1. Animal Welfare as a whole should be a DGR class, not just short-term direct care of animals (Information request 4)

I am concerned about animal welfare, including in our agricultural sector. I know, both from public polling and from interactions with my friends, family and community, that this concern is widely shared by Australians and only growing. We care deeply about the animals that we share this earth with and their suffering.

I think the phrasing of the charitable purpose regarding animals in the *Charities Act* makes sense. “Preventing or relieving the suffering of animals” is a clear and laudable concept. However, the way that 4.1.6 of the *Tax Act* narrows that down to organisations whose principal activity is “*providing short-term direct care to animals (but not only native wildlife) that have been lost, mistreated or are without owners*” or “*rehabilitating orphaned, sick or injured animals (but not only native wildlife) that have been lost, mistreated or are without owners*” is obviously unreasonable.

The more impactful way to help animals is a holistic approach that seeks to prevent cruelty from occurring, pursues sensible regulation about how society at large treats animals, and also provides direct care to animals that fall through the cracks. Complex problems have complex solutions. Limiting DGR – a significant boost to the efficacy of charities who can access it – to only “bandaid solutions” limits the impact of the cause overall.

I sympathise with concerns that a dramatic expansion of DGR status could have impacts on the tax base. I think, if DGR is going to be expanded gradually, prioritisation should be based on where the most positive impact can be achieved per dollar, and with a view to aligning DGR status with the values of modern Australians.

Charity evaluators, in their work assessing the potential good that could be achieved by working on different causes, consistently agree that animal welfare is one of the most impactful ways to do good. As a proxy for interest in the community, Roy Morgan has found that the trend in vegetarian eating continues to grow, with 2.5 million people in Australia (over 12% of the population) now eating all or almost all vegetarian. About 1 Australian decides to go meat-free every 5 minutes. Obviously, not everyone who cares deeply about animal welfare is a vegetarian, but this indicates that a very significant portion of the Australian population is motivated by this concern. Despite how widespread this view is, the community is currently underserved by charity law. This limits the extent to which we can make tax-deductible donations and limits the positive impact we can achieve through our donations.

2. The *Charities Act* should be amended to resolve confusion about PBIs, including “dominant purpose” (Information request 6)

The way Public Benevolent Institutions are regulated is outdated and should be absorbed into the *Charities Act*. The Law Council of Australia and the ACNC are regularly debating the meaning of the cases from the 1930s and 1940s that define how PBIs can operate. This is not helpful for organisations, communities, or their ability to do charity in an impactful way. The legal conversation has lost track of the policy intent.

An obvious example of this lack of focus on outcomes is the dispute over the meaning of “dominant purpose”. Without re-stating legal arguments, the ACNC seems to think that a charity that is a PBI has to have its PBI-purpose as its “overriding” purpose, and therefore it can’t also have other purposes from the *Charities Act*. The Law Council thinks this reading is a misunderstanding of the meaning of “dominant purpose” and that having a purpose from the *Charities Act* shouldn’t disqualify a PBI.

This is just one example, and who is “right” doesn’t matter. What matters is that having critical definitions about how a charity can do its business buried in arcane case law that doesn’t have a clear reading and isn’t aligned with the Government’s policy intent is not efficient or effective.

In the case of “dominant purpose”, it’s clear that Government policy has no concern with a charity pursuing multiple purposes. This is clear because the *Charities Act* allows a charity to have multiple purposes. This is common sense – no public policy purpose is served by requiring separate organisations for separate charitable purposes (indeed, the administrative inefficiencies that it creates are contrary to good public policy). And this has real-world implications for how PBIs can engage in fundraising, do impactful work, and support their communities.

“Dominant purpose” is just one example of common law that is no longer helpful. There is also confusion around other phrases like “direct relief”.

The Productivity Commission should recommend amendments to the *Charities Act* to override the common law and create a new charity type that is not mutually exclusive with other charity types. The precise details can be resolved by ACNC-led consultation and Government decision.

To summarise - Australian charity regulation has become outdated. Charities with DGR status are the lion’s share of the sector, but DGR status is not aligned with my values or the values of my peers. This means that charities aren’t focusing on many of the things I care about, and aren’t providing the community support and volunteering opportunities that are meaningful to me.

The Productivity Commission has a chance to make recommendations that realign the sector with the values of today’s Australians. Applying the lens of impact could greatly increase the amount of good that the sector can achieve, which in turn would drive donations and build the community supports that younger Australians need. I’ve seen too many talented Australians whose values align with mine leave for the UK or USA to do high-impact charity work because Australia doesn’t have a workable ecosystem for their values. This is hurting our community, our democracy and our future.

For the animals and humans of Australia,
Kai McBeth