



Compulsory Income Management : *A flawed answer to a complex issue*

The Australian Government has introduced legislation into Parliament to establish a national compulsory income management scheme for certain groups of social security recipients. This will restrict their right to decide how they spend their social security payments.

The scheme would extend income management across the Northern Territory then, potentially, to disadvantaged areas around the country.

It will operate separately and in addition to the 'welfare reform' scheme in Cape York, pilot income management schemes for families dealing with child protection authorities in Western Australia and the Northern Territory, and the school attendance trials in Queensland and the Northern Territory.

What is income management?

Compulsory income management was introduced to many Aboriginal communities in 2007 in the Howard Government's Northern Territory Emergency Response (NTER).

Income management works by quarantining a proportion of social security payments - both income support payments such as Newstart Allowance and Family Tax Benefits - which is directed to a special account. This money can only be used to buy 'essentials'. The proportion is generally 50%, but may be up to 70%. Generally, 100% of any lump sum payments (such as the Baby Bonus) is quarantined.

Income managed funds must not be spent on prohibited items, including alcohol, tobacco, gambling and pornography. Recipients must negotiate arrangements with Centrelink to pay bills using the quarantined amounts.

Why are social security payments paid in cash?

Social security recipients generally have a legal right to decide how to spend their payments. Payments such as Newstart Allowance and Family Tax Benefits are cash benefits. This principle has been part of social security law since the first national scheme of unemployment benefits was introduced by the Curtin Labor Government in 1944. This was done in response to the experience of the great depression of the 1930s. At that time, unemployed people had no legal right to income support and had to apply for State Government relief (called 'susso' from 'sustenance') from police stations. This was usually provided in kind, for example food and blankets. Unemployed people found this demeaning and many families struggled with bills such as rent and power.

What is a Basics Card?

A proportion of a person's income managed funds will generally go to their Basics Card account. The Basics Card is provided by Centrelink to people who are subject to income management. It can be used as an EFTPOS card to buy groceries and other items from approved stores using income managed funds.

The Basics Card cannot be used to buy prohibited goods or gift vouchers. Individuals must spend a minimum of \$5 in any transaction on the card.

It can only be used in stores which are licensed by the Government. Many small retailers will be excluded from the scheme, forcing income support recipients to shop at larger retail chains even though this may be more expensive and less convenient. At this stage, licensed stores are mainly in the Northern Territory, which makes it difficult for people affected by Income Management to travel interstate.

Who will be affected?

At this stage most of those affected by Income Management are living in Indigenous communities in the Northern Territory. The Bill before Parliament would extend the scheme to people living in disadvantaged areas prescribed by the Minister for Families, Housing, Community Services and Indigenous Affairs, which could encompass an entire State or Territory.

However, if there is a change of Government the scheme could extend much more broadly. The Opposition Leader, Hon Tony Abbott, previously argued that compulsory income management should extend to all families fully reliant on income support: *'Well one alternative would be to extend welfare quarantining or family income management as it's sometimes called to all welfare dependent families with children; that's to say people on the full rate of a welfare benefit with dependent children.'* ('Insiders', ABC 24/05/2009)

There are five categories of people in those disadvantaged areas who will be affected by the proposed scheme:

1. Young people (under 25 years) who have been on nominated payments for at least than 13 weeks in the last 26 weeks;
2. 'Long-term unemployed' (over 25 year olds) who have been nominated payments for at least 52 weeks in the previous 104 weeks;
3. Income support recipients assessed as 'vulnerable' by a Centrelink social worker;
4. Individuals referred for income management by child protection authorities;
5. Individuals who request voluntary income management.¹

The nominated payments are Newstart Allowance, Youth Allowance, Parenting Payment, Sickness Benefit and Special Benefit.

¹ For more details see FAHCSIA's Q&A on 'new income management' at: www.fahcsia.gov.au/sa/families/progserv/welfarereform/Pages/nim_quanda.aspx

People 'assessed as vulnerable' refers mainly to victims of domestic violence and others at risk of having their social security payments controlled by others when this is not in their interest (for example some people with mental health problems). However documents recently released by FAHCSIA for consultation suggest that the scope of 'vulnerable' income support recipients could be much wider than this – including people in financial hardship, people who 'fail to undertake reasonable self care' (e.g. people with gambling problems) and people who are homeless or at risk of homelessness.² This much wider group could be subject to income management whether or not they receive one of the nominated payments above (for example they may be on a disability pension). The assessment of 'vulnerability' would be made by a Centrelink social worker.

When will the scheme start?

If the legislation is passed, the new scheme will be rolled out across the Northern Territory between 1 July 2010 and mid-2011. An evaluation of the Northern Territory trial will inform any future roll-out across the country.

How can people get out of the scheme?

Long-term recipients of the nominated payments will automatically be enrolled in the scheme, regardless of how diligently they budget their money, search for work or care for their children. To get out of the scheme, individuals will have to apply for an exemption:

- Parents with school age children can apply for an exemption by supplying evidence from the school that their child is attending regularly
- Parents with preschool age children would have to provide evidence to Centrelink of 'responsible parenting', for example, by having their children immunised, visiting the doctor or an allied health professional regularly, enrolling them in child care services or play groups, or other structured activities. 'Responsible parenting' will be assessed by Centrelink.
- Income support recipients without children will find it more difficult to get out of the scheme. This group must either get a job or enter full-time study to obtain an exemption.

In all of these cases, to obtain an exemption, the person must first be assessed by Centrelink as having 'reasonable financial stability'. Documents recently released by FAHCSIA for consultation indicate that this could involve detailed assessment of their budgeting skills over the last 12 months, for example whether they saved for large bills, applied for urgent payments, or lost their basics card. The need for a detailed interview where they have to prove their ability to budget on social security payments would discourage many people from applying for exemptions.³

² See http://www.fahcsia.gov.au/sa/families/pubs/Pages/instruments_consult.aspx

³ See link to FAHCSIA above.

How is this different to the Cape York model of income management?

A system of income management operates in four Indigenous communities in the Cape York region of Queensland. This was negotiated between the communities and the State and Australian Governments. A key feature of this scheme is a 'Family Responsibilities Commission' comprising a retired magistrate, relevant professionals, and local community leaders. The Commission has the power to make a range of orders in cases where a person is assessed as failing to meet their personal and social responsibilities, for example to properly care for their children or pay rent. One of the orders the Commission can make is that a person is subject to income management.

However, these orders are only made in very specific circumstances; where a person has failed to meet their responsibilities and then failed to attend a number of case conferences. Income management in Cape York is much more finely targeted than the national scheme now proposed by the Australian Government. In practice, the Commission relies mainly on 'case management' (intensive counselling and support including financial counselling and other services), and only uses income management as a last resort. Anecdotally, the child protection pilot in Western Australia also operates on this principle.

In contrast to the Cape York Scheme, income management under the Government's proposed national scheme would apply automatically to certain groups of social security recipients in the proposed national scheme. Those affected would have to apply to 'opt out' of income management.

What reasons has the Government given for doing this?

The Government, and the previous Government, have given a range of different reasons for the introduction and extension of income management. In her speech to the Parliament introducing the current Income Management Bill, the Minister, Hon Jenny Macklin, signalled that income management is part of a wider policy agenda to end 'welfare dependency':

*'Welfare should not be a destination or a way of life. The Government is committed to progressively reforming the welfare system to foster individual responsibility and to provide a platform for people to move up and out of welfare dependence.'*⁴

This is a major shift in the way the Government talks about social disadvantage – from the language of social inclusion to the language of 'welfare dependency'. The Minister refers to an '*the entrenched cycle of passive welfare*',⁵ This suggests that for many deeply disadvantaged Australians, 'welfare payments' are themselves the root cause of their problems rather than high unemployment, poverty, or social disintegration.

⁴ Hon J Macklin MP 2009, Social security and other legislation amendment (Welfare reform and reinstatement of Racial Discrimination Act) Bill 2009, Second Reading Speech.

⁵ Hon J Macklin MP, 2009, page 9.

When income management was introduced as part of the NTER, the Howard Government's Minister, Hon Mal Brough advanced a narrower set of objectives, to: *'stem the flow of cash that is expended on substance abuse and gambling'* and *'to ensure funds that are provided for the welfare of children are actually expended in this way.'*⁶

The previous Government suggested that the NTER was triggered by a Report from the Northern Territory Government on child abuse and neglect in Indigenous communities.⁷ Together with the Combined Aboriginal Organisations of the Northern Territory and many other local and national Indigenous organisations, ACOSS opposed the NTER, arguing that it was discriminatory and that a paternalistic approach would reduce the communities' capacity to resolve the complex social problems they faced and that Governments should instead strengthen the resources and services available to the communities to deal with those problems.⁸

The Government has committed itself to an evidence-based approach to welfare reform. It plans to evaluate the extension of income management across the Northern Territory and use this information to inform any decisions to extend the scheme more widely.

It would be hard to measure the impact of the proposed new scheme of income management in reducing something as nebulous as 'welfare dependency'. The limited evidence available does not support the notion that a 'culture of dependency' on social security payments traps people on income support.⁹ As the debate over income management has progressed, the Government has focused on narrower goals more directly related to individual financial management:

*'Income management is designed to achieve a range of outcomes including increasing the amount of money spent on priority needs, improving food security, reducing harassment for money and improved money management.'*¹⁰

This raises the question of whether such a drastic and costly change to the social security system is needed to achieve those narrower goals. For example, a much less expensive way to improve nutrition in remote Indigenous communities would be to subsidise the transport of fresh fruit and vegetables to the communities.

Would the legislation restore the Racial Discrimination Act?

Another key reason advanced by the Government for the extension of income management is that the Government is committed to reinstate the Racial Discrimination

⁶ The Hon Mal Brough MP, *Social Security and Other Legislation Amendment (Welfare Payment Reform) Bill 2007*, Explanatory Memorandum at 5.

⁷ Northern Territory Board of Inquiry: "Little Children are Sacred", Report of the Northern Territory Board of Inquiry into the Protection of Aboriginal Children from Sexual Abuse, 2007

⁸ Combined Aboriginal Organisations of the Northern Territory, A proposed Emergency Response and Development Plan to protect Aboriginal children in the Northern Territory; ACOSS 2007, Submission to the Senate Legal and Constitutional Affairs Committee on the Social Security and Other legislation (Welfare Payment Reform) Bill and the Northern Territory National Emergency Response Bill 2007

⁹ Vinson 2009, Intergenerational disadvantage, Commissioned paper on Social inclusion, DEEWR

¹⁰ Hon J Macklin, MP & Hon W Snowdon, MP, Media Release, Northern Territory Emergency Response progress, 9 June 2010.

Act (RDA), which was suspended under the previous Government's legislation that implemented the NTER. This was done at that time to protect the NTER from legal challenges on the grounds that measures such as compulsory leases of Aboriginal lands, the take-over of local community administration, alcohol and pornography restrictions, and income management, were only targeted to Aboriginal communities. The suspension of the RDA by the previous Government was widely opposed on the grounds that Indigenous people should not be treated differently due to their racial background.

The legislation currently before Parliament would partially reinstate the RDA, though many Indigenous organisations warn that it fails to do this comprehensively. For example, compulsory leases of Indigenous land would continue.¹¹

The Government argues that the extension of compulsory income management to non-Indigenous people in the Northern Territory (and potentially across Australia), means that the scheme would no longer be discriminatory. However, since the Government chose this option instead of rolling back income management in prescribed Aboriginal communities or targeting income management to people with particular problems, it is likely that many more Indigenous people will be affected by income management if the scheme is rolled out nationally. This is because many Indigenous people across Australia rely on unemployment, youth or sole parent payments.

How much will income management cost taxpayers?

The Government has estimated the scheme will cost \$405 million over five years to roll out across the Northern Territory alone. National figures are not yet available.¹²

On the basis that the Territory scheme is estimated to affect 20,000 people, the scheme will cost **\$4100 per person per annum**. Put in perspective, this is **one-third of the allowance paid to unemployed people over a year** (\$11,600 per annum). It is **more than eight times** the amount provided to employment service providers to address barriers to work for long-term unemployed people (\$500 per annum).

What is the evidence?

The available evidence in support of the proposed model of income management is weak and conflicting.

To justify the removal of individual's control over their social security payments, it is not enough to show that most people who fall within the target groups for income management (mainly long term unemployed people and sole parents on income support) are economically and socially disadvantaged. This would not be surprising given their low levels of income support (\$231 per week for a single adult on Newstart Allowance in May 2010) and lack of employment. Convincing evidence would also be needed to show that a substantial proportion of these groups are affected by a 'culture of welfare

¹¹ See for example submissions to the Senate Community Affairs Committee Inquiry into Social Security and Other Legislation Amendment (Welfare Reform and Reinstatement of Racial Discrimination Act) Bill 2009 from Central Land Council, Reconciliation Australia, and the Northern Australian Aboriginal Justice Agency.

¹² Federal Budget Paper No 2 2010-11.

dependency', incapable of managing their budgets, spend a high proportion of their incomes on such things as gambling and alcohol, or that they are not responsible parents.

If not, then the automatic application of the proposed scheme to these groups would wrongly stigmatise entire populations of social security recipients, as well as being needlessly punitive and wasteful.

Officials from the Department of Family Housing and Community Services and Indigenous Affairs were asked about the evidence which was used to target these particular groups income management, by the Senate Committee inquiring into the income management legislation. Their response was that:

'The Government's position in relation to the evidence used in the development of the new scheme of income management is included in the "Policy Statement: Landmark Reform to the Welfare system, Reinstatement of the Racial Discrimination Act and Strengthening of the Northern Territory Emergency Response", page 9: ...

*'The categories are designed to reach people the Government considers are most in need of income management and extend no further than necessary.'*¹³

Professor Tony Vinson, a member of the Government's Social Inclusion Board, raised concerns that his widely respected research on disadvantaged regions would be wrongly used to target social security recipients or income management:

*'charting the distribution of disadvantage throughout Australia was intended to concentrate positive, inclusive forms of assistance for individuals and families caught in entrenched disadvantage, not to increase their exposure to sanctions.'*¹⁴

The evidence on the effectiveness of income management is also thin. The Government argues that income management in the NTER has been effective in increasing the amount of money spent on food and other basics, reducing 'humbugging' and reducing the purchase and consumption of alcohol, tobacco and gambling products. No evidence has been presented that income management reduces unemployment or long term reliance on social security payments.

The Government's evidence came from a variety of reports, reviews and consultations. Yet the evidence for extension of income management is mixed and often contradictory. In addition, there are a number of other reports and reviews which raise clear concerns about compulsory income management and question the positive benefits claimed by the Government.

Some key points to note about the available evidence are that:

- The Government has relied heavily on anecdotal information;

¹³ Senate Community Affairs Legislation Committee, Inquiry into Welfare Reform and Reinstatement of the Racial Discrimination Act Canberra Hearing, Thursday 4 February 2010, Answers to questions on notice, question no: WR6. Viewed 2 June 2010, http://www.aph.gov.au/senate/committee/clac_ctte/soc_sec_welfare_reform_racial_discrim_09/submissions/QoN6F.pdf

¹⁴ Stephen Lunn: Academic questions use of his research in identifying disadvantaged areas *The Australian* November 28, 2009

- Concerns have been raised about the research methodology used in some of the NTER reports;
- It is difficult to measure the impact of income management as compared to other NTER measures, like community store licensing;
- In most of the studies, there is no baseline data of health and social outcomes before the intervention;
- There is no itemised data to show what people are purchasing with their income managed funds, so evidence about increased food sales is based on reports of store owners and customers, not hard data;
- The evidence consistently shows that opinion in communities about income management is deeply divided; and
- There are some clear contradictions within the available evidence. For example, although in one survey over half of clients surveyed reported spending less on cigarettes, a majority (73.3%) of surveyed store owners reported that cigarette sales had remained unchanged.¹⁵

A key report on which the Government has relied is based on surveys and consultations undertaken by FAHCSIA in a number of Indigenous communities in the Northern Territory.¹⁶ The data was then provided to the Australian Institute of Health and Welfare (AIHW) for analysis. The AIHW stated in its report that:

*'The research studies used in the income management evaluation (point-in-time descriptive surveys and qualitative research) would all sit towards the bottom of an evidence hierarchy. A major problem for the evaluation was the lack of a comparison group, or baseline data, to measure what would have happened in the absence of income management...the evaluation findings would have greater strength if these views were supplemented by empirical indicators that showed evidence of the changes reported'*¹⁷

Recently, research on nutrition in Arnhem Land communities by the Menzies School of Health Research was published in the Medical Journal of Australia. Unlike the study referred to above, the researchers collected quantitative data on purchases from community stores before and after the NTER. The researchers found that in the 10 stores surveyed:

*'Income management independent of the government stimulus payment appears to have had no beneficial effect on tobacco and cigarette sales, soft drink or fruit and vegetable sales.'*¹⁸

The Government's proposed scheme runs counter to the recommendations of the independent NTER review committee established by the Government, in particular, its recommendation that the compulsory income management scheme should cease and

¹⁵ Australian Institute of Health and Welfare (AIHW), The evaluation of income management in the Northern Territory, AIHW, 2009, p. v, viewed 1 June 2010 http://www.fahcsia.gov.au/sa/indigenous/pubs/nter_reports/Documents/nt_eval_rpt/NT_eval_rpt.pdf

¹⁶ *Ibid.*

¹⁷ *Ibid.*, p.iv.

¹⁸ Julie K Brimblecombe, Joseph McDonnell, Adam Barnes, Joanne Garnngulkpuy Dhurrkay, David P Thomas and Ross S Bailie, Impact of income management on store sales in the Northern Territory, MJA 2010; 192 (10): 549-554.

be replaced by a combination of voluntary and targeted trigger-based systems (for example, in cases of child neglect). The Committee's recommendations included:

- *'The current blanket application of compulsory income management in the Northern Territory cease.*
- *Income management be available on a voluntary basis to community members who choose to have some of their income quarantined for specific purposes, as determined by them.*
- *Compulsory income management should only apply on the basis of child protection, school enrolment and attendance and other relevant behavioural triggers. These provisions should apply across the Northern Territory.*
- *All welfare recipients to have access to external merits review.'*¹⁹

Why shouldn't income support recipients be required to spend their money on priority needs?

Most income support recipients spend their payments carefully to meet the basic needs of their families. Even with careful budgeting, it is not possible to live decently on payments such as the \$231 per week received by a single adult on Newstart Allowance.

The Government's proposed scheme is not restricted to people who have difficulty managing their finances or are not adequately caring for their children. Rather, it will cover broad categories of payment recipients who will have to provide proof of responsible parenting or a pattern of part-time employment to escape the scheme.

Requiring many recipients to use a special card to spend half of their income support payments is demeaning. There are reports that some large stores in the NT have established separate checkout queues for basics card holders. Income management will also make it harder for them to budget to pay bills and other expenses. The best way to help the vast majority of social security recipients to budget is to increase their meagre payments and allow them to control how they spend the money.

Shouldn't recipients have to do something in exchange for their payments?

ACOSS supports reasonable employment-based activity requirements, such as job search and training, as a key strategy to reduce reliance on income support payments by helping people to obtain jobs.

Far from 'passive welfare', Australia already has strict requirements for people of working age on social security payments to look for work and engage in education or training. Most recipients of Newstart Allowance, and people on Parenting Payment who have school-age children must:

- look for around 6-10 jobs a fortnight

¹⁹ Peter Yu, Marcia Ella Duncan, Bill Grey, Northern Territory Emergency Reponse, Report of the NTER Review Board. October 2008, p. 23, viewed 1 June 2010, http://www.nterreview.gov.au/docs/report_nter_review/docs/Report_NTER_Review_October08.pdf

- attend Centrelink each fortnight and show that they have applied for jobs
- accept suitable job offers
- regularly meet with their Job Services Australia provider
- participate in job search training, vocational training, Work for the Dole, and other employment programs.

Compulsory income management is very unlikely to assist people to find work or achieve financial independence. Financial counsellors are concerned that it may lock people into long-term dependence on others to make financial decisions for them:

“The aim of financial counselling is to put a client back into control of their financial situation. The inherent contradiction in the government’s policy is that income control is said to foster individual responsibility. It is hard to see how this happens when individuals lose control over 50% of a welfare payment and 100% of any lump sum payment.”

Statement by ACOSS and Australian Financial Counselling & Credit Reform Association, 26 February 2010.

Won’t it stop people spending money on alcohol and drugs?

One of the Government’s purposes in proposing a national compulsory income management scheme is to reduce spending on alcohol and drugs. In theory, people whose money is income managed will be unable to buy prohibited goods, including alcohol or illegal drugs, with the quarantined funds.

While this might have a positive effect on individuals with alcohol or drug problems, the measure is not targeted towards people with those problems. Targeted, intensive counseling and support to help people overcome alcohol and drug addictions is likely to be much more effective than a poorly targeted compulsory income management regime. Without support of this kind, people with drug and alcohol problems are likely to find ways around restrictions on their spending.

What are people saying about it?

Of more than 90 submissions made to a recent Senate inquiry into the proposed scheme, the overwhelming majority did not endorse the Government’s proposed scheme.²⁰

In addition to ACOSS, many organisations have raised concerns about the scheme, including the National Welfare Rights Network, St Vincent de Paul, UnitingCare, the Salvation Army and Catholic Social Services Australia. The peak bodies for child protection and financial counseling have also questioned the poorly-targeted nature of the scheme. A number of human rights and Aboriginal organisations have also voiced concerns, including Amnesty International, the Human Rights Law Resources Centre, Reconciliation Australia, the Australian Indigenous Communications Association, Central Australian Aboriginal Legal Aid Service (CAALAS), Laynhapuy Homelands Association,

²⁰ Terry Priest with Eva Cox, A response to the Social Security and Other Legislation Amendment (Welfare Reform and Reinstatement of Racial Discrimination Act) Bill 2009, Why the proposed bill should be delayed. Jumbunna Indigenous House of Learning, May 2010, p. 14

Australians for Native Title and Reconciliation (ANTaR), and the Australian Indigenous Doctors' Association.

A joint statement of major national community organisations opposing the extension of compulsory income management was released in December 2009²¹.

Consultations and workshops in affected Aboriginal communities in the Northern Territory showed that opinion was divided, with many people voicing strong opposition to the measures. Most people expressed a preference for tightly targeted or voluntary schemes rather than the poorly targeted, 'opt out' model which the Government proposes:

*'There was strong opposition to the income management system expressed throughout the workshops. Likewise, there was strong opposition to the proposal in Future Directions to introduce a system of exemptions. For the most part, participants expressed a preference for a voluntary system.'*²²

ACOSS is aware that some communities consider income management to be a useful response to social problems in communities. Where communities do support the continuation of income management, ACOSS argues that they should be able to opt-in to the scheme after a process of community consultation. We do not support the imposition of compulsory income management on communities who have not indicated clear and informed consent.

What are the concerns?

Many concerns have been raised by organisations concerned about the measures:

- The stigmatising of long-term unemployed people, young people and sole parents;
- Inadequate investment in social support programs and help to develop budgeting skills;
- The administrative burden and inconvenience which recipients will experience;
- Its high cost, at up to \$4,100 per person per year;
- The lack of solid evidence in support of the measures;
- The likely disproportionate impact on Indigenous Australians;
- The failure to fully or immediately and fully reinstate the *Racial Discrimination Act*;

²¹ Joint Community Sector Statement on Income Management, ACOSS, December 2009. Viewed 1 June 2010, <http://www.acoss.org.au/images/uploads/Final%20sector%20statement%20on%20income%20management.pdf>

²² Alastair Nicholson, Larissa Behrendt, Alison Vivian, Nicole Watson and Michele Harris, Will they be heard? A response to the NTER consultation June to August 2009. Research Unit, Jumbunna Indigenous House of Learning, November 2009, p. 31

- Inadequate action to remedy the underlying causes of poverty or social exclusion, for example by increasing payment levels, and improving housing standards and employment assistance; and
- The risk that people in crisis such as domestic violence victims will not seek assistance from Centrelink social workers to avoid being assessed as 'vulnerable' and becoming subject to income management.

What are the alternatives?

ACOSS has made a number of recommendations to address the specific problems facing deeply disadvantaged communities, including Aboriginal communities, and to reduce poverty and social exclusion more broadly. Our proposals respect human rights and are informed by evidence about what works. We call on the Government to:

- Withdraw the compulsory income management legislation and instead support a system of income management that people can opt into, on an individual or on a local community basis. Communities should be supported to conduct consultations on whether they wish to participate in an income management scheme.
- To reduce poverty and unemployment, raise single rates of Newstart Allowance and other Allowance payments substantially; improve employment assistance for long term unemployed people including through paid work experience for long term unemployed people, and adapt the Productivity Places training program to the needs of disadvantaged job seekers.
- Substantially increase funding to the support services needed by the minority of deeply socially disadvantaged Australians to improve their capacity to manage their money, deal with personal and family crises and any addictions, and remove barriers to work, by redirecting funds (\$405 million) which were to be allocated to the national compulsory income management scheme.
- Fully restore the Racial Discrimination Act by removing exemptions affecting Indigenous communities in the Northern Territory. The partial restoration of the Act in the Territory should not be traded off against extension of Income Management to communities across Australia.

For more information, see the [Compulsory Income Management](#) page on the ACOSS website.