



# REVERSING INCOME MANAGEMENT

## Real support that makes a difference

Compassionate. Fair. Effective.

The Greens will stop compulsory income management, which is unfair and ineffective. Instead of policies like the cashless welfare card, the Greens will focus on policies that work by giving individuals and communities the support they need to address substance abuse and other challenges.

Income management is a failed policy. Evaluations have shown that it doesn't help people struggling with substance abuse and disadvantage, but it hurts vulnerable people and communities. The old parties want to keep expanding this unfair and ineffective policy. The Greens want to give individuals and communities real support and control that will make a difference.

### > STOPPING COMPULSORY INCOME MANAGEMENT

The Greens will **remove all compulsory income management, including the cashless welfare card**. Where individuals have genuinely volunteered for income management, the infrastructure will remain in place to support individuals who've made a genuine choice to participate.

### > CUTTING INEFFECTIVE COSTS

The policy has been fully costed by the Parliamentary Budget Office, and will **save \$65m** in the 2016-17 financial year. Cutting this unfair and ineffective policy means other programs that offer genuine support can be better funded.

### > LISTENING TO THE COMMUNITY

The Greens share the concerns of people and communities across the country who have fought against harsh income management policies, including the cashless welfare card. The old parties have both supported expanding income management, an unfair and ineffective policy. Both old parties voted in support of the cashless welfare card on multiple occasions, despite knowing it would be ineffective, and ignoring the opposition from community members.

### > INCOME MANAGEMENT – A FAILED POLICY

Income management has been consistently criticised by independent experts and reviews.

#### [Evaluating New Income Management in the Northern Territory: Final Evaluation Report](#)

*A substantial group of people subject to income management felt that income management is unfair, embarrassing and discriminatory. (p. xxi)*

*There was no evidence of any overall improvement in financial wellbeing, including reductions in financial harassment or improved financial management skills. (p. xxi)*

*The evaluation found that, rather than building capacity and independence, for many the program has acted to make people more dependent on welfare. (p. xxii)*

*The evaluation data does not provide evidence of income management having improved the outcomes that it was intending to have an impact upon. (p. xxii)*

#### [Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Social Justice Commissioner Mick Gooda](#)

*We have no evidence to support the prediction that a restriction on cash payments will curb an individual's addiction or their ability to provide a safe environment for their children.*

#### [Adjunct Professor Eva Cox](#)

*Despite denials by the government, the evidence is that a universally applied limited access to cash does not restrict access to alcohol and drugs ... there is no valid evidence that the income management program, in its various form, has improved the alcohol and related problems in the range of communities in the NT where it has been applied.*