

From: Adam Johnston [REDACTED]
Sent: Monday, 27 June 2022 2:27 PM
To: DisabilityAdvocacySecretariat
Subject: Disability Advocacy Framework

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Completed

Categories: [REDACTED]

Dear Sir,

Why do we keep doing the same thing when it does not work? I guarantee that this rather rudimentary Framework and Strategy will cause the States to fund a bewildering array of rent seeking charities and NGOs to provide people with disability with some alleged form of 'advocacy'.

All State Governments could more usefully spend the money building a one-stop-shop for complaints about State agencies. Having worked at various complaint handling bodies including the NSW Ombudsman and EWON (Energy and Water Ombudsman NSW), I am aware of various proposals being worked up, only to have them go nowhere. The complaints handling bodies should also cover any third party acting on behalf of a State Government. If an NGO takes public money, they should legally be considered a state agency, with all the reporting and accountability obligations that entails. This is something I have long argued for and (partially on the basis of my submission) the NSW Parliament's Public Accounts Committee recommended a follow-the-dollar proposal in 2014 (see: [Auditor-General Hampered by Lack of Follow-the-Dollar Powers | Jonathan O'Dea Member for Davidson \(jonathanodea.com.au\)](#)). To my knowledge, this recommendation is yet to be enacted. Everything about my experience with NGO 'service providers' (tongue very much in-check) makes me ask both, where did all the money go and, why is it so hard to find and access services?

While here, it is also worth asking why services do not have more invested in physical infrastructure, like staff and offices? While webpages, portals and apps may reduce overheads, it is a different matter if you have physical documents to lodge. Nobody wants them, or if they accept them, it is made clear that this done under sufferance and that you, the client, are being a nuisance. It is much preferred that the citizen/client/customer is put to the trouble of scanning documents into computer systems. It seems to be implied that we the disabled, elderly, unemployed, etcetera, have nothing better to do with our time than send electronic documents to government and NGO computer systems – and that we enjoy doing it. I do not and have never met anyone who does. Yet, NGO and governments are alike in so many ways. If you want something, you must chase them and find your way through their indistinguishable bureaucracies. Very much like George Orwell's *Animal Farm*, there is nothing easy or revolutionary about NGO service delivery. It is often as slow, rigid, and complex as the State services it replaces, yet less accountable for delivery failure. Therefore bodies, regardless of whether they are NGO or State-run, should be held to the same level of scrutiny if they deliver goods or services (including advocacy) with public funds.

It should also be easier to challenge and stall provider/advocate action. As I said, when the client wants something, you the client wait. When *they* want something from you the client, you must immediately drop everything to attend to an administrative two-year-old, who will have a tantrum if you do not give them your undivided attention. Therefore, I want a State-wide clearinghouse for complaints and, ideally, the onus of proof is weighted against NGOs, governments, and advocates alike. States should also be required to show their one-stop shop complaint bodies have reciprocal arrangements with counterparts in all Australian jurisdictions. Too often, every party except the person with disability has the resources to represent themselves. Also, too often, advocates run the argument they want to run, which can bear little or no resemblance to the reason you contacted them in the first place. Advocates have the capacity to transpose their ends for yours ends, while presenting the latter as the former. I learned this when part of the NSW Government's Attendant Care Program, a forerunner to the NDIS. This experience was so poor (see: <https://www.pc.gov.au/inquiries/completed/disability-support/submissions/sub0055.pdf>) it confirmed my opposition to the rollout of the NDIS. The same advocacy bodies which brought us the NDIS will no doubt be all over this

consultation. They will tell the department how much they need still more public money to provide more of their wonderful advocacy and support services. Nothing could be further from the truth!

The inter-jurisdictional reciprocity I referred to earlier should extend to recognizing each other's documents. Particularly in relation to legal or quasi-judicial proceedings, I have been in the embarrassing situation of using the wrong form in proceedings. Making an application in the ACT many years ago for accessible housing (in an attempt to pursue a graduate position in Canberra) I had presumed the ACT would use Commonwealth forms. It was my mistake as the very green law graduate from NSW who was also a self-represented litigant. However, no-one for the Registry or the ACT Government raised it with me prior to the hearing. The Registrar certainly did – on the day of the hearing. Perhaps it was out of sympathy, maybe I groveled sufficiently, or may be given that the ACT was prepared to proceed, meant that after the longest 30 procedural minutes of my life, we dealt with the substantive issues. Admittedly, it was still my filling mistake, but the experience has made me wonder about the real value of some procedural technicalities across borders and jurisdictions getting in the way of courts and tribunals handling substantive matters. Addressing such problems will do far more in my opinion, instead of throwing ever more money at third-rate NGO advocacy services and hoping for the best.

I have responded to multiple inquiries and consultations from your department over many years, particularly in relation to so-called 'welfare to work' and equally euphemistically named Disability Employment Services. The DES system, run by NGOs, produces paperwork but few jobs. I left the system in disgust because it was apparent to me that I was wasting my time. DES staff, in many instances, could hardly be considered as gainfully employed themselves. How could a government funded NGO agency email me, a middle-aged man with cerebral palsy, confined to a wheelchair and a trained solicitor, a job-offer as a butcher in an abattoir? It said much. Perhaps someone had a particularly bad experience in court, or more likely, sending me an offer (even one I could never physically fulfill) satisfied an office KPI. This may well have explained many other stupid events, like calling me to the office to sign up to a graduate program which was then cancelled.

Therefore, I challenged the National Disability Insurance Scheme (NDIS), if unsuccessfully, in the AAT over the use of employment funding under the NDIS. While my arguments were largely dismissed as policy issues, my point in bringing the action was to show on the basis of readily available material, that NGO employment support and advocacy services for those with disabilities were ineffectual and, I should use my support on professional accreditation and related services. The AAT took a different view in *Johnston and National Disability Insurance Agency* [2020] AATA 2583. To look too closely at the many shortcomings of the NGO disability sector would have opened a very uncomfortable can of worms which AAT Deputy President Constance probably preferred not to open. But I am not afraid to do so, and I fear providers for the Advocacy Framework will emerge from the same can of worms and be just as useless. This is underlined in Appendix 1, where I set out some of the evidence against Disability Employment Services. Yet in Appendix 2, you see me respond to my local Council's Disability Action Plan, which drew on many similar, failed strategies.

To change or improve anything for those of us with disabilities, the States and Territories need to rework this Advocacy Framework and:

1. Establish a one-stop shop for the handling of complaints and, that all these agencies have reciprocal arrangements.
2. Recognize that on-line submission is not convenient for everyone, especially some with disability.
3. Continue to man physical offices and direct staff to accept paper documents.
4. Harmonize Court and Tribunal processes as much as possible, so that even if someone (like me) lodges documents attached to the wrong forms, the substantive matters can still proceed.
5. Ensure NGOs who receive public funds (if such practices are to continue) are held to the same standard of scrutiny as an equivalent State agency. Additionally all NGOs should be subject to the all-in-one complaints agency in point 1.

APPENDIX 1

My case against Disability Employment providers (based on my arguments in *Johnston and NDIA* (2020) before the AAT. While the Tribunal was free to dismiss this as policy, I think the Parliament must determine whether it ever obtains good service for people, or value for money when it outsources service delivery to NGOs. This is not my experience. I submit that NGO disability employment service providers (amongst others) are not an efficient or prudent use of public funds:

1. [Dockery and Webster](#)^[1] make the point that long-term unemployment is a multi-faceted issue, requiring a range of responses. They question the true impact of programs (p. 181) while the last full paragraph at page 183

makes the point that many of the jobs gained will be temporary/casual. This has certainly been my experience: see submission to 'Willing to Work' inquiry at https://www.pc.gov.au/data/assets/pdf_file/0004/209749/subpfr356-human-services-identifying-reform-attachment1.pdf. Dockery and Webster also put the per-head expense of supposed employment programs at far greater than what I am asking for.

2. I note the Dockery and Webster paper highlights the lack of an effective knowledge base and, the Commentary which follows it seems to concentrate on the length of time a person has spent outside the workforce. Anecdotally, I would agree; the longer you are out of the workforce the harder it is to get back in. However, I am not in that position, being a Lay member of various committees overseeing NSW Health, which pay sitting fees. It is worth noting that nothing about my application and appointment to these positions (and other roles) had anything to do with an employment agent.
3. Even employment agents themselves (see [Dr Greg Lewis](#),^[2] attached) do not seem to be able to cite much hard data themselves, or are calling for more research. Meanwhile, the document "[Employment final draft](#)"^[3] shows the difference between willingness and capacity to maintain work, due to disability and external factors. While that paper relates to autism (and not cerebral palsy, as in my case) some of the points it makes are relevant. Firstly, the importance of support (see "[Various papers](#)"^[4]). While the latter series of papers dates from the 1980s, they do contain various references to the importance of ongoing support when employed. This was something which was not generally part of my experience except with my very first agent. As time passed (along with temporary jobs) the level of contact/support became less and, having a mandatory meeting was either by phone call or a requirement for a face-to-face meeting, which in recent years was a taxi at my expense. This did not please me; nor did the lack of results for my time – See my submission to the 2016 Disability Reform Discussion Paper at https://engage.dss.gov.au/des_reform_nov16-submissions/1481501406/. I also endorse the comments of Jane Scott at https://engage.dss.gov.au/des_reform_nov16-submissions/1481521768/. We have both experienced similarly lax service from people being paid handsomely, to largely leave us (the under-employed or unemployed) to our own devices. Then these so-called "services" are going to bill the Commonwealth for support allegedly provided to people like me and Ms Scott. It has been many, many years since I could claim satisfaction with an "employment service". The NDIA and the Tribunal would do well to consider whether these employment agencies are billing the Commonwealth under false pretences, because I concur with Ms Scott when she says: *'When I attend appointments they sympathise about the difficulties of finding a job and ask me what kind of help my want. That's not so that they can tailor their efforts to me as an individual. It's because they don't know how to help. All the system seems to require is that they log the fact that I attended the appointment. They are not "employment providers" they are "role markers". I presume they are called employment providers so that the government can make it sound like they are offering a useful service but there seems to be no requirement for my "employment provider" to do anything which will increase my employability. They are often nice people but they don't have the right skills to do the job and meeting them often costs me valuable time I could otherwise spend applying for jobs. When I was an English as a Second Language teacher, I knew what my students needed to improve their English. I was trained to provide it and I did. I didn't ask my students to formulate the lesson plan. My "employment consultants" offer little in the way of effective strategies. They'll give me feedback on cover letters and applications if I ask them to, though even when they do, I often have little confidence in its value. Most of them have made some adjustments to my resume (the adjustments made by one provider made it incorrect). Once they are satisfied that I can write a decent application, they seem to think their only task is to ensure that I keep doing it. One provider had an occupational therapist on their team. Several times, I asked to talk with her to discuss matching my particular limitations with the right employment opportunities and what kind of assistive technology might help, so that I could target my applications appropriately. They refused to give me an appointment with the occupational therapist. They said I would meet with her only after I got a job to discuss what help I needed in the job. Recently, I filled out a job application for Vision Australia which asked me whether I had a disability and what kind of adjustments I might need them to make if I got the job.'* Ms. Scott is absolutely right and, the NDIA needs to re-evaluate the place of employment agents as funded NDIS services. They are not value-for-money and most in my (and apparently Ms. Scott's) experience are not competent. Being 'nice' doesn't cut it and, the Commonwealth needs to explain why the same old incompetent charities who populated the pre-NDIS world are still here?
4. I note that even where so-called activation policies are seen to be working, the endorsement is highly qualified: *'It should also be stressed that the implementation of activation strategies in OECD countries has generally involved significant changes in labour market policy institutions, legislation, and management principles, as well as in the design of specific programmes. This has taken time and often required experimentation and testing. But much remains to be done to provide systematic evaluations of co-ordinated policy packages that are the essence*

of activation strategies. Evaluations of such packages are complicated and much of the literature focuses instead on the effectiveness of specific measures on individuals' labour market outcomes, thereby failing to capture potentially sizeable interactions...In fact, the impact of individual programmes on aggregate employment or beneficiary caseloads is often fairly modest. This is not necessarily surprising and need not be discouraging given that most programmes are highly targeted, investment of public resources is limited and program durations are short. But it also suggests that there is scope for better co-ordination between policy domains. In part, such co-ordination can be achieved by customizing policy parameters of individual measures.' ([Journal of Labor Policy](#), p.16 of 20,^[5])

5. In point 4, the impact of individual employment is "often fairly modest". I agree and, wonder how a Job Guarantee might help focus minds on true results; lasting employment. (See [J52 2006](#),^[6]) Until then, how can the NDIS defend employment providers as value-for-money? Further, why should I not conclude that 'connected to disability' means failure and unemployment for me as I am tended to by 'nice' but incompetent people who are being paid to say they are helping me find work, but in truth they are barely employable themselves.
6. In their paper '[Universal Welfare by Other Means](#)',^[7] Adam Stebbing and Ben Spies-Butcher chart the rise of tax expenditures. The NGOs which the NDIS relies upon for so-called delivery of alleged employment support (given their charitable status) are part of the Commonwealth's forgone revenue. Now, the NDIS wants to tell me that it is 'value-for-money' for me to give an employment allotment in a budget to a disability employment services provider. This means that more public money goes to a tax-exempt organisation which is likely to have a very marginal outcome record. To sustain the 'value-for-money' proposition my application should be judged against a true assessment of disability employment service providers. This is not only in terms of the individual funds directly spent in services with marginal results, but the value of forgone revenue to the Commonwealth budget, given providers' charitable status. This will provide a true cost comparison. Furthermore, while the NDIA is legislatively required to ensure its own financial sustainability it arguably does this at the expense of both participants and the Commonwealth Treasury. There is nothing in the legislation requiring providers to be church or charitable entities. Yet, when I suggest something which does not the classic provider model, you will either say it is not closely enough linked to my disability, or that a value-for-money proposition is not met. Despite this, you will continue to support tax-exempt entities with direct funding, which is far more costly than what I propose. With what is cited and above I further dispute any claims you may make about the competence, value-for-money, or employment results produced by disability employment providers. Equally, I would submit that the only reason these bodies are 'linked to disability' is that historically people with disabilities have been tied to the church and charitable sector, whether we have wanted this or not. With your rejection of my application the NDIS is using its Rules to enforce the same old wretched charity model on me. I object; see this paper for my justification: *Adam David Johnston, The NDIS: The Mark of Pre-War or Post-War Public Policy Making?*, <https://novaajs.newcastle.edu.au/hass/index.php/humanity/article/view/63>. Your attention is also drawn to the paper and presentation I made to a Sydney University Conference on Research. (already submitted). It exposed the NDIS as a Scheme which aims (whether deliberately or not) to perpetuate dependence, disease and disability, to the benefit of the NDIA and its charitable partners, but certainly not to the benefit of me, my family or anyone else with a disability.
7. The last academic paper is from [Felix Driver](#).^[8] While it concerns the Poor Laws in England, I note its discussion of perverse economic outcomes, growing public expense and increased central bureaucracy. It sounds very familiar right here and now and, I ask the NDIA and the Tribunal to reflect on why they may order me back to a failed, perverse and continually subsidised disability sector. What does that say about the NDIS and does it have a historical comparator? I submit that it does and, that Felix Driver's paper demonstrates this fact.

1ST SUPPLEMENTARY SUBMISSION

Employment was an agreed part of the plan, which was written with some reference to me (and it may have my name on it) but it was predominantly written by someone I never met. It has been made clear to me that Uniting are not the planners; they are just LACs and the planners are quite separate. This was not originally explained to me and, I submit the whole plan process is misleading, manipulative and deceptive by design.

Secondly, it was also known that I was trained in and sought work in the law. Due to the structure of the legal profession, only the Law Society of NSW provides such accreditation; it is not provided elsewhere by some alternative support mechanism, though the decision-maker seemed to suggest it was. My [two](#)^[9] [submissions](#)^[10] to the [Productivity Commission](#)^[11] argue the need for reform and the difficulties of employment for not just me, but many others. However, the Law Society is now acknowledging these issues by virtue of the establishment of its [Diversity and Inclusion Committee](#),^[12] the [Business Case](#)^[13] and [National Charter](#)^[14] (all attached) And, they have for many years collected 'diversity data' as part of an annual survey (which, when I have been offered the opportunity, I have completed; noting

disability and employment status). They are clearly more readily acknowledging that disability (and other criteria) are relevant to employment. In this respect, the Law Society may be at a greater point of advancement than the NDIS itself. [Lawyers Weekly](#)^[15] also regularly publishes articles on diversity and the law. (see [example](#)^[16])

Therefore, I submit my employment and certain costs related to my employment clearly pertain to disability, a point the Law Society may now be more open to than the NDIS, given your internal decision. Indeed, from where I sit all elements of my life pertain to my disability; arguing that there is some neat dividing line between what is disability and what is not is quite nonsensical (and, notably pertaining to this division, the AAT recently made a rulings around [nutrition](#),^[17] [pegs, feeding and breathing tubes](#),^[18] which the Agency had cruelly dismissed as ‘health-related’). Regarding lawyers with disabilities [Alexander J. Bolla Jr.](#)^[19] writes this in the US:

Nevertheless, economic efficiency guides the private marketplace and there is little incentive, moral or legal, practical or theoretical, to draw this sector to employ the physically disabled attorney. According to distributive justice theory, the result is everyone’s problem; yet practically, it is no one’s to solve. Some are stimulating private placement through consortium ef-

forts,⁴⁹ appealing to peer enforcement for voluntary mainstreaming.

A recent federal study of private employers and the handicapped reproaches forced mainstreaming, while lauding the virtues of the private sector:

An emphasis on stringent enforcement, if undertaken, must be accompanied by the knowledge that it would change the climate of current attitudes, which are fairly favorable and sympathetic toward the disabled. A punitive approach might increase employment among firms currently hiring few disabled persons but this must be weighed against the loss of good will and affirmative action in many firms which are the result of favorable attitudes, including the belief that handicapped workers are likely to be extremely reliable and highly motivated. Since hiring the handicapped is good business and also has moral sanction in the belief of employers, self-enforcement has many more advantages for achieving government objectives that it may have with other groups needing affirmative action.⁵⁰

The business case attached shows there are only 6% of lawyers who identify as disabled, so I submit that much of what the US writer said then is true of Australia now and true for me. Bolla’s so-called everybody’s problem of disabled persons’ employment is not helped by NDIS inaction. Generally, the NDIS has such a narrow focus on the individual and individual plans, that anything wider is not reasonably necessary unless you can directly relate it to that individual. However, this You Tube of a “Matter of Fact” program (ABC, May 2018, below) reveals what the Agency should also be doing. Go to time index 17:43 of 21:53. The NDIS apparently had mandates for participation, inclusion and community awareness, which it seems to have done nothing about, having been fixated on individual plans.

<https://youtu.be/qGdRkGgxOso>



I doubt anything much has changed since the airing of the program. The speakers then were saying that the NDIS had done nothing for inclusion or employment. If you keep using the same old bunch of charitable sector providers who pass for disability employment services, then I submit that nothing will ever change. This scenario also tells me a great deal about what the NDIS thinks of me. It further demonstrates what it takes to link spending to disability, if ‘having a disability employment agent’ is required to satisfy the last criterion. If my presumption is correct, then it is not so much “ableism”^[20] that is at issue but rather, an NDIS that wants to keep me disabled and knowing my place as dependent on the charitable sector. I submit that this characterisation of me, my abilities and ambitions is inherently discriminatory (and an insult), but it is the one the Agency is implicitly using. As such, I submit that these words apply to the Agency’s reasoning: ‘The soft bigotry of low expectations limits what we can achieve’ – Graeme Innes, ex-Disability Rights Commissioner, Australian Human Rights Commission. (Source: Making rights make sense - <https://makingrightsmakesense.wordpress.com/2014/10/24/beware-the-soft-bigotry-of-low-expectations/>)

Can you clarify exactly what the ‘connected to disability’ criterion looks like when it is fulfilled? Can you also justify my presumed necessity to re-enter the charity quagmire of lazy, inept and sometimes corrupt charity/NGO rent-seekers (see e.g. Submission re VET - https://www.pc.gov.au/data/assets/pdf_file/0005/209750/subpfr356-human-services-identifying-reform-attachment2.pdf) to access employment supports funding? I’ve written extensively on not only my loss of faith in the NGOs, but also argued that governments (and people generally) should not fund them, or provide tax relief to them (see e.g.: 2018-19 Pre-Budget Submission - https://consult.treasury.gov.au/budget-policy-division/2018-19-pre-budget-submissions/consultation/view_respondent?show_all_questions=0&sort=submitted&order=ascending&q_text=adj&uuld=519819481). The submission you already have makes clear they are not fit for purpose. Would a “real” insurance company fund charity except as a tax minimisation and ‘soft media’ strategy? I submit not, beyond the exceptions noted. The question then becomes why is the NDIS so dependent on charities and, how can that be serving my interests as a participant? And why should I accept this, if I am supposed to be a rights-bearing individual?

I had to this point thought it only reasonable to submit the professional accreditation fee, but noting the reasoning in McGarrigle (see Victorian Legal Aid - <https://www.legalaid.vic.gov.au/about-us/news/ndis-test-case-win-for-young-liam-mcgarrigle-in-federal-court>) the accreditation fee is only a part payment and, does not incorporate the membership fee. Following the reasoning and principle applied, I should submit both elements, which doubles the amount claimed. Even so, I argue that the time, money and expense to NDIS is more reasonable and necessary and linked to both my employment and disability than a disability employment services provider could ever be. Having dealt with several such providers, you quickly learn why most of them are in charity; there is no place for them and their deficit of competence in the real productive economy.

Finally, if you still insist the Law Society payment/s are still not to be funded, what would you permit, given my revulsion at handing the Bunyip Aristocracy of Charity more money, be it public money or my personal funds. All I would get is the same old lousy service. (Bunyip aristocracy - https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Bunyip_aristocracy)

*Please note that I am now employed part time. The NDIS can claim no credit for this.

APPENDIX 2

MY SUBMISSION TO NORTHERN BEACHES COUNCIL DISABILITY ACTION PLAN CONSULTATION

From: Adam Johnston [REDACTED]
Sent: Sunday, 8 May 2022 8:36 PM
To: 'council@northernbeaches.nsw.gov.au' <council@northernbeaches.nsw.gov.au>
Cc: [REDACTED]
Subject: Disability Inclusion Action Plan

Dear Sir,

To me, access and inclusion will always be about footpaths that are even and wide. It is also about every bus stop having a shelter in place and it being connected to a footpath. Furthermore, access means Council considering as important, the fixing of footpaths affected by tree roots and other hazards. Additionally, it would be appropriate for Council to prioritize potholes on local roads. They have become noticeably bigger after the recent rains. Talking of rains, not all buildings have any shelter in place over entry or exit ramps. This would be an adaptation worthwhile considering and, much welcomed by me.

The Council's key areas of focus have not changed for some time. I do not think Council can do much in relation to employment and certainly, engaging DES providers will guarantee wasted time and money but no jobs. See: <https://engage.dss.gov.au/wp-content/uploads/2016/12/Submission-re-DES.docx>. This remains my view of the DES system and the employment figures your disability plan quote have remained stubbornly the same for 20 to 30 years. This report from the NDIA itself (<https://data.ndis.gov.au/media/2815/download?attachment>) shows the employment of those with disability is still well below the general population. Just over half of those employed are still in receipt of the Disability Support Pension, or part thereof (including me).

This hardly seems worthy of nine years of the NDIS and billions of dollars, which is the source of my growing frustration, as expressed at: <https://www.aph.gov.au/DocumentStore.ashx?id=e7e5b939-3a5b-4b3d-8a1c-c4cd4c43fd45&subId=720681>. Meanwhile, questions over the integrity and efficacy of NGOs have rolled around for years, yet we keep co-opting these bodies for civic functions at all levels of government – see: [Adam-Johnston-310865.pdf \(treasury.gov.au\)](#). This should stop. Rather than finding expensive and unsuccessful ways to allegedly 'live' with disability, why not deliver the best form of inclusion there is – a cure. Why not reimagine the proposed Town Centre in Frenchs Forest as a science and technology hub. It is close to the Northern Beaches Hospital and delivers on the mayor's much talked of (by him) but never realised university campus. This would be more useful than another Town Centre. It would also appear to meet an urgent need. As recorded by MSN: [Missing in action: five issues the major parties are avoiding in the 2022 federal election \(msn.com\)](#)

Science funding

Australian scientists are calling for more government research funding, which has declined in recent years despite vaccines and treatments for Covid-19 highlighting the key role science plays in tackling global challenges.

The pandemic has brought [widespread job insecurity and plummeting morale](#) among Australian researchers. A Morrison government decision in December to veto some funding grants has had a "chilling effect" on academic independence in Australia and made it harder to attract international talent, a [Senate inquiry heard in March](#). A new position statement released by the Australian Academy of Science (AAS) has criticised the current approach to science funding as "not fit for purpose".

It said: "Today, Australia's science funding system is characterised by a real declining base level of government support for public science agencies and universities."

"Despite one-off funding for research and science during the pandemic, in 2021 the Australian government's investment in science was 0.56% of gross domestic product – which is lower than peer nations – and has declined over the past decade."

It comes amid criticism by a leading Australian climate scientist that the national science agency, the CSIRO, has turned into a "very extravagant consulting company" under the Coalition.

Prof David Karoly, who worked on four of the six major assessments by the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change, [told Guardian Australia](#) this week that CSIRO scientists had been barred from speaking publicly about

government policy, and that budget cuts had transformed the agency into one reliant on external contracts to survive.

It is difficult to judge the exact situation, or the reliability of this report (sourced from The Guardian). However, I know personally of scientists leaving research positions and losing grant funding. If I want to be cured of my disability and see others healed likewise, writing to consultations like this one is a good place to start.

Yours truly,



Adam



Adam

Adam Johnston

[Redacted content]



This email has been checked for viruses by Avast antivirus software.
www.avast.com

- [1] See https://espace.curtin.edu.au/bitstream/handle/20.500.11937/18509/20501_downloaded_stream_489.pdf?sequence=2&isAllowed=y
- [2] See https://espace.curtin.edu.au/bitstream/handle/20.500.11937/12309/157686_157686.pdf?sequence=2&isAllowed=y
- [3] See <http://eprints.nottingham.ac.uk/39713/1/Employment-final%20draft%20JADD%2044%2810%29.pdf>
- [4] See <http://citeseerx.ist.psu.edu/viewdoc/download?doi=10.1.1.1014.8053&rep=rep1&type=pdf>
- [5] See <https://izajolp.springeropen.com/articles/10.1186/2193-9004-1-9>
- [6] See http://www.billmitchell.org/publications/journals/J52_2006.pdf
- [7] See <https://www.cambridge.org/core/journals/journal-of-social-policy/article/universal-welfare-by-other-means-social-tax-expenditures-and-the-australian-dual-welfare-state/41E5D6F140F0EDDEBC3C554168C63E9F>
- [8] See <https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0305748889801173>
- [9] See https://www.google.com.au/url?sa=t&rct=j&q=&esrc=s&source=web&cd=5&cad=rja&uact=8&ved=2ahUKEwj6n5P34t3jAhWklbcAHb7HCikQFjAEegQIAhAC&url=https%3A%2F%2Fwww.pc.gov.au%2Fenquiries%2Fcompleted%2Faccess-justice%2Fsubmissions%2Fsubmissions-test%2Fsubmission-counter%2Fsubdr164-access-justice.docx&usg=AOvVaw1y-iyL_vDiiMqOPiTygna&cshid=1564528595224585
- [10] See <https://www.google.com.au/url?sa=t&rct=j&q=&esrc=s&source=web&cd=2&ved=2ahUKEwj5s5a95N3jAhUd7XMBHXAQB9AQFjABegQIBRAC&url=https%3A%2F%2Fwww.pc.gov.au%2Fenquiries%2Fcompleted%2Faccess-justice%2Fsubmissions%2Fsubmissions-test%2Fsubmission-counter%2Fsubdr297-access-justice.docx&usg=AOvVaw0RRRDYGebq2hcVB7jnOOOu>
- [11] See <https://www.google.com.au/url?sa=t&rct=j&q=&esrc=s&source=web&cd=3&cad=rja&uact=8&ved=2ahUKEwjx0vrY5d3jAhVe7HMBHTfoCSsQFjACegQIAhAB&url=https%3A%2F%2Fwww.pc.gov.au%2Fenquiries%2Fcompleted%2Faccess-justice%2Freport&usg=AOvVaw3sP4tBoPg9QDGFY6aH48rW>
- [12] See <https://www.lawsociety.com.au/advocacy-and-resources/advancement-of-women/diversity>
- [13] See https://www.lawsociety.com.au/sites/default/files/2018-06/LS1856_Policy_DIC_BusinessCase_2018_v2_final.pdf
- [14] See <https://www.lawcouncil.asn.au/files/web-pdf/1508-Charter-Diversity-and-Equality-Charter.pdf>
- [15] See <https://www.lawyersweekly.com.au/>
- [16] See <https://www.lawyersweekly.com.au/biglaw/25922-global-law-firm-confirms-40-40-20-target>
- [17] See <https://www.disabilityservicesconsulting.com.au/resources/ndis-health-aat?rq=tribuna>; see also <https://www.disabilityservicesconsulting.com.au/resources/ndis-health-aat> (related article)
- [18] See <https://www.disabilityservicesconsulting.com.au/resources/coag-drc-health?rq=coag%20>
- [19] See <https://scholarship.law.missouri.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?referer=&httpsredir=1&article=2746&context=mlr>
- [20] See <https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/abs/10.1080/09687599.2014.923749>