

Submission to enquiry. Productivity Commission

I would like to make a brief submission because there have been so many requests for submissions I have not known exactly what each one is for.

Regarding this submission I believe housing is the most important issue for people with disabilities. Various government departments espouse rights for people with disabilities but when it comes to housing they refuse innovative options which they say they are encouraging. In fact if a person with a disability wants to live in a cluster with his or her friends around them this is refused because it is said to be an institution. Until we get rid of the deinstitutional freaks nothing will change and especially when it appears parents are going to be expected to pay for this housing. Bureaucrats then can't impose their wishes on the person who is affording and fully funding the facility.

Often the parent models are more cost effective and when government community houses cost from \$300,000 to \$500,000 a year to staff it is no wonder government are abandoning housing and asking parents to foot the bill.

Regarding cost effectiveness. It appears to me the most cost effective way of providing services is for the Federal government to directly fund families who have a bank account the money can be placed in four times a year and who can provide receipts for all money spent.

This saves the huge costs of service providers. The current model is top heavy and these managers often take 70% of the package thus ensuring the person with the disability does not get enough help.

This direct payment model would ensure the long time essential care and support needs were met. Outcomes would be better and people would get what they were entitled to and there would be more money for individual needs. The outcomes would be better.

Long time care and support should be assessed by Centrelink and then payments should be made to the person with the disability directly through Centrelink. Centrelink could calculate the cost of long time care and support. This would be a better model. When the insurance levy kicks in this could also be provided out of the pool through Centrelink thus streamlining the system.

With direct funding a range of supports is possible and then the actual needs of the individual can be met. With direct funding if it is adequate all outcomes are better and thus equipment needs can be met respite also transport and day programs.

The one thing follows on from the other if the person is properly assessed and the money paid directly to them there will be plenty of money.

At present money disappears as it filters through the different levels of government to the end user who is usually a service provider creaming the last cent out of the package.

Naturally there will have to be options for people who can't manage their own money but then maybe a guardian could be appointed.