



THE UNIVERSITY OF
**WESTERN
AUSTRALIA**



UWA
Public Policy
Institute

Let Every Stage Advance

Policy Ideas for Australia's Fiftieth Parliament



Laurence Coleman, Editor
Peter van Onselen, Foreword
Shamit Sagar, Director



THE UNIVERSITY OF
**WESTERN
AUSTRALIA**



UWA
Public Policy
Institute

Let Every Stage Advance

Policy Ideas for Australia's Fiftieth Parliament

Laurence Coleman, Editor
Peter van Onselen, Foreword
Shamit Saggar, Director

Essays from Marielle Smith, Mehreen Faruqi, Matt O'Sullivan,
Patrick Gorman, Helen Haines, Kate Thwaites, David Van,
Tim Ayres, Alicia Payne, Amanda Stoker and Raff Ciccone

Copyright © the authors; used with permission.

These works are copyright. Apart from any fair dealing for the purposes of private study, criticism or review, as permitted by the Copyright Act, no part may be reproduced by any process without written permission.

Any view or opinion expressed in this publication is that of its author, and does not necessarily represent the position of the author's affiliate organisations, The University of Western Australia or UWA Public Policy Institute.

First published in 2019 by:
UWA Public Policy Institute
The University of Western Australia
M464, 35 Stirling Highway
CRAWLEY WA 6009

Design, typesetting and printing:
UniPrint, The University of Western Australia.

ISBN: 978-1-74052-991-4

Message from the Vice-Chancellor



In 2018 I appointed former Australian Foreign and Defence Minister, Professor the Hon. Stephen Smith, to establish a new UWA Public Policy Institute – signalling a step-change in how our University and its researchers fulfil our duties as a civic institution.

The UWA PPI is not a classical public policy research institute, in the sense that it does not teach courses or conduct its own research into Australian public policy. Rather, it was created to help us get our research and expertise out of dusty academic journals and into the hands – and heads – of policymakers in WA, Canberra and across our Indo-Pacific Region.

All over the world, Western democracies are undergoing a crisis of authority. The proliferation of ‘fake news’ and internet information of dubious accuracy, a polarisation of politics associated with social media feedback loops, and rolling scandals in governments and churches have led to a diminution of trust in the authority of all sorts of previously trusted institutions.

The Australian National University recently released new research data showing that universities – and in particular university researchers – have defied this trend, and throughout Australia remain highly trusted sources of authoritative information. In light of this, there is now more need than ever for academics to use our expertise for the civic good.

This publication seeks to contribute to that effort by focusing the minds of newly elected federal Senators and Members of Parliament on long-term policy considerations.

Accordingly, we asked a total of 24 new MPs and Senators to submit an essay. As well as those elected in the 2019 federal election, we included some new parliamentarians who had been elected or appointed in by-elections or to fill casual Senate vacancies in 2018. We sought to include proportionate representation from the various political parties,

reach gender equality, and have fair representation from each state and territory. In total we asked 12 Members and Senators from the Coalition, nine from the Australian Labor Party, one from the Greens Party and two independents. We had a fair amount of interest in the project from most of those invited to contribute, though many were unable to due to time constraints. In total this publication includes essays from six Labor Members and Senators, three from the Coalition, one Green and one independent. Of these, six are women and five are men. There is at least one essayist from each state and territory aside from Tasmania and the Northern Territory.

I am grateful to all the contributing essayists and their staff for sharing our vision of the importance of considering Australia's long-term policy challenges. I also thank UWA PPI Director Professor Shamit Saggar; the publication's editor, Laurence Coleman; and the entire UWA PPI team for their work in bringing this project to fruition.

It is my hope that this publication prompts ongoing discussion and debate – about the ideas it contains, but also about Australia's long-term interests and the role universities can play to help policymakers build a better future.

Professor Dawn Freshwater

Vice-Chancellor

The University of Western Australia

Contents

Message from the Vice-Chancellor	5
Foreword <i>Professor Peter van Onselen</i>	9
Introduction <i>Professor Shamit Saggar and Laurence Coleman</i>	11
Automating authority <i>Senator Marielle Smith</i>	15
Universal free TAFE and university <i>Senator Dr Mehreen Faruqi</i>	19
Data should drive next generation of jobseekers into work <i>Senator Matt O'Sullivan</i>	23
For we are young and free: How free childcare will keep Australia's economy on top <i>Patrick Gorman MP</i>	27
Towards a father-inclusive model of pregnancy care <i>Dr Helen Haines MP</i>	31
The information challenge and the need for public interest journalism <i>Kate Thwaites MP</i>	35
Energy policy post-2030 <i>Senator David Van</i>	39

Equity, efficiency, voice – Australian industrial relations in a changing world <i>Senator Tim Ayres</i>	43
Public early childhood education <i>Alicia Payne MP</i>	49
Dyslexics untie <i>Senator Amanda Stoker</i>	53
Freelancing without fear: a new industrial paradigm for a new generation of workers <i>Senator Raff Ciccone</i>	57
Epilogue and acknowledgments <i>Laurence Coleman</i>	61
About UWA PPI	63

Foreword

Professor Peter van Onselen



Big ideas, which by their very nature need to be future looking, are not as common in politics as they perhaps should be. Criticism for this is usually laid at the feet of the politicians, but the blame is a shared responsibility.

The media arguably does not treat big ideas with the detail or seriousness they deserve – perhaps one consequence of the changing media landscape. The voting public appears disinterested in major reforms which can unsettle their daily lives – perhaps a consequence of reform fatigue after so many decades of significant change. And the political system does not easily lend itself to bold thinking: three-year terms, direct member electorates and an upper house which challenges the mandates of elected governments all add up to a more conservative style of governance.

However, the challenges Australia faces as part of a globalised, ever changing world, coupled with the rapid change domestically, mean that we need to open our minds to what might be done differently to enhance quality of life. There is a sense that opinions are polarising, as silos develop which prevent the sort of frank and open contest of ideas that once acted as the precursor to heady reforms.

The authors in this collection are at the beginning of their federal political careers, even if most have had substantial pre-parliamentary careers, including within their party organisations, within state parliaments and in the government and non-government sectors. Proposing policy change so early in one's political career might be described by Sir Humphrey of *Yes Minister* fame as 'courageous'. But it is courage we want and need, because debating ideas is the only way

to pressure test them, assisting us to decide what to embrace and what to throw away.

The authors of this publication are a diverse bunch, both in terms of their backgrounds and outlooks, which makes for more vibrant reading. Topics include examinations of state funded childcare and post-secondary education; how the systems of employment and industrial relations can be improved; how technology might change the way we think and do business.

These collected essays include powerful arguments for change built on international evidence, with particularly original contributions on topics as broad as public interest journalism by Kate Thwaites, and Dr Helen Haines' father-inclusive model for pregnancy care.

Despite the large and diverse collection of authors, however, there were some glaring gaps in the literature – for example, nobody tackled the challenges of our future infrastructure needs or how Australia's economy might be diversified.

With so many big ideas worthy of debate, such gaps are not a criticism of the effort of our authors. Rather, they serve to recognise just how broad the challenges Australia faces are, highlighting exactly why big debates about the future matter, and therefore why this publication is a valuable one.

Professor Peter van Onselen is Political Editor for Network Ten and a contributing editor for The Australian. He is also Professor of Politics and Public Policy at The University of Western Australia.

Introduction

Professor Shamit Saggar

Director, UWA Public Policy Institute

Laurence Coleman

Editor



The decisions that politicians make, or refuse to make, change our nation. Whether such changes are good, bad, or ugly is a matter of political rhetoric and debate. Nevertheless, it is in the national interest that our politicians and their hinterland of policymakers have the best possible information about what the consequences of their action – or inaction – might be.



In 2019, it is not uncommon to read critiques about the impact to the common weal of rising populism and deliberate ignorance on the part of political decision makers. We regularly hear arguments that our politics has become personality driven and dumbed down; that it is too focused on the short term; that Australian public policymakers have lost the skill of identifying emerging challenges and addressing them before they cause irreparable harm. This speaks to a larger question: where *should* new ideas and thinking be coming from?

Whether or not these arguments ring true, this volume contains 11 essays from newly elected federal Senators and Members of Parliament which address long-term policy challenges facing our nation. We have sought through this project to create a space, slightly removed from the maelstrom of day-to-day parliamentary politics, for our newest politicians to think and write about our future public policy needs.

We asked a total of 24 new MPs and Senators to submit an essay, a short bio and a photograph. As well as those elected in the 2019 federal election, we also included some new parliamentarians who had been elected or appointed in by-elections or to fill casual Senate vacancies in 2018. We sought to include proportionate representation from the various political parties, reach gender equality, and have fair representation from each state and territory. In total we asked 12 Members and Senators from the Coalition, nine from the Australian Labor Party, one from the Greens Party and two independents. We had a fair amount of interest in the project from most of those invited to contribute, though many were unable to do so due to time constraints. In total this publication includes essays from six Labor Members and Senators, three from the Coalition, one Greens and one independent. Of these, six are women and five are men. There is at least one essayist from each state and territory aside from Tasmania and the Northern Territory.

We are currently at the commencement of the Commonwealth's 46th Parliament – our 50th Parliament will serve from 2031 to 2034 (assuming each parliament between now and then runs for its full three years). The essayists in this publication may, in 15 years' time, be cabinet ministers or party leaders. It is comforting to know that they are thinking seriously about our nation's future.

In some respects, that some new politicians are considering the long term should not surprise close followers of Australian politics. Nor should the general themes of many of our essayists' policy interventions: a former youth worker wrote about better ways to help jobseekers, former unionists wrote about matters of industrial relations, a former journalist wrote about public interest journalism and a former university academic wrote about free university tuition. Despite a rhetorical environment that is increasingly hostile to experts, these essayists have written boldly and with clarity on what they know from direct experience.

Some essayists wrote about the opportunities and challenges posed by technology – such as the gification of work, big data and blockchain. Others sought inspiration from overseas – with policy ideas being drawn variously and selectively from Scandinavia, Korea, Germany, the US, New Zealand and elsewhere.

Despite the international inspiration, not a single essay was submitted exploring Australian foreign policy or our nation's place within the Asian Century. While it would be understandable that serving politicians

avoid writing directly about the Sino-US trade war, the absence of any comment on the rise of India, Indonesia and the ASEAN economies combined is a lacuna. This should not create any illusion that there is no foreign policy interest amongst our current cohort – and at length, it can be reasonably assumed that our 50th Parliament may well include alumni from the New Colombo Plan.

Nor have any of the essays addressed market reforms, economic diversification, tax reform or Australia's future infrastructure needs. There was limited attention to the ageing population or the demographic challenge of a generation of baby boomers needing aged care, and only passing comment on our future health needs. These essays nevertheless reveal a nuance and sophistication of policy debate both between and within parties that are incompletely represented by our Fourth Estate.

The essayists in this publication, as emerging national leaders, are not mere recipients of an uncertain future. Rather, they will act upon and shape the future of our economy, democracy, and society. Whether their ideas crystallise into acts of parliament and ministerial decisions is largely a question for the authors, their colleagues, and those who read this publication. It is our hope that these ideas will be picked up, reiterated, refined and reframed over coming years, and that by 2034 they will be ripe and ready for active government consideration in the national interest.

The UWA Public Policy Institute will continue to engage with and advise our politicians and public policymakers to ensure they have the best possible evidence base with which to make the decisions that shape our nation.

Automating authority

Senator Marielle Smith

Senator for South Australia



The printing press automated the production of the written word. By doing so, it became an agent of change, allowing for the spread of ideas, language and learning previously denied to too many. The Industrial Revolution led to the invention of the steam-powered press, which dramatically amplified the dissemination of the written word. We are now amidst the ‘fourth industrial revolution’ – where new technologies are presenting both threats and opportunities to the Australian economy and the nature, security and stability of work.

One of the key challenges for policymakers will be to ensure this sweeping change is harnessed to create opportunities for Australians, to bring us forward into the future together and to share in the benefits that economic change can deliver. Among the new technologies upon our doorstep, blockchain is one of the most exciting, but the least understood. It is exciting because it offers unforeseen opportunities to empower our society to be fairer, more accountable, and more transparent.

If the printing press automated the production of information, then blockchain promises the automation of authority. Just as the printing press set off a chain reaction of literacy, political legibility and cultural energy, blockchain is once-in-a-generation in timing and extensive in potential. By vesting users themselves with the power to authorise and verify digital transactions, we have the chance to overcome inefficiencies, red tape and the murky commodification of our data by third parties.

Blockchain is a technology able to record and track transactions involving some kind of *value*: money, goods, property, identity and

even votes.¹ Think about it like a shared guestbook, with copies in every guesthouse in its network. Three particular characteristics make blockchain interesting from the perspective of policymakers: first, it arranges data in a way that is *irreversible*. Using the guestbook analogy: you can make a new entry below the previous ones, but you can't strike them out or change them. Second, it is *open to view* by anyone with access, but only a unique key allows you to make a new entry, and only one user can make a new entry at a time. Third, it *verifies itself* through its network, rather than relying on third parties. When someone makes a new entry in a guestbook, the other linked guestbooks will cross-reference with each other and decide if the line item is legitimate.

What is the point? The simple answer is blockchain builds the architecture for a secure yet visible transfer of something between users. Blockchain helps us mitigate against one of the most significant problems of digital life: the possibility for infinite proliferations of unverified digital copies. The three characteristics highlighted above are part of why blockchain can cut out the requirement for third-party verification. A gamut of possibilities opens up when users can trade things with one another knowing that authorisation processes are baked into the infrastructure. The best known is financial technology, specifically Bitcoin and other cryptocurrencies, but the possibilities extend into more everyday, conventional life.

For instance, blockchain has the potential to put complex public policy problems to the market. Think of it as taking the sharing economy to the next level. Neighbours with solar panels could automatically sell their unused electricity to each other.² In my state of South Australia, we know the issues of high electricity prices too well. Blockchain could enable residents to use an allocated budget of electricity however they wish, setting their own terms. What sets it apart from product-based trading platforms like Gumtree or eBay as they are designed today, is its central use of smart contracts.

Smart contracts automate transactions so that the process is only completed and delivery made when certain conditions are met. These conditions are set by the users themselves. To take the solar energy example, a neighbour may set a price limit on the electricity they want to purchase. When another neighbour is willing to offer their unused electricity at this rate, the smart contract is automatically activated: payment goes through, and the electricity is delivered

automatically. Underpinning these super-efficient transactions is the open and indestructible ledger system recording the flow of payments and deliveries, ensuring that nothing gets ‘lost’ in the digital ether.

But of course, like other emerging technologies, it is not without risk. In the example above, despite blockchain technology opening up a convenient marketplace, not all Australians will have the economic capacity to participate, nor the ability to navigate the safe and efficient use of such tech-driven marketplaces. We must avoid the perils of tech integration pulling our society towards an elitist, two-tiered system, where the tech-endowed are split from the tech-less. If government takes steps to incorporate new technologies into daily life, the metric for success should be that it works for all Australians, not just a select few.

And while blockchain can facilitate human progression, it can also enable humanity’s darker side. Leveraged well, blockchain is open, verifiable and radically transparent. Used nefariously, it can enable criminal behaviour to be shrouded in secrecy and go underground. As policymakers and legislators, we also need to be sharply attuned to the unprecedented challenges blockchain and other associated technologies will bring.

We are in the very early days of blockchain technologies and its associated philosophies – only 0.5 per cent of the world’s population are using it.³ This is a similar proportion to the number of users worldwide on the internet in 1995. We are a fair way off incorporating blockchain into public services, but the hard work of technologists and entrepreneurs is speeding up the advent of a gradual rollout.

The printing press did not actually produce anything new – it simply automated the process of publishing, making the process much cheaper, and the products much more accessible. Blockchain technology promises similar transformational effects for our digital generation. In the days of the printing press, the most valuable commodity was the written word. In our generation, it is digital data, and blockchain provides effective ways for users to take back their control of it, for their own benefit. It is now up to policymakers to determine how we harness blockchain for the good of the Australian population, to ensure this and other new technologies work like the printing press to unlock opportunity, not divide it.

Marielle Smith represents South Australia in the Senate for the Australian Labor Party. She is a professional public policy adviser by background, with diverse experience as an international policy adviser for the Department of the Prime Minister and Cabinet, as an adviser on early childhood education and care to former Minister Kate Ellis MP and as a senior adviser to former Prime Minister Julia Gillard, Chair of the Global Partnership for Education and Beyond Blue. Marielle has a proven record in senior leadership through private and public sector board positions and as a manager within her family business. She has also volunteered her time to work with children who had been the victims of forced labour in West Africa. Marielle holds a Master of Science with Distinction in Public Policy and Administration from the London School of Economics and a first class honours degree from the Australian National University. Marielle lives in Adelaide with her husband and young son.

Universal free TAFE and university

Senator Dr Mehreen Faruqi

Senator for New South Wales



There is an inherent hypocrisy to Australian higher education policymaking. Dozens of politicians, including cabinet ministers from both major parties, attended university when it was free in the 1970s, but they have not deigned to return the favour to future generations.

Students graduating from TAFE and university now leave their education with crushing debts. The average female teaching graduate, for example, will take 13 years to pay off a \$20,000 debt. A male early childhood educator takes two whole decades to become debt free.

Burdening young people with debt simply for accessing the basic right of education is as unfair as it is unsustainable, especially when they are just starting off in life. The cost of living is increasing and work is increasingly insecure, yet the very people who benefited from free education are now denying it to current and future generations of students.

Guaranteeing free TAFE and university to all Australians throughout their lives is the key policy we need in order to build a just society and prepare for futures and challenges we have not even imagined yet, let alone the ones we already face. In a world facing the twin challenges of climate crisis and inequality we need new research, new ways of doing things and a practical remaking of our world if we are to survive and thrive. We all stand to benefit from an education system that gives everyone lifelong access to learning and retraining to do the complex and creative work of not just adapting to change but, more importantly, shaping that change.

We know the way we work and the jobs we do are rapidly changing. Thinking of this uncertain future can be as terrifying as it is thrilling. We enrich our individual lives and our communities as we tackle the climate emergency by transforming from a fossil-fuel based economy to renewables and investing in caring and creative jobs in schools, hospitals, aged care and the arts. To make sure no one is left behind in this enormous remaking project, we must all have the opportunity to retrain or change careers at any stage of life without the burden of massive debts.

Free TAFE and uni is the policy to do that, delivering a long overdue reset of adult education at the same time – one that places ongoing access to learning throughout one’s life at the centre of how we conceive of education.

Jobs are important, but it is vital that we shift the emphasis of education policy pronouncements away from productivity and career progression towards the value of education itself: how it enriches individuals and its immense social benefits. Education should be about more than training people to find a job lucrative enough to not have to worry about their restrictive study debt. This should be reflected in education institutions that treat students as learners rather than customers, and the pursuit of work as life-making and shaping, rather than just a means to earn a wage.

We already have universally free primary and secondary education. Extending this to TAFE and university is the next step for Australia. Not only will this policy allow people to learn, upskill and requalify, it will give the average graduating student an extra \$20,000 in their pocket for living expenses, food and rent in the decade after they graduate. That is more than \$5,000 in the first four years circulating through the wider economy.

But surely this must be too expensive, you ask? It is actually easily affordable if we have our priorities right, even without accounting for the long-term benefits it will bring in an uncertain, constantly changing world. We can start by ending enormous fossil fuel subsidies that help big mining companies minimise their tax and making offshore gas companies pay a flat 10 per cent royalty rate for extracting gas. With that alone, we would have more than enough to fund free TAFE and university education. In fact, it would also be enough to cover an increase to university funding, measures to improve job security for

staff and a \$75 per week increase to Youth Allowance and other income support for students.

This is not a revolutionary or untested idea. Germany, Norway and Finland are among the countries that already have free (or largely free) higher education, and New Zealand has begun the process of joining them.

It is, however, a big idea and one whose time has come here in Australia. A socially just, economically innovative and environmentally sustainable Australia requires a free education system, from early childhood through to higher education at TAFE and uni. It is time to make that happen.

Dr Mehreen Faruqi is the Greens' Senator for NSW and spokesperson for education, housing, industry and international development. She is a civil and environmental engineer, National Tertiary Education Union member and lifelong activist for social and environmental justice. Mehreen has worked in leadership positions for local government, consulting firms and as an academic in Australia and internationally, including as Director of the Institute of Environmental Studies and as an Associate Professor in Business and Sustainability at UNSW.

Data should drive next generation of jobseekers into work

Senator Matt O'Sullivan

Senator for Western Australia



Australia's current employment services program was designed at a time when Google was in its infancy, when jobseekers could not just set up alerts on *SEEK*, but instead had to peruse the local paper and cold-call local businesses.

Our employment services system objectively leads the world, but there is much room for improvement to ensure that jobseekers and employers are able to achieve better outcomes and ensure taxpayers are getting maximum value from their investment.

At a cost of over \$7 billion, the Australian Government's employment services program – delivered via Jobactive – is the second largest procurer of services to government outside of Defence. But not many people know that, because whilst we see images of submarines, frigates, and fighter jets splashed all over the media, not enough people are talking about how we get more Australians off welfare and into work.

But we should be, and the time is now.

Prior to entering the Australian Parliament, I was the Chief Operating Officer of GenerationOne, an initiative founded by Andrew and Nicola Forrest to create employment for Indigenous Australians. The target was 50,000 new and sustainable jobs across the country.

Our program worked by turning the training and employment services system on its head.

Typically, an unemployed person would go to Centrelink to register for Newstart. Centrelink would send them off to an employment service provider – administered under Jobactive. The service provider would

enrol them in a course and then hope for the best that they would get a job.

This is still how the system operates today, and more often than not, the training they do is just training for training's sake and often is not linked to a job.

A high administration and compliance burden of the program is placed on jobseekers – who must apply for 20 jobs per month, whether or not those jobs match their skill set, and jump through hoops which often provide negligible value in finding and securing meaningful work.

And all of this happens whilst the taxpayer foots the bill, and Centrelink is satisfied the right boxes are being ticked.

Under GenerationOne, we started with an employer who had a job, designed the training around their requirements and guaranteed the individual a job before they commenced training. It was made clear at the start of the program that expectations would be high and participants had to be fully competent across all units before they could graduate. Ultimately, the success of the model, which helped tens of thousands of long-term unemployed get into work, was a direct result of the tailoring of the program to the needs of both the jobseeker and the employer.

Under the current system, the average Jobactive consultant has a caseload of 148 jobseekers. This volume does not allow them to provide the level of personalisation required to get people into work and keep them there. It also does little to inspire and empower the consultants themselves – the higher than average staff turnover in the employment services industry not only demonstrates this is the case but also makes it increasingly difficult to improve the specialisation of the industry as a whole.

So how do we create a capability that delivers tailored support in partnership with employees and employers, and scale it for a national rollout?

To me, the answer is to better use data to place downward pressure on jobseeker-to-consultant ratios, and enable greater collaboration between government, employers, providers and, most importantly, jobseekers.

Last year I was part of a team that delivered the *I Want to Work* report to the Commonwealth Government.⁴ The purpose of the review was to examine what Australia's future employment services system should look like. To find out, we consulted with over 1,400 jobseekers, employers and service providers.

We heard the stories of systematic churn, and calls from employers to improve the job-readiness of those who had come through the system.

If there was a single thread that ran through each consultation, meeting, and submission, it was that personalisation is the key to any future platform. Data, machine learning, integrated analytics and greater collaboration are the tools we need to drive and deliver change.

A future system should use data points and machine learning, adjacently to existing providers, to deliver a tailored pathway to employment. It could use analytics to provide insight into local industries to not only give a list of current opportunities and trends, but those likely to arise. It could examine which qualifications have proven the most effective in gaining employment in a particular field. It could also analyse the barriers each jobseeker has to finding employment, along with those who have come before them, ensuring they are connected to the services and support they need.

Above all, the system would ensure that each action an individual is taking under the program is leading them down the pathway to meaningful and long-term employment – using data to inform what works and what does not.

Presently, 64.9 per cent of jobseekers have been in the system for 12 months and 19.6 per cent in excess of five years. Business engagement with the system has also dropped sharply from 18 per cent in 2007 to around four per cent in 2018.

The success of a new model should be measured by a decrease in the length of each interaction, an increase in the number of people who would be able to self-serve with a new user-friendly digital platform, and an increase in the engagement of employers.

We know that 90 per cent of jobseekers use the internet to find work – along with a not insignificant number of people who can find work independently of the system. They have an idea of what they want to do and how they should get there. These individuals should have the digital tools they need to self-serve, thereby placing further downward pressure on consultant ratios.

So often, the best success of the current program lies in those finding a job in spite of, not because of, the support they receive from Jobactive services. The system was created in an analogue era – it is time we updated it by using data to drive better employment outcomes.

The Morrison Government has taken the critical first steps to implement structural reform by trialing a new digital system for jobseekers in two locations across Australia. The outcomes from this trial will help inform the creation of the new model poised for a national rollout.

Jobactive interacts with over 650,000 Australians at any one point in time. We cannot underestimate the significance of this program. We know what we need to do – and it is time to get to work.

Matt O'Sullivan was sworn in as a Liberal Senator for Western Australia on July 2, 2019. He began his working life as a tradesman, before pursuing a career change as a youth worker. He spent eight years working extensively with at-risk children and their families before heading up GenerationOne, an initiative which saw tens of thousands of Indigenous Australians gain long-term employment.

Matt has been instrumental in leading reform across employment and social policy areas in Australia. He is passionate about economic development and opportunity, employment services reform and early childhood education and is using his life experience to deliver the measurable social and economic outcomes that Western Australians deserve.

For we are young and free: How free childcare will keep Australia's economy on top

Patrick Gorman MP

Member for Perth



Australia needs an education system that starts at birth.

Our schooling system starts far too late. But, like many parents, I find the idea of my son starting 'school' earlier is terrifying. Free childcare for all children is the answer.

My son Leo has just turned two years old. He knows when I have forgotten my keys, understands how FaceTime works on the iPhone and can count to 10. He also has rhythm that would make Ringo Starr jealous.

By the time Leo has enrolled in primary school, some 90 per cent of his brain development will be complete.

Many parents (like me) already use long day care where education curriculums help social and brain development. But access to this is determined by income and is closed off for many parents who do not work.

Providing a free, universally accessible childcare for all children would be a significant shift. Placing the child's needs at the centre of policy development would also help us avoid the never-ending increases in out-of-pocket fees, which have gone up some 28 per cent in just the past five years despite record government investment.

According to recent statistics from the University of Melbourne, on average, childcare costs amount to 27 per cent of household income for Australian families. Australian childcare costs for families are among the highest across OECD countries.

Australia's government spend on childcare is below the OECD average. Our chronic underspend has contributed to low rates of childcare enrolment: only 40 per cent of Australian children under the age of six are enrolled in formal childcare.

Despite the clear link between developmental outcomes and early childhood education, the problem persists. Moreover, consequences extend beyond developmental outcomes. For the many Australian families where full-time childcare is not accessible due to cost, parents feel forced to work part-time. Accordingly, Australia's part-time employment rate is the fourth-highest in the OECD.

There is a strong correlation between labour market participation for mothers and the enrolment of children in childcare. In countries such as Portugal and Slovenia, where children are in childcare for an average of more than 35 hours per week, the part-time employment rate for women is below 10 per cent.

Making our childcare system more like our primary school system is a huge reform that will put Australia on top both economically and in terms of our productivity.

A universally accessible system will also form part of the new social wage necessary to handle the huge economic disruption of the fourth industrial revolution.

To be competitive in the knowledge economy, we need to provide an education system that truly delivers lifelong learning.

The world is seeing the decline in manufacturing jobs and the greater automation of many physical labour roles. CEDA research says this could be some 40 per cent of current Australian jobs or some five million jobs. That is 5,000,000 people across Australia – or the entire population of Western Australia, twice over! Such a reform will also keep Australia internationally competitive. Knowledge economies are heading in this direction. Sweden's 'Educare' model is practically free, Korea has a free option for parents and Berlin is the first German city phasing out early childhood education fees.

But, like so many social reforms, Australia was first. Prime Minister John Curtin was the first to deliver federal funding for crèche services for children. This assisted hundreds of thousands of women to join the war effort by entering the workforce. In a very real sense, free childcare services helped save our nation.

Investing in what we now know as early childhood education and care is one of the great economic levellers. New research from the Telethon Kids Institute shows that children in socioeconomically disadvantaged areas are more than four times more likely to be developmentally vulnerable than children from the least disadvantaged areas.

In Western Australia, more than one in five children has been identified as developmentally vulnerable. Further research shows that children from these disadvantaged groups stand to gain the most benefit the most from a high-quality early childhood education.

This is not something we can do quickly. Whenever I raise this need, the traditional small-picture arguments come back – it costs too much, it is hard to deliver on scale, and inevitably, arguments return to the need to invest in the traditional education sectors of schooling and tertiary education.

So we need to start with baby steps towards this long-term goal. Right now that means providing permanent funding for free preschool for three- and four-year-olds. It means expanding the Government's 'Unique Student Identifier' to childcare so we can truly acknowledge lifelong learning, and it means continuing to find ways to professionalise the pay and training of early childhood educators.

Until we have a true national vision, we will continue to see fragmentation on how states approach early childhood. Victoria has gone it alone in a \$1 billion plan for free preschool for three-year-olds. In Western Australia, free preschool is mostly delivered through state schools and not through childcare centres.

This requires a radical change in the services that the market has developed for early childhood education and care.

The Telethon Kids Institute has rung the alarm on how the architecture of a child's brain is weakened when exposed to poverty or neglect without access to positive relationships. One of the simplest ways to act upon this is to ensure vulnerable children have access to qualified early childhood professionals.

The Keating Government was the first Australian government to fund childcare infrastructure, and later the Howard and Rudd governments expanded the childcare subsidy scheme.

These initiatives have gone a long way. However, we are now at a point where either our early childhood system becomes a for-profit

service for working parents, or alternatively it becomes more like our schooling system – free and accessible for all.

I know that the strongest investment the federal Parliament can make is in our next generation and education for zero- to four-year-olds. It will deliver on our national mission for gender equality and economic growth. And it is one of my missions as the Labor Member for Perth.

How exactly will it work? That is what we need to work on, together, over the next 10 years. If we want the best minds working on the challenges we as a country will face in the future, from national security, to aged care and climate change, we need to start investing in those minds now.

Patrick Gorman was elected the Federal Member for Perth in 2018. Prior to Parliament, Patrick led the 2017 State Election campaign which elected Mark McGowan as Labor Premier of Western Australia.

Patrick has a Master of Business Administration from The University of Western Australia and lives in North Perth with his wife Jess and their two-year-old son, Leo.

Towards a father-inclusive model of pregnancy care

Dr Helen Haines MP

Member for Indi



The health of Australian men often lags behind that of women. This is a problem – and not just for men. When a man becomes a father, his physical and emotional health directly impacts on his children’s health, especially in the early years. Yet despite an established system of prenatal care for expectant women, fathers are not included in any systematic health surveillance during the prenatal or early parenting period. This is a missed opportunity for men and their families.

Fathers who are healthy – physically and mentally – are far more likely to have healthy kids and respectful relationships. The evidence of this is now very clear.^{5,6} The Longitudinal Study of Australian Children, for example, demonstrated that if fathers are a healthy weight, kids are far more likely to be of healthy weight too, regardless of the mother’s weight.⁷ Similarly, kids are far more likely to display behavioural and emotional difficulties if their fathers have psychiatric disorders.⁸ The pregnancy period is a time when there is a heightened readiness to change entrenched lifestyle behaviours such as diet, exercise, alcohol use and smoking.

It is also clear that pregnancy is a major stressor on the mental health of expectant fathers. It is well known that around 14-16 per cent of new mothers will experience postnatal depression; it is less well known that between five and 10 per cent of fathers will too.⁹ Research shows the pregnancy period can be more stressful for men than the period after a child is born.¹⁰ Much like women, the impending birth of a child forces a man to adjust to a change in his perception of himself, the perceptions

of others and the real or perceived pressures of supporting a new family.¹¹ This unaddressed mental health strain on men affects their partners, too. Disturbingly, pregnancy is the most likely period for a woman to experience domestic violence for the first time, and for it to escalate for women who have already experienced violence.

Yet we do very little as a society to support men's health during their partners' pregnancies. Men are far less likely than women to access healthcare in general, and even if they do, they are more likely than women to focus on physical problems and less likely to disclose mental and emotional distress. The pregnancy period, with its many health check-ups and pre-birth classes, rightly focuses on women; however, it presents an excellent opportunity to engage men about their own health, as well as that of their expectant partners. But we are missing this opportunity.

In my former life as a rural health researcher, I conducted a large population study in Sweden and found that men with feelings of fear about the forthcoming birth of their children had barely engaged with prenatal services; and when they did, they received scant recognition from the health system.¹² When I replicated this research in regional Victoria, I found the same thing. Most men were never asked about their health when attending antenatal health check-ups with their partner, nor did they consider reporting their psychological concerns to their usual GP.¹³ These men were exposed vicariously to healthcare professionals on several occasions but the opportunity to engage them was missed.

This is largely because the pregnancy period in Australia is still seen as 'just' women's business. These days, we talk about fatherhood as if it were a 'partnership', a sort of joint experience with the mother during pregnancy, birth and parenting.¹⁴ But this is not the experience of most people. Instead, when men encounter the healthcare system during pregnancy, they overwhelmingly report feeling peripheral at best and marginalised or excluded at worst.¹⁵

And this is despite data showing men generally want to be more involved during the pregnancy process.¹⁶ The sidelining of men during pregnancy not only misses a chance at early mental intervention, but exacerbates the gendered nature of parenthood once kids arrive. Everybody loses.

The most recent Clinical Practice Guidelines for Pregnancy Care suggest “assessment and intervention for fathers/partners may also be a consideration”.¹⁷ To date there is no evidence of this systematically happening anywhere in Australia. That needs to change.

A father-inclusive model of ante-natal care would involve two key planks. First should be the introduction of Medicare-listed mental health check-ups for expectant fathers. This could be done this year. In fact, just last December the UK introduced a similar model. Second, and more ambitiously, we need a wholesale review of the way pregnancy care is delivered in Australia to ensure that we are engaging men, at this critical time, as equal partners in the parenting experience. This is a longer-term goal but one that we should commence now.

Improving men’s mental health – and therefore the health of their relationships and the prospects of their children – will not be solved with a single intervention. The mental health system is woefully under-resourced as is, and allocating resources to early mental health interventions is a broader goal. This is particularly the case for rural and regional Australia, where access to mental health services is poorer than in the cities. Mental ill-health, gender-based violence, gendered parenting expectations – these are complex problems with complex causes. Likewise physical behaviour change takes sustained effort. But where problems start, so too should we. Let us add value to routine pregnancy care and systematically engage with the health of fathers.

Helen Haines is the Independent Federal Member for Indi. She was elected in May 2019 – the first Independent to succeed another in the same electorate in Commonwealth Parliamentary history. In her earlier professional career she was a nurse, midwife, health administrator and rural health researcher in Victoria’s North East for more than 32 years. She has a PhD in Medical Science from Uppsala University in Sweden and completed a postdoctoral fellowship at Stockholm’s Karolinska Institute.

The information challenge and the need for public interest journalism

Kate Thwaites MP

Member for Jagajaga



I have always been interested in how we get the information that helps us to understand and shape our society, hold our governments and institutions to account, and keep our democracy strong. That is why I started my working life as a journalist at the ABC, part of a news organisation telling stories from across our country. Now, as a newly elected Member of Parliament, I am trying to understand how information is spread so that I can reach my

electorate and the broader community.

Of course, the media landscape has fundamentally been reshaped in the just over a decade since I left journalism. Back then, digital disruption had started, but only just. The ABC's online news site was still in its early days and there was not yet a 24-hour TV news channel, leaving most journalists to concentrate on filing for the flagship 7pm TV news program. My colleagues in newspapers were still largely focused on their deadlines for print the next day. Now, everyone has access to endless media in the supercomputer in our hands and journalists are under pressure to file constantly for online platforms. As news consumers, we are now the curators of our own news and we rely less on traditional news sources. The ACCC's recent *Digital Platforms Inquiry* tracks the rise of digital platforms, particularly Google and Facebook, and the concurrent decline of traditional print media. It reports that classified advertising revenue declined from \$2 billion in 2001 to \$200 million in 2016. The number of journalists employed in print and online businesses fell by 20 per cent from 2014 to 2017.¹⁸

This has consequences for our democracy. When we curate our own news, it is easier for us to exist in our own bubble, reading the stories that social media algorithms collect to fit our own world view, without ever really needing to encounter or accommodate the views of others. This makes it harder to achieve the type of meaningful debate and consensus needed for long-term policy reform on the big issues of our time. When so much information is available, it becomes more difficult to know which information to trust, with the perverse consequence that while we trust nothing official, we are more open to disinformation campaigns run by those with agendas designed to shape what we think matters and how we vote. When we have fewer journalists employed in news organisations, there is less investment in the kind of reporting that takes time and resources, holding government, corporations and people in power to account. This is why one of the key long-term policy challenges we face over the next 15 years will be about who provides information and how they provide that information. One of the responses we have to consider to this challenge will be government investment in public interest journalism.

What do I mean when I talk about public interest journalism? When I was studying journalism, my lecturers taught us a version of the quote often ascribed to American newspaper baron William Randolph Hearst, that ‘news is something someone somewhere doesn’t want you to know.’ There is a difference between news that is in the interest of the public – reporting that explains what is going on in our parliaments, our courts and our businesses – and news that is interesting to the public. While there is certainly a place for the latter, it is the former that governments need to be concerned about, and much more involved in supporting.

This will require a shift from how we currently consider funding journalism, as something that is largely the domain of private businesses, run by the market and dependent on advertising revenue attracted. It will require solutions that allow for government support but not government control of the news. The ACCC inquiry and subsequent submissions provide suggestions for directions to consider, including tax incentives for funding public interest journalism, direct funding for regional journalism, and direct support for journalism that is considered to be in the public interest. It will also require robust and secure funding for the ABC, that allows it as our national broadcaster to continue to provide information across our country and internationally.

Australia is not alone in facing this challenge. It is one that many Western democracies are confronting. In the United States, they are grappling with the impacts of a coordinated Russian disinformation campaign on their last Presidential election. The US Senate is considering legislation that would provide grants to help educate young people in digital and media literacy and critically examine the sources of their information.¹⁹ And news organisations are taking their own action as well. The Trust Project is a consortium of top news companies that have committed to providing standardised disclosures about the news outlet, the journalist and the work behind a story to make it easier for the public to identify trustworthy news.²⁰

In many ways, while the information challenge is a long-term public policy issue, the challenge of supporting public interest journalism is one that will need to be addressed sooner rather than later. Digital disruption is having an impact on our news sources now, and the consequences are already being felt in our democracy. I want to be sure our future is one where we live in a community with access to information we can trust, where governments are held to account, and where we can have debates outside of our bubbles.

Kate was elected as the Federal Member for Jagajaga at the 2019 Federal Election.

Kate is a former ABC TV and Radio News Reporter and has held senior roles at Oxfam and in the Victorian Public Service. She has a BA in Journalism and a Master of International Development.

She worked for Jenny Macklin to help deliver important Labor reforms, including the National Disability Insurance Scheme and paid parental leave. Kate ran for Parliament because she believes we need new energy to tackle the big challenges facing us.

Energy policy post-2030

Senator David Van

Senator for Victoria



In December 2015 the countries of the world met in Paris, France and agreed to fix emissions reduction targets in a coordinated global effort to ward off catastrophic climate change. The Paris agreement was hailed as a major breakthrough, with signatory countries signing off on what they each felt they could legitimately do. This was a rare act of global agreement done in a spirit of cooperation.

Signatories still have over 10 years to go to reach their self-defined targets and some countries, such as Australia, will meet their targets early while others may or may not meet theirs. Those that meet them early may elect to reset their targets or may just continue the policy settings adopted such that reductions will continue to accrue.

Obviously the expectation is that signatory countries will meet their targets, though there is no guarantee they all will. If all, or most, meet their targets as agreed, we should keep warming to below two degrees. However, the efforts cannot and should not stop there. Yet there is currently no international framework to address what happens post-2030. There is a need to consider new policy settings that address continued emissions reduction and carbon abatement beyond 2030.

The challenge for policymakers is that the technologies that will be required to drive further reductions, in the most part, do not exist yet or at best are nascent. Therefore, the key policy that needs to be set is one that drives and rewards innovation. There are many sources of greenhouse gases, such as energy, transport, steel and agriculture. To reach the levels of emissions that some are preaching for is all

but impossible unless technologies are developed that allow us to do the impossible.

The key difficulty in continuing to cut emissions post-2030 is that by then all of the 'easy' gains will have been taken. Energy generation, one of the largest contributors to emissions, will have reached low or no emissions on current trajectories. There may still be some legacy coal-fired generation that should only come off line at the end of its productive life, but for the most part a glut of low-cost renewable power will have made coal generation economically unviable. However, this is will only happen if other means of providing firm power are found.

That is policy challenge number one: getting an energy mix that is at once reliable, cheap and with no or low emissions.

Pumped hydro is the ideal use of excess, cheap intermittent power to provide replacement 'firmness' but there are probably not sufficient geographically suitable sites to build enough hydro to service all jurisdictions. Batteries may provide some of the solution, but the cost and efficiency must improve and end-of-life issues must be addressed.

Concentrated solar thermal (CST) generation with molten salt storage has long been discussed as a potential replacement for baseload power. While there are a number of projects happening in other markets, this technology has not had a successful start in Australia yet.

In the timeframe we are talking about, reductions in transport emissions may seem a walk in the park with the growing acceptance of electric vehicles (EVs). However, the technology suitable to power EVs is not suitable to power trucks, railway, ships and aircraft which all contribute significantly to emissions.

Hydrogen is often spoken about as a solution here, and may well be, but current projections are that the year will be at least 2030 before we are likely to see any commercially viable, hydrogen-fuelled transport. The key logistical challenge will be fuel distribution, which could possibly mean that while the technology to use for hydrogen is available by 2030, the infrastructure to enable it could take a further 10 years.

Furthermore, the ability to export bulk hydrogen fuel will likely be a simpler use of the fuel. Similarly, bulk production may also enable energy production, especially for distributed micro power generators operating in tandem with wind or solar, much in the same way we should be using natural gas presently. It is foreseeable that the prioritisation

of innovation in potentially more profitable uses of hydrogen, such as these, may further delay its use in transport.

Metal production, especially iron- and steel-making, contributes to about 10 per cent of global greenhouse gas emissions. There are huge energy requirements for heat as well as the need for coke as a reducing agent. Obviously, the energy contribution to emissions may be able to be reduced using technologies discussed above, but it will still require coking coal to be mined although this contributes little to CO₂ emissions.

Agriculture, particularly meat production, contributes to greenhouse gas emissions, as do humans and all other animals. The great challenge that is often posed is: how do you stop cows from belching?

While as a concept this is not feasible, there are technologies being developed that may use feed additives from seaweed, which won't stop belching ruminants but have the potential to reduce greenhouse emissions in said burps.

In summary, policymakers need to continue the good work done so far in reaching our 2030 targets. They will also they need to foster innovation that will create the technologies to tackle the over-the-radar period of emissions.

David Van is a Liberal Senator for Victoria. He is a former small business owner, where he provided advice to clients about Royal Commissions and other government inquiries. While starting in Australia, his experience and approach to solving these challenges have led him to working around the world. David lives in St Kilda with his wife Nerilee.

Equity, efficiency, voice – Australian industrial relations in a changing world

Senator Tim Ayres
Senator for New South Wales



In 1986, at the height of the Accord era, the venerable union leader Laurie Carmichael visited Sweden as part of an ACTU delegation to study that country's unique system of industrial relations. The report he produced from this trip, *Australia Reconstructed*, represents one of the most ambitious and enduring Australian union documents of the 20th century.

While *Australia Reconstructed* was primarily concerned with industrial relations, it was a comprehensive policy manifesto that considered trade and industry policy, Australia's place in a changing global order, and how Nordic policies could be reconciled with Australian values.

Three decades later, Australia's industrial relations system is in a state of torpor. Decades of anti-union legislation has diminished all of its participants. Conservatives have been captured by a base, zero-sum politics driven by US-style anti-unionism. Meanwhile, the labour movement has been consumed by the consequent struggle for survival.

This conflict prevents Australia's industrial relations from achieving the substantive function of a modern industrial relations system: to engage all of the participants in the labour market – unions, employer groups, superannuation funds and government – in the big public policy challenges we face.

There have been two historical forces that have enabled this torpor. Firstly, three decades of growth in national income, substantially driven

by the industrial rise of China; and secondly, an essentially benign geo-security setting, assured by the unrivalled primacy of our security guarantor in the region. This has discouraged self-reliance and allowed national and institutional complacency. Our growth has been matched by a decline in our industrial capability and sophistication, and a shift down the value chain for Australian exports.

We are, again, the nation of Donald Horne's aphorism:

Australia is a lucky country run mainly by second rate people who share its luck. It lives on other people's ideas, and, although its ordinary people are adaptable, most of its leaders (in all fields) so lack curiosity about the events that surround them that they are often taken by surprise.

And there is stark evidence to suggest that our luck is running out.

Despite decades of aggregate economic growth, our prosperity has been distributed unequally across classes and regions. The GDP figures flatteringly describe, in aggregate, an economy that is uneven, and they paper over the experiences of communities that have been left behind. But now, a decade after Australia pushed its way through the Global Financial Crisis, economic growth is flatlining, wages are stagnant and household incomes and living standards are retreating. Notwithstanding its limitations, this period of geostrategic stability and unending national growth is plainly at an end.

This complacency has infected other areas of economic and domestic policy, including stagnation in industrial relations. The last significant advance in Australian industrial relations was the introduction of enterprise bargaining by the Keating Government in 1993. Shifts in regulation since then have either been ideological assaults on unions and the institutions that set minimum standards, such as *WorkChoices*, or slight reversals like the legalistic approach of the *Fair Work Act*.

Complacency in industrial relations has been damaging on several fronts. Firstly, it has led to a decline in living standards for Australian workers; the restrictions on their rights and conditions have suppressed their wages and driven a shift in national incomes from wages to profits. Secondly, it has stifled efforts to lift productivity. Thirdly, the assault on unions and union membership has hollowed out key Australian democratic institutions. In Australia, democracy and democratic action now stops at the office door and factory gate – a democratic deficit

that has driven the hollowing out of vital democratic institutions and traditions formerly facilitated by union organisation.

A continuation of this complacency is even more ill-suited to the challenging times ahead. While column inches will be written about the impact on our foreign policy, the shift in our operating environment demands a radical shift in our approach to work, institutional cooperation and the regulation of work. That requires bold government action and a level of institutional cooperation and coordination not seen in Australia since the Accord period.

There is certainly no shortage of issues that an effective industrial relations system needs to tackle: productivity, competitiveness, the future of work, gender equity and the participation of women across the economy, improving workplace culture, innovation, and the impact of rapid technological change.

A precondition for a shift to a more cooperative framework is making industrial relations fair for workers and their unions again by levelling the playing field: removing impediments to collective bargaining, lifting minimum standards, and abolishing unfair and oppressive proscriptions on collective action and bargaining.

But Labor's approach should go much further, putting workplace relations and the regulation of work back at the centre of economic and social policy by engaging the labour market institutions at a national and sectoral level. Only by returning to the elemental purpose of work in public policy terms is a shift from shallow conflict to substantial reform possible.

American industrial relations scholar Professor John Budd suggests the public policy value of work is in the extent to which work achieves three objectives: 'equity, efficiency and voice'. In the Australian context, this approach should be useful in forcing policymakers to focus upon the purpose of work and the regulation of work, particularly if it is reframed slightly to adapt to modern Australian workplaces.

'Equity' contains the distributional struggles around remuneration and profit, gender equality, workplace conditions, job security, and the flexibility that supports good jobs and family friendly work.

'Efficiency' engages with competitiveness, productivity, and the flexibility that promotes agility, responsiveness and adaptability that allows firms and employers to operate effectively in their market conditions.

‘Voice’ sets out the democratic facets of work – the role of institutions in workplaces and the labour market, the capacity of workers to have a real say, to engage in democratic deliberation and democracy at work. This core aspect of work has been neglected by policymakers.

The objective of a future Labor Government should be to reconcile effectively these three competing and overlapping objectives in the national interest by engaging our labour market institutions in a direct and democratic process to deal with national challenges, shape national growth and build better work. That would represent a rejection of 26 years of narrow neoliberalism in industrial relations and a return to the values of consensus, cooperation and national purpose that underpinned the Accord period, albeit without centralised wage-fixing.

Much like Laurie Carmichael three decades ago, we should look to our Nordic counterparts for inspiration. Also situated in one region of great power contest, at the fringes of NATO, the EU and an aggressive Russia, the Viking economies put workplace and institutional cooperation, and sector-level collective bargaining, at the heart of their economic strategy. This is part of a deliberately constructed social and economic model that binds imperatives for good work, high standards of living, global competitiveness and democratic norms.

Taken together in population terms, the Nordic countries are roughly equivalent to Australia. But over the same period that Australia has gone backwards in industrial diversity, the Nordics have advanced. Every Australian can swiftly conjure the name of giant Scandinavian firms with global reach, high tech exports and a substantial domestic employment footprint – Ericsson, Nokia, Volvo, Sandvik, Electrolux, Kone and Ikea – but would struggle to name Australian counterparts.

Rising living standards, social cohesion, competition and capability, built in large part upon industrial cooperation and active government: Australia can have this if it wants. But only by shifting to a public policy focus on work, engaging an active government with social and economic institutions to make work better, and rediscovering a sense of urgency and common cause in the national interest about the future of work and good jobs for Australians.

Tim Ayres grew up in country NSW. He spent 23 years representing working people as an official of the Australian Manufacturing Workers’

Union. In 2010 he was elected as the Secretary of the NSW Branch of the AMWU.

In 2019, he was elected as a Labor Senator for New South Wales.

Tim is married, with two teenage children, and lives in Sydney.

Public early childhood education

Alicia Payne MP

Member for Canberra



The Australian Government will spend \$8.6 billion on childcare this year.^{21 22} It is a good thing for government to invest in, as there is strong evidence to support the benefits of early childhood education and care (ECEC), including improvements to children's education and social outcomes, gender equality and the economy. However, to maximise these benefits, and therefore the efficacy of this investment, ECEC needs to be more affordable, flexible and equitable. To deliver on this we need to rethink the structure of this system.

In spite of the Federal Government's sizeable investment in ECEC, it remains expensive and difficult to access for many families.²³ This means the benefits of ECEC are not being maximised for Australian children or the Australian economy. Early childhood educators and workers are poorly paid, while at the same time the industry is not particularly profitable for providers.^{24 25} Ultimately the system is failing.

I believe publicly available ECEC delivered within our public school system would unlock better outcomes for children, parents, early childhood educators, and the Australian economy, while delivering better value for federal government investment. The scheme should be universally available but not compulsory.

The benefits of an early childhood education are well known, particularly for disadvantaged children. James Heckman, a Nobel Laureate in Economics, found that investment in early childhood education for disadvantaged children improves their economic and health outcomes. It also delivers a seven to 10 per cent return on government investment every year for the rest of that person's

life.²⁶ In Australia, PWC has estimated that investing in childcare for disadvantaged children could boost the Australian economy by \$10.3 billion per year.²⁷ One of the fundamental drivers of equality in Australia is our public schooling system. This could be extended to ECEC, where dollar for dollar the lifelong benefits are even more pronounced.

It is clear that the promised efficiencies and consumer satisfaction of a privatised system have not been achieved in the Australian ECEC industry. All parents with children in childcare know how difficult it is to find a place for their child. The cost of childcare has increased by 30 per cent on average since 2013, despite increasing government expenditure on subsidies.²⁸

A key concern of a proposal to create a public ECEC system is the impact on private business. However, the Productivity Commission researched the profitability of the ECEC sector and found that “profitability of the ECEC sector is variable, across both providers and from year-to-year... it is mostly a low margin activity with relatively stable long-term returns, underpinned by substantial government subsidisation of user fees.”²⁹ The industry is low-profit and largely reliant on government subsidies. To allow choice and ensure a smooth transition from the current scheme, the government Child Care Subsidy could continue to be available to families opting to use privately provided ECEC.

Publicly available childcare, with improved accessibility, would enable parents to have a broader and more flexible discussion about balancing work and caring for young children. Currently the costs of childcare factor heavily into the decisions that the sole parent or secondary (lower) earner makes about whether they will return to work, and how much they will work if they do. When they are combined with the effective marginal tax rate equation (the amount of income retained from extra work after tax increases and any social security payments are reduced), for some parents these childcare costs can mean that it is simply not worth returning to work, or taking on an extra day. Because sole parents and secondary earners are predominantly women, these calculations entrench the idea that the choice between caring for children and working is one for women alone to make. Taking the cost out of this decision would promote a more open discussion of the benefits of both parents sharing the opportunity to work and caring for children.

We know that good-quality, accessible childcare improves outcomes for gender equality in the workforce. In Sweden, where the government

has legislated to confer childcare as a right immediately following parental leave, 76.2 per cent of women participate in the workforce – the OECD average is 61.7 per cent.

Increased female labour force participation and attachment to the workforce after having children would help to address the retirement income gap, and the increased likelihood of living in poverty in their older age women in Australia currently experience. A more balanced sharing of parenting responsibilities between the sexes would also allow more men to enjoy this special time of life and to bond with their young children. The normalisation of taking time out of work to care for young children (and other relatives) for both sexes would be a major advancement for gender equality in the workforce.

As treasurers from both sides of politics have always said, ‘Budgets are about choices.’ That is certainly true and making the decision to essentially extend the education and care that primary schools provide would require significant investment in planning, infrastructure and people. However, the cost of the current, broken system is significant. We should invest this money in a new system that will increase workforce participation and gender equality in workforce decisions, and improve the lives and capability of our children.

Alicia Payne is the Federal Member for Canberra.

Alicia’s career aim has been to find policy answers to address the problems of poverty and inequality and this is a key reason she is in politics. After completing a Bachelor of Economics with Honours in Political Economy at University of Sydney, Alicia worked as a researcher at the National Centre for Social and Economic Modelling (NATSEM), at the Australian Treasury and as an adviser to Lindsay Tanner, Bill Shorten and Jenny Macklin.

Dyslexics untie

Senator Amanda Stoker

Senator for Queensland



There is research in the United Kingdom indicating that up to 40 per cent of the prison population has dyslexia. In Australia's general population, it is estimated one in 10 people has dyslexia to some extent, including dysgraphia (an inability to get words out on paper) or dyscalculia (an inability to work with numbers). These statistics are an indication that a significant portion of our population faces incredible challenges in a society that demands literacy and numeracy, and some of them are ending up in the criminal justice system. They also demonstrate a need for public policy to address the 10 per cent of our citizens who find it hard to read and therefore learn, gain a qualification and be productive members of the workforce.

The statistic that 40 per cent of the prison population in the United Kingdom has dyslexia is matched by the (albeit limited) research done on the Australian prison population. That statistic compels the question: why is dyslexia so prevalent amongst people who commit crimes?

Our analysis should go back to the early years of schooling, when a child learns to read, but the letters appear scrambled and jumping all over the page. Children who have a teacher that is inadequately equipped to identify dyslexia often feel stupid and inadequate, and are sometimes labelled stupid or lazy. Too often teachers give up on them, put them in the bottom reading group, and there the child flounders until they give up.

When disengagement with education begins so early, by the time a dyslexic child leaves school (usually early – to the utter relief of underequipped teachers, principals and the parent community) they

are not employable. Many whose disengagement meant they ‘wagged’ school, found the wrong crowd, and were expelled, found they were soon well on their way into the criminal justice system.

Of course I generalise and caricature here. There are some teachers who are well equipped, and some parents who go to great effort to overcome these challenges. Not all children fall through the cracks. But it is equally true to say that far too many do.

So what do we *do*?

The first thing we must do is create an education system which recognises dyslexia as a learning disability. The Morrison Government has already identified that poor literacy teaching in the early years of primary school will have an ongoing impact well into tertiary education and employment, and has started the process of identifying how teachers can better teach reading, such as including phonics in university education degrees and professional development for those already in the profession. This change is important as a diagnostic measure: when teachers can effectively teach phonics, they will soon work out which students cannot grasp reading at all.

That is important because it makes possible the next step that is required: channels for the simple, cost effective referral of those students on for in-depth assessment and, if the diagnosis is confirmed, intervention.

Children identified as dyslexic need support throughout their schooling. Currently, to qualify to access any form of publicly-funded help, the child needs to undertake an assessment by an educational-, developmental- or neuro-psychologist, which can take around eight hours of testing and which requires questionnaires to be completed by teachers, parents or carers. The assessment costs around \$2,000 per assessment. It is not on the Medicare Benefits Schedule, and is often unaffordable for low income families. This will need to be addressed if we are to tackle dyslexia as an impediment to learning.

Of course, the taxpayer does not have bottomless pockets, and we must find ways to deliver this help efficiently, with an eye to reducing the cost of service provision over time. If we develop centres of excellence at key universities to bring together experts in this field, facilitating the sharing of information and the conduct of research into dyslexia and other learning disabilities, we can speed the development of the scientific, educational and health data that underpins the way we treat

children with dyslexia. More cost-effective assessment processes that can be conducted earlier will – despite their up-front costs – deliver lower costs in the long term to the taxpayer. The earlier the diagnosis, the less education a dyslexic child will miss out on and the better the prospects of helping that child grow into a person capable of working and contributing to the economy. A life of welfare dependence or incarceration is both a poor life outcome and a heavy expense for others to bear.

There are programs already developed in other countries being applied here in Australia. An independent school in my state, Brisbane Boys' College is the only one in the country with the Arrowsmith Program, which addresses dyslexia and other learning issues associated with Autism Spectrum Disorder. Another intervention program is Learnersaurus, in which a student is tutored one-on-one for one hour a week, using a range of techniques to retrain the brain to read letters correctly. It harks back to old-fashioned teaching of phonics; it is repetitive and builds incrementally each week. Both of these programs are available and could be applied more broadly now. They do not need to be in every school, but they could be offered in convenient locations for those who need them.

The final issue we need to address is allowing people with dyslexia – either in education or the workplace – to use assistive technology. Dyslexia is a lifelong condition, and there is no cure. We need to look at ways to help students read in class, and to give them extra time in exams. An employee with dyslexia also needs consideration. They need to be able to use voice-to-text and vice versa technology to undertake work and training. To deny a dyslexic person the capacity to participate when adaptive tools are so readily within reach is a form of unfair discrimination that we should seek to overcome. With better awareness of the strengths of dyslexic people, and the ease with which many of their challenges can be overcome with technology, dyslexic workers need not be so marginalised.

At present, dyslexic people generally have lower rates of employment, lower incomes, lower socioeconomic status, lower educational attainment and lower health outcomes than their non-dyslexic counterparts. Every one of those measures will improve with a more effective approach, using early intervention and technological adaptation to help dyslexic people reach their potential. If we see dyslexia as more than an educational

issue, but as an interdisciplinary health, disability, employment and educational one, the solutions we develop will have greater impact. We can expect it, in the long term, to reduce incarceration rates too.

We all have our part to play in society, and people with dyslexia are no exception.

Amanda is married to Adam, and is a mother of three young girls. She comes to the Senate after a career in the legal profession. Amanda studied law at Sydney University, and commenced her career at Minter Ellison. She was associate to then Justice Ian Callinan AC QC on the High Court of Australia, and Justice Philip McMurdo, who was then on the Supreme Court of Queensland's commercial list. After some time prosecuting for the Commonwealth in Brisbane and Townsville, Amanda joined the private bar. As a member of Level Twenty Seven Chambers, she practiced in commercial law, administrative law and corporate crime. Amanda has served as Vice-President of the Women Lawyers Association of Queensland.

Amanda joined the Liberal Party at the age of 19. She has spent over a decade growing in the party and giving voice to her convictions. She is motivated by the desire to see Australia return to a country of opportunity based on centre-right values.

As a Brisbane based member of the Liberal National Party, Amanda sits in the Liberal Party room in Canberra. Amanda is Chair of Legal and Constitutional Affairs Legislation Committee, and the Parliamentary Joint Committee on the Australian Commission for Law Enforcement Integrity. She is Deputy Chair of Legal and Constitutional Affairs References Committee and a member of the Parliamentary Joint Committee on Intelligence and Security.

Freelancing without fear: a new industrial paradigm for a new generation of workers

Senator Raff Ciccone
Senator for Victoria



In 2019 I turned 36 years old: no longer a young man, but by no means an old one either. And, yet I can name four completely different jobs I have had in the relatively short decade-and-a-half of my working life. In contrast, my grandfather worked his whole life not just in one industry, but for one single organisation. Together, the two of us present a neat sketch reflecting the bigger picture of the changing nature of work.

In just two generations, working life in Australia has shifted dramatically. In 40 years, the rate of casuals in our workforce has doubled.³⁰ In 2016 the ABS reported that nearly one million Australians were working as independent contractors.³¹ And with myriad new technology platforms like Uber, AirTasker and Deliveroo, piecemeal and underpaid gig work is enjoying something of a renaissance.^{32 33}

Workers under these arrangements live in a precarious world. They are paid for each unit of work produced, with little accounting for their time, skills or expertise. They miss out on the protections offered to workers employed in more mainstream structures: award wages, superannuation, leave and security of tenure. These arrangements also come with risk: sham contracting, dodgy employers who believe in profit at any expense, including the livelihood of employees and their families, a cash economy that leaves workers without access to insurance or proper OH&S conditions. At the worst end of the scale, workers contend with the shocking exploitation of modern slavery,

which is a well-documented occurrence in Australia.³⁴ Experts also point to evidence that shows how technology platforms entrench inequality and exacerbate discrimination.³⁵

These phenomena of casual work, independent contracting and the gig/platform economy are unlikely to disappear over the next two decades. But, rather than lament the technological advances and cultural shifts that have lent themselves to these changes, I want to advocate for a deep paradigm shift in Australian industrial relations, one that will ameliorate the risks and disadvantages inherent in these working structures and will stop unscrupulous employers who abuse employment law.

In 2019 in Australia we regulate employment, not work.³⁶ By 2035, if we want to maintain high wages and good working conditions, we will need to have shifted to regulating work itself, not just workers in mainstream employment structures.

This paradigm shift might be elegant in its simplicity, but it will require thoughtful policy approaches to bring about.

Establishing an in-principle right for independent contractors and gig workers to collectively bargain would allow workers to negotiate better pay and conditions alongside their colleagues. At the same time, it would allow workers who derive a genuine advantage from contract work, such as professional consultants, to maintain that advantage.

In New York City, drivers who use technology platforms like Uber and Lyft, are benefiting from a designated minimum wage, which is reportedly adding almost USD\$10,000 extra to their yearly wages. In Australia, a number of states and territories have developed regulations to allow ride-sharing platforms to operate within the law. This shows it ought not be impossible for the Commonwealth to regulate to allow for drivers to benefit from the minimum employment standards set out in the *Fair Work Act*.

We could carefully look to examples in Germany and Singapore, where the use of sector bargaining has created higher wages, lifted productivity in entire industries and benefited the economies of local communities.³⁷

Any regulation of work ought also include mandatory employer-contributed superannuation so that all workers, no matter the framework within which they contribute to the economy, have the security of retirement savings.

Not only would measures like these benefit workers employed in traditional structures and workers occupied in new frameworks, it would benefit our economy as a whole. Reduced wages have been shown by some economists to have a depressive effect. They are associated with lower productivity, less innovation, lower rates of growth in skills and professional development and continued reliance on obsolete technologies.³⁸ Moreover, depressed wages are also associated with a reduced marginal propensity to consume.

None of us really know what lies ahead in the future, but I imagine when I am the age my grandfather was when he retired, work will look very different again. Our responsibility as leaders and as lawmakers is to ensure that the Australian principle of a fair day's pay for a fair day's work, established in 1907 with the Harvester decision and now an integral part of the spirit of our nation, remains at the heart of the structures we work in.

Raff Ciccone is a Federal Labor Senator for Victoria and currently serves as the Deputy Opposition Whip in the Senate.

Before he was elected, Senator Ciccone worked in the union movement, financial planning and as an adviser in the Commonwealth government, as well as serving on the board of a local community health organisation for over nine years.

Senator Ciccone is committed to improving preventative healthcare, investing in schools, TAFEs and early childhood education, and addressing homelessness, Indigenous rights', and workers' rights.

Epilogue and acknowledgments

Laurence Coleman



In 2034, 15 years from now, the nation's 50th Parliament will be heading towards a federal election. It is probably safe to assume that whichever party is in government, the 2034 election will not be a contest between Scott Morrison and Anthony Albanese.

We cannot safely predict the issues on which the 2034 election will be fought. Nevertheless, the 11 essays in this volume, all from newly elected federal MPs and Senators, give consideration to long-term policy challenges facing Australia. They might well hold a clue to the politics of our future.

Many of the essayists, now at the start of their political careers, may be senior cabinet ministers or elder statesmen and women by the time of the 50th Parliament. The ideas they have now for Australia's future may well frame the next decade-and-a-half of public policy debate.

Too often politics generally, and politicians in particular, are criticised for being cynical, out of touch and focused on short-term political gain at the expense of the long-term national interest. And not without reason – certainly for some politicians, and for some issues, that is incontrovertibly true. But we do not think that it is the whole story, and writing off all politicians in that way is bad for our democracy.

This publication deals with the long term. In producing this publication we wanted to create a document that demonstrates the depth and breadth of policy thinking that the new cohort of fresh federal MPs and Senators brings to our national parliament.

Contributors were asked, taking a 15-year horizon, to write about one policy idea whose time was yet to come.

The ideas represented in this publication are not simply calls by the essayists for their policies to be immediately incorporated into their respective parties' policy platforms (though, of course, some may welcome such a move). Rather, they represent genuine attempts to engage with long-term policy challenges that face Australia – from automation and the rise of big data, to childcare and education, to industrial relations, health care, gender relations and national interest journalism. While each essay focuses on one aspect, at their heart they are all dealing with questions about what we want to be as a nation, within a rapidly changing geopolitical, economic and social context.

In producing this report we are grateful to all of our essayists and their staff, who have been immensely helpful and generous with their time and energy. Thanks, too, must go to UWA Vice-Chancellor Professor Dawn Freshwater, without whose personal support this project would not have been possible. I would also like to record my thanks to the Director of the UWA Public Policy Institute, Professor Shamit Saggat, as well as Anneke Forster and the entire team for their efforts to ensure its success.

The University of Western Australia's founding mission – written into our Act in 1911 – is to *advance the prosperity and welfare of the people*. The UWA Public Policy Institute supports this mission by seeking to foster better engagement between politicians and policymakers, and experts and their evidence. We are delighted that the essayists in this publication have embraced this mission, and we commend their ideas to the public.

Laurence Coleman is Senior Adviser to the Vice-Chancellor at The University of Western Australia, and works closely with the UWA Public Policy Institute.

Laurence has a background in public policy and is a UWA alumnus. He was previously a research fellow with a leading UK think tank, Policy Exchange, and has worked as an adviser to politicians in Canberra, Perth and Westminster.

About UWA PPI

The UWA Public Policy Institute (UWA PPI) is a bridge between academic research and government, public and business needs. It delivers real-world policy impact and is focused on the translation of UWA research into a strong and usable evidence base for decision-makers in Western Australia, Australia and the Indian Ocean region.

UWA PPI pursues its mission by ensuring that relevant expertise and research findings are accessible, communicated for purpose, and deployed in a timely manner to policymakers and practitioners across sectors. Building on our strengths in translation, timing and trust, we help position UWA as a go-to partner for advice on evidence-based policy challenges faced by governments, business and non-profit organisations.

As a key delivery mechanism of UWA's 2030 Vision, which centres on the civic character of the University and service to its communities, UWA PPI is placing special emphasis on active engagement with Australian governments as well as those within the region.

Director

Professor Shamit Saggarr CBE FACSS



Chair of the Advisory Board

Professor the Hon. Stephen Smith



UWA Public Policy Institute
The University of Western Australia
M464, 35 Stirling Highway
Crawley WA 6009

uwappi@uwa.edu.au
+61 8 6488 5825

Notes

- 1 R. Hutt, 'All you need to know about blockchain, explained simply', *WEF*, 17 June 2019, <https://www.weforum.org/agenda/2016/06/blockchain-explained-simply/>.
- 2 D. Lehr & P. Lamb, 'Digital Currencies and Blockchain in the Social Sector', *Stanford Social Innovation Review*, (January 2018); https://ssir.org/articles/entry/digital_currencies_and_blockchain_in_the_social_sector1.
- 3 *Ibid.*
- 4 A copy of the report can be found at https://docs.employment.gov.au/system/files/doc/other/final_-_i_want_to_work.pdf.
- 5 A. Sarkadi *et al.*, 'Fathers' involvement and children's developmental outcomes: a systematic review of longitudinal studies', *Acta paediatrica*, Vol. 97, No. 2 (2008), pp. 153-58.
- 6 R. Fletcher *et al.*, 'The effects of early paternal depression on children's development', *Medical Journal of Australia*, Vol. 195, No. 11 (2011), pp. 685-89.
- 7 E. Freeman *et al.*, 'Preventing and treating childhood obesity: time to target fathers', *International Journal of Obesity*, Vol. 36, No.1 (2012); pp. 12-15.
- 8 P. Ramchandani & L. Psychogiou, 'Paternal psychiatric disorders and children's psychosocial development', *The Lancet*, Vol. 374, No. 9690 (2009), pp. 646-53.
- 9 J. Paulson *et al.*, 'Individual and Combined Effects of Postpartum Depression in Mothers and Fathers on Parenting Behaviour', *Pediatrics*, Vol. 118, No. 2 (2006), pp. 659-68.
- 10 J.T. Condon, P. Boyce P & C.J. Corkindale, 'The First-Time Fathers Study: a prospective study of the mental health and wellbeing of men during the transition to parenthood', *The Australian and New Zealand Journal of Psychiatry*, Vol. 38 (1-2) (2004), pp. 56-64.
- 11 J. Ives, 'Men, maternity and moral residue: negotiating the moral demands of the transition to first time fatherhood', *Sociology of Health and Illness*, Vol. 36, No. 7 (2014), pp. 1003-19.
- 12 I. Hildingsson *et al.*, 'Childbirth fear in expectant fathers: findings from a regional Swedish cohort study', *Midwifery*, Vol. 30, No. 2 (2014), pp. 242-47; I. Hildingsson *et al.*, 'Childbirth fear in Swedish fathers is associated with parental stress as well as poor physical and mental health', *Midwifery*, Vol. 30, No. 2 (2014), pp. 248-54.
- 13 H.M. Haines, *Emotional Health of Mothers and Fathers in a Northern Victorian Cohort* (Melbourne: University of Melbourne Press, 2015).
- 14 J. Ives, 'Men, maternity and moral residue: negotiating the moral demands of the transition to first time fatherhood', *Sociology of Health & Illness*, Vol. 36, No. 7 (2014), pp. 1003-19.
- 15 L. Barclay, J. Donovan & A. Genovese, 'Men's experiences during their partner's first pregnancy: a grounded theory analysis', *Australian Journal of Advanced Nursing*, Vol. 13, No. 3 (1996), pp. 12-24; J. Fenwick, S. Bayes & M. Johansson, 'A qualitative investigation into the pregnancy experiences and childbirth expectations of Australian fathers-to-be', *Sexual & reproductive healthcare: official journal of the Swedish Association of Midwives*, Vol. 3, No. 1 (2012), pp. 3-9.
- 16 O. Kowlessar, J.R. Fox & A. Wittkowski, 'The pregnant male: a metasynthesis of first-time fathers' experiences of pregnancy', *Journal of Reproductive & Infant Psychology*, Vol. 33, No. 2 (2015), pp. 106-27.

- 17 Australian Health Ministers' Advisory Council, *Clinical Practice Guidelines: Antenatal Care: Module 1*, Australian Government Department of Health and Ageing, (Canberra: 2012) https://consultations.health.gov.au/phd-tobacco/clinical-practice-guidelines-antenatal-care-module/supporting_documents/ANC_Guidelines_Mod1FINAL%20D13871243.PDF.
- 18 ACCC, *Digital Platforms Inquiry: Preliminary Report* (December 2018), p. 3 <https://www.accc.gov.au/focus-areas/inquiries/digital-platforms-inquiry/preliminary-report>.
- 19 A. Klobuchar et al, *Digital Citizenship and Media Literacy Act* (Bill S.2240), US Senate, July 23, 2019 <https://www.congress.gov/bill/116th-congress/senate-bill/2240/text?r=4&s=2>.
- 20 See 'The Trust Project' <https://thetrustproject.org/>.
- 21 Department of Education, Education and Training Portfolio Budget Statement 2019-20, https://docs.education.gov.au/system/files/doc/other/education_and_training_portfolio_budget_statements_2019-20.pdf.
- 22 M. Klapdor & S. Clark, *Child care and early childhood education*, Parliamentary Library (2019), <https://parlinfo.aph.gov.au/parlInfo/search/display/display.w3p;query=Id%3A%22library%2Fprspub%2F6803648%22>.
- 23 Productivity Commission, *Childcare and Early Childhood Learning: Overview*, Inquiry Report No. 73, (Canberra: 2014), <https://www.pc.gov.au/inquiries/completed/childcare/report/childcare-overview.pdf>.
- 24 W. Smith, 'Labor wants to pay childcare wages itself. A perfect storm makes it not such a bad idea', *The Conversation* (2019), <https://theconversation.com/labor-wants-to-pay-childcare-wages-itself-a-perfect-storm-makes-it-not-such-a-bad-idea-116272>.
- 25 Productivity Commission *Op. Cit.* 2014.
- 26 J. Heckman, 4 Big Benefits of Investing in Early Childhood Development – The Heckman Equation, (2019: The Heckman Equation), https://heckmanequation.org/www/assets/2017/01/F_Heckman_FourBenefitsInvestingECDDevelopment_022615.pdf.
- 27 PwC, *Putting a value on early childhood education and care in Australia*, PwC (2014), <https://www.pwc.com.au/pdf/putting-value-on-ecec.pdf>.
- 28 Department of Education, *Child Care in Australia*, Department of Education (2019), <https://www.education.gov.au/child-care-australia>.
- 29 Productivity Commission, *Appendix H: The costs and viability of ECEC services*, (Productivity Commission, 2014), <https://www.pc.gov.au/inquiries/completed/childcare/report/childcare-appendixh.pdf>.
- 30 G. Gilfillan, *Characteristics and use of casual employees in Australia*, Parliamentary Library (2018), <https://parlinfo.aph.gov.au/parlInfo/search/display/display.w3p;query=Id%3A%22library%2Fprspub%2F5742396%22>.
- 31 Australian Bureau of Statistics, 'Independent Contractors', *Characteristics of Employment, Australia*, Australian Bureau of Statistics (2016), <https://www.abs.gov.au/ausstats/abs@.nsf/7d12b0f6763c78caca257061001cc588/7adacaf4099318cca25801fo01865ed!OpenDocument>.
- 32 Victorian Government Media release, *Revealing The True Size Of Australia's Gig Workforce*, Victorian Government (2019), <https://www.premier.vic.gov.au/revealing-the-true-size-of-australias-gig-workforce/>.
- 33 J. Stanford, *Submission to Victoria Inquiry into On-Demand Work*, Centre for Future Work (2019), https://www.futurework.org.au/submission_to_victoria_inquiry_into_on_demand_work.

- 34 Mindaroo Foundation, *Global Slavery Index*, Mindaroo Foundation (2018), <https://www.globalslaveryindex.org/2018/findings/country-studies/australia/>.
- 35 J. Schor, *The Platform Economy*, Policy Network (2018), <https://policynetwork.org/opinions/essays/the-platform-economy/>.
- 36 T. Lyons, *Is Work in Australia Working?*, Per Capita (2018), <https://percapita.org.au/wp-content/uploads/2018/05/Is-Work-In-Australia-Working.pdf>.
- 37 A. Chowdhury, *Work Industry-Wide Bargaining Good for Efficiency, as Well as Equity*, Centre for Future (2018), https://www.futurework.org.au/industry_wide_bargaining_good_for_efficiency_as_well_as_equity.
- 38 *Ibid.*

