

# 23

At the time of the NYC Inquiry, there was research evidence that youth homelessness had decreased somewhat from 2001 to 2006 due to early intervention. However, in 2006 and 2007 the affordability of housing became a major issue as private rents steeped dramatically and vacancy rates reached record lows. The NYC Inquiry in 2007-08 took place at a watershed point. Homelessness has been highlighted by the new Federal Government as a priority issue for action under the policy rubric of 'social inclusion'. If the right policy settings are put in place and there is sustained investment and growth across a continuum of measure from prevention, to early intervention, crisis intervention and then post-vention reconnection to community, it is possible to change the face of 'youth homelessness' in Australia. The NYC urges a constructivist approach, an appropriately robust and sufficiently bipartisan structure and process equal to the tasks that will need to be tackled over the long-term. The NYC proposes a ROADMAP of 'must do' 10 strategic actions - a national framework and a national plan of action; a refocus of service provision to building capacity in 'communities of services' with actual communities across Australia; increased affordable housing for young people; an expanded Reconnect early intervention response for at-risk young people; prevention of homelessness for families and children; a national reform agenda for care and protection; supported accommodation in communities; new models and funded cooperative links between specialist health, drug and alcohol and employment services; a new Foyer-like form of youth housing and, finally, post-vention support for young people re-establishing their lives in the community.



## Chapter 23 | The Way Forward

23.1 The history of youth homelessness policy and programs in Australia goes back to the early 1980s when most notable national initiative was the creation of the Supported Accommodation and Assistance Program. A joint Commonwealth- states program commenced in 1985. SAAP evolved from several other programs that already existed. SAAP includes a wide range of models of service provision for providing support to homeless people and supported accommodation. A fifth SAAP agreement was signed for the period 2005-2010.

23.2 Each SAAP agreement was accompanied by a stated agenda for reform and change, and, under SAAP IV, there was an Australian Government National Homelessness Strategy (NHS). The aims of the NHS<sup>1</sup> were to:

- Provide a strategic framework that will improve collaboration and linkages between existing programmes and services, to improve outcomes for clients and reduce the incidence of homelessness;
- Identify best practice models, which can be promoted and replicated, that will enhance existing homelessness policies and programmes;
- Build the capacity of the community sector to improve linkages and networks; and
- Raise awareness of the issue of homelessness throughout all areas and levels of government and in the community.

The NHS 2005-06 budget allocated \$10 million over four years towards demonstration projects and communication activity. In the 2005-07 budget round there were eight demonstration projects and five communication activities and in the 2007-09 round there were seven demonstration projects and six communication projects. The NHS

projects funded were all innovative initiatives that could in theory be replicated and used throughout Australia. However, clearly the nomenclature 'National Homelessness Strategy' was a misnomer – the NHS was a small program to divvy up funds for one off projects<sup>2</sup>. While useful, this was far from a national strategy for dealing with homelessness.

23.3 A national strategy implies a long-term shared vision about the desired improved state to be achieved. It offers long-, medium- and short-term aims, along with credible, well-reasoned strategies for achieving those aims and explicit, measurable targets so that progress or regress can be monitored. The clear need for a coordinated strategy has been established in the debates about climate change and water, and likewise a similar approach is needed to achieve social policy objectives. In terms of how the various jurisdictions cooperate on issues related to the environment there are Commonwealth-state ministerial councils, such as the national Environment Protection Council etc.

23.4 Social issues and problems in Australia have received separate, dislocated responses. Although it is widely known that for many people issues and crises occur simultaneously, there is no concerted, sophisticated approach to working across departments and sectors on these social issues. However, no less commitment and robust methodology should be applied to social problems such as 'youth homelessness' than to other big issues faced by the nation. The Australian people expect their governments and NGOs to care and act, rationally and compassionately, to redress the issues of young Australians who do not share in national prosperity – youth who have suffered the effects abuse, neglect, extreme conflict and family breakdown, in some cases, for many, many years

23.5 One of the most significant innovations to emerge under SAAP IV was the choice by several state jurisdictions to seek a more strategic approach to dealing with homelessness. These homelessness strategies were not a planned outcome or one of the strategic issues under SAAP IV. However, Victoria, Western Australia, Queensland and the ACT developed homelessness strategies in order to achieve social policy objectives over the longer-term. A somewhat different approach was taken by South Australia, which set up a Social Inclusion Unit following the UK model, but homelessness became a priority. Queensland has taken new initiatives on young people who are homeless, or at-risk, under a Responding to Homelessness framework.

23.6 In the Victorian Homelessness Strategy, the final report framed five strategic objectives:

- improving client focus and client outcomes;
- developing integrated and sustainable service responses;
- working across government and the community to prevent homelessness;
- increasing access to and supply of affordable housing;
- supporting and driving change.

The Victorian strategy was accompanied by funding for some additional crisis services.

From 2000-2002, Victoria contributed 40 per cent over and above the funding the state was obliged to under the Commonwealth-state bilateral agreement. Over the same period the Transitional Housing Management program was extended by 600 properties. A new Ministerial Advisory Committee was developed along with an Inter-departmental Committee as it was recognised that 'to address the myriad of needs presented by people who are homeless, all areas and levels of Government need to be on board, to ensure cohesive integrated responses are developed'<sup>3</sup>. Subsequently, Victoria has developed a Youth Homelessness Action Plan including a stage 1 and 2 implementation.

23.7 Youth homelessness is no longer dealt with by only SAAP services - there is also Reconnect and JPET. Early intervention involves schools and a range of community agencies. In the years since the HREOC Inquiry, youth homelessness continued to rise until 2001 and only since then has the increase in the population of homeless young people been arrested and reduced a little. Despite a growth economy, record levels of employment and the lowest unemployment for more than 15 years, 'youth homelessness' is still endemic. We have to ask the question: and 'What would need to be done to effectively eliminate youth homelessness in Australia?

23.8 The NYC recognises that the answer involves setting in place an effective prevention and early intervention response as well as helping those young Australians who are already homeless. Youth policy does not exist in a comprehensive form and where policy exists it has been developed largely in terms of education, training and employment. Despite the National Homelessness Strategy, a misnomer for a relatively small funding program, there has been no over-arching homelessness strategy. The most promising development under SAAP IV was the genuine attempts by some states to develop their own homelessness strategies.

23.9 The states actions suggest that a national framework needs to be developed that of necessity can work on a long-term timeline. The framework needs to be cross-sectoral and cross-departmental to an extent that has not been previously attempted.

23.10 An acceptance that overcoming youth homelessness requires action on several fronts, sustained over a long period of time raises the question as to what structures and processes would be able to sustain the implementation of a national strategy. Bipartisan support has been an informal hallmark of the Australian response to homelessness, although when governments change there are a host of changes in administration and priority. Sometimes change is as simple as renaming and reorganising, while retaining the essential functions of programs that are necessary and basically sound.

## **The concept of social exclusion**

23.11 For a long time, debates about homelessness and disadvantaged were staged around structuralist versus individualist explanations. Individualist accounts focused on the deficiencies or failings of individuals - those individuals whose personal misfortunes or failings are held to largely account for their situation - while explanations emphasising social structure lead to arguments about income distribution via social programs, or progressive taxation. However, researchers often describe homelessness as involving both

structural factors and individual issues. In 1975, The Australian Government Commission of Inquiry into Poverty tabled its report, *Poverty in Australia*<sup>4</sup>. This inquiry examined social disadvantage and poverty and established the Henderson poverty line as a non-judgemental measure of poverty, purely in terms of income. The Henderson inquiry into poverty in Australia was concerned about the distribution and redistribution of income and resources within society. In more recent times, policy talk has focused less on poverty and more on homelessness as an extreme of poverty.

23.12 Levitas<sup>5</sup> discussed several competing discourses about the fact that people in society are unequal. One she described as the ‘moral underclass discourse’ (or MUD) where an individual’s behaviour was held responsible for their situation; prompting educational measures, and social work together with various incentives were as proposed solutions. Blaming youth homeless benefits for causing young people to leave home and the assumptions underpinning much of welfare-to-work reforms in the past 10 years, would generally fall under what has been described as moral underclass discourse.

23.13 A second discourse was named the ‘redistributive egalitarian discourse’ (or RED). This could be regarded as the policy framework of social democratic parties during most of the post-war period, which saw poverty and social exclusion as the result of structural factors in society. Policies were consequently set to try and measure the redistribution of income via taxation or various benefits.

23.14 The third discourse in play was the ‘social integrationist/new labour/ third way discourse’, where rights were balanced by social responsibilities and policies focused on getting people into the labour market, education and training.

23.15 Critiques of the concept of social inclusion have raised concerns about a focus on ‘social cohesion’ rather than ‘social justice’<sup>6</sup>. The new labour policy direction is about ‘social integration’ which deals mainly with participation in the labour market:

*... employment is promoted as the primary route to inclusion, and unemployment (or worklessness) is treated as synonymous to social exclusion, rather than just exclusion from the labour market. ... ‘work’ becomes the cornerstone for social integration and for social cohesion.*<sup>7</sup>

*On the other hand, social inclusion admits a wide range of individual and social factors into a conversation between ‘unequals’. Questions are asked about how people who are poor, unemployed or marginalised in some way can be supported and helped to participate and share in society and the economy. Bradshaw suggests that the initial strict functionalist rhetoric of New Labour has been moderated over time. He says social inclusion does talk about eliminating poverty, but in terms of a broader range of understandings and possibilities.*

## UK New Labour Social Exclusion Unit

23.16 Apart from debates about the theoretical adequacy and practical utility of ‘social inclusion’ there is already some history of the concept-in-practice, firstly under the

Blair Labour Government from 1997 to 2007 and - to a much smaller extent - in South Australia. Established within the Cabinet Office, the unit's brief was described in their own words:

*Our remit is to help improve government action to reduce social exclusion by producing 'joined-up solutions to joined-up problems'. We work mainly on specific projects, chosen following consultation with other government departments and suggestions from interested groups. The unit is staffed by a mixture of civil servants from a number of government departments and external secondees from organisations with experience of tackling social exclusion. We work on issues that affect a range of government departments, and do not duplicate work being done elsewhere. We publish reports on specific issues and are involved in other cross-government policy relating to social exclusion. (SEU Brochure)*

23.17 In the early years of the Blair Government the SEU policy work achieved a high profile. Some of the policy topics of 'teenage pregnancy' (1999), 'rough sleeping' (1998), 'truancy and school exclusion' (1998) and 'Bridging the gap – new opportunities for 16-18 year olds not in education, employment or training' (1999) are familiar in an Australian context. On the other hand, a focus on rough sleeping is probably an ill-conceived way of entering the policy debate about dealing with homelessness, Australian jurisdictions generally take a broader view of homelessness than this.

23.18 How effective has the UK Social Exclusion Unit approach met its declared goal of 'joined-up solutions to joined-up problems'? This Inquiry is not in a position to provide a definitive answer to this question. The formation of the unit certainly achieved a high profile for certain policy issues early on, but a 'project by project' modus operandi hardly constructs a long-term approach with sustainable long-term structures and processes. The shift of the unit from the Cabinet Office to the Office of the Deputy Prime Minister, in May 2002, has been seen by some as reflecting a somewhat reduced influence. There are no highly visible sustainable cross-sectoral and cross-departmental structures and ways of operating. Lastly, the SEU was born as a top-down initiative by an incoming government. As time passes, it resembles just another taskforce that has done some good policy work, some of which has been vigorously implemented. Would the Social Exclusion Unit survive a change of government, which will inevitably happen at some point within a 20-year time frame? – most probably not.

23.19 The tendency to copy models from overseas has an undignified history in social programs and policy. In some areas, and homelessness is one of them, the leading advances and innovations have happened in Australia, not elsewhere.

23.20 The NYC Inquiry recognises the conceptual utility of broadening the concept of poverty in the direction of 'social exclusion' because of the way that problems such as homelessness can be understood as a complex interaction between social structural factors and individual issues.

23.22 Responding youth homelessness will require a long-term strategy and action plan over 20 to 25 years, and the horizon needs to be the elimination of youth homeless-



ness and homelessness, not reducing the number of rough sleepers in the inner city by relocation or displacement to other sectors of the homeless population.

#### **Recommendation 23.1**

**The NYC Inquiry recommends that the Australian Government and state and territory governments commit to developing a long-term strategy and action plan to eliminate homelessness in Australia.**

#### **Recommendation 23.2**

**The NYC recommends that the Australian Government and state and territory governments create properly resourced compatible data collections across all programs, both Federal and state, that assist homeless people. At the same time, a homelessness identifier should be incorporated in other social programs.**

#### **Recommendation 23.3**

**The NYC Inquiry recommends that the Australian Government and state and territory governments form a National Homelessness Taskforce as a vehicle for developing a national homelessness framework as well as a national strategy and action plan.**

23.23 Broadly, the NYC supports addressing poverty and social exclusion by means of a long-term strategy. However, a caution is issued on uncritically adopting the UK Social Exclusion model into the Australian context. Alternatively, bottom-up approach to developing social inclusion reforms linked to progress on the reform of Commonwealth and state relations is advised, on the understanding that this is a difficult area on which the UK SEU made only modest progress. The NYC suggests a ‘constructivist’ approach whereby the tasks of joining-up policy and government agencies are understood to be a major but difficult agenda requiring sustained effort over time, and for which there are no strikingly successful exemplars.

#### **Recommendation 23.4**

**The NYC Inquiry recommends that a Federal Government Social Inclusion Unit focus on developing a reform agenda for how joined-up government and joined-up policy can be undertaken in an effective and sustainable way across departments and jurisdictions to assist young people who are homeless.**

23.24 Apart from the challenges in ‘whole of government’ and ‘joined up’ government projects and programs, there remain, some serious issues of poor public administration that have adversely affected a number of homelessness programs. Careful forward planning and allowance for salary increases and real cost increases need to be factored into budget planning for all social programs, especially the programs directed to assisting the most vulnerable Australians. When governments seek efficiency dividends from programs across the board in some cases, the effect may not be noticeable. Evidence came to the attention of the Inquiry that suggests noticeable adverse impacts on the ground. Increases in SAAP funding have not kept pace with real cost increases over the past decade, despite all kinds of inventive attempts to do as much with less. The constrained funding regime has put more pressure on community agencies and charitable organisations to



raise additional funds. Reconnect services, which usually have two EFTU workers, have been affected as well. Improved public administration, clear standards and greater accountability of the administrative side of social programs needs urgent attention.

#### **Recommendation 23.5**

**The NYC Inquiry recommends that the public administration of all programs for homeless young people be reviewed with a view to improving program administration and cost planning for service provision.**

**The review should address:**

- **Improved accountability by developing more efficient and streamlined ways of collecting information and reporting on outcomes;**
- **Adequate real cost indexation to maintain service provision in the face of rising external costs;**
- **An exemption from the impact of efficiency dividends for programs catering for the most disadvantaged Australians;**
- **Service models that adequately allow for real cost structures such occupational health and safety, training and professional development and community service salary scale increments;**
- **A minimum standard of three-year funding agreements.**

## **10 POINT ROADMAP FOR YOUTH HOMELESSNESS**

23.25 The development and implementation of a framework and a national action plan on homelessness is imperative. One of the lessons from the past ten to fifteen years on how homelessness has been addressed is that policy has been unevenly attended to and there has been no planned approach. Within a no-growth budget, there has been good cooperative oversight of SAAP, but JPET and Reconnect have been developed separately. There is no common data collection and decisions are not strongly coordinated.

23.26 The following 10 points comprise what might be called a 'roadmap'. They are not the only areas for attention but they are must do strategic areas. Implementing the core 10 points of the Roadmap would change the face of youth homelessness in Australia. This will be a complex developmental process requiring policy multi-tasking and new ways of connecting different areas of policy and programs – but all the core ingredients need to be in play. In the first term of the new Government, \$100 million per year would make that possible and demonstrate to the Australian community that 'homelessness' is one of the Government's highest priorities for national action.

### **1. Develop and implement a national framework and National Homelessness Action Plan**

23.27 Australia needs a new commitment from Commonwealth and state and territory

governments on homelessness, a national framework and a national action plan, including:

- **A national aspirational horizon – the goal of eliminating youth homelessness by 2030;**
- **Appropriate structures and processes designed to work across election cycles in a bipartisan way;**
- **Specific targets over the short, medium and long-term;**
- **Strategies that set out realistically how targets will be reached.**
- **A youth-centred focus for service provision and programs;**
- **Review and public monitoring so that progress can be recognised and problems identified against the needs of homeless young people.**

## **2 Affordable housing for young people**

23.28 The affordable housing crisis has developed as a result of decades of policy neglect and under-funding. The NYC supports a broad affordable housing strategy as a new framework for explicitly addressing the needs of low income and disadvantaged Australians. Under this approach, there will need to be: (a) a multi-billion dollar investment in public and community housing; (b) taxation incentives to encourage affordable private rental housing, and (c) explicit policies and housing form designs and locations that facilitate access for young people. The NYC is concerned that the interests and needs of young people are appropriately addressed under a new National Affordable Housing Strategy and that the hard work of undertaking planning based on the leading edge Australian housing research is done. The NYC recommends:

- **the development of a new national affordable housing strategy for Australia, with explicit attention to the needs of young people and in particular disadvantaged young people.**

## **3 Refocus service provision on building and resourcing ‘communities of services’**

23.29 The way governments and departments divide up geographical areas for funding and program delivery is confusing, contradictory and uncoordinated, with little progress since the Burdekin Report in 1989. Building ‘communities of services’ will require all government departments to work towards agreed compatible geographical templates based on actual communities of people. Large Local Government Areas or clusters of small LGAs are probably the closest spatial unit to actual communities. Community capacity building has entered the rhetoric of the community services, but there is a challenge in how it could be achieved in practice. Building effective local service systems will require resources to advance beyond the current status quo. The exemplars of the School Focused Youth Service or the Youth Support Coordinators combined with some of the Queensland education coordination reforms point the way forward. Re-

sources will be need to support the development phase, but also some resources will be needed to maintain service system coordination once developed. Ultimately whatever is done needs to be available to all communities. An estimated minimum funding goal of \$30 million per year, but implemented over 10 years would require \$3 million/year of additional funds. This is a conservative position that could serve as a realistic starting point. This initiative will require:

- **a refocus of Commonwealth and State/ Territory funding for services and programs on a common community level template;**
- **the provision of cross-sectoral/ cross-departmental resources to support the development sustainable 'communities of services'.**

#### **4 Prevent homelessness by supporting 'at-risk' families**

23.30 If at-risk families are assisted in a flexible, practical needs-based way before they become homeless, then homelessness can be prevented. A small program known as HOME Advice has demonstrated that this is possible in nine out of 10 cases. About one third of all SAAP clients are families with nearly 55,000 accompanying children, Preventive support to assist at-risk families using a proven model would have a major impact on the number of families entering SAAP. The HOME Advice evaluation estimated that a conservative minimum of \$36 million would be required but suggested more realistic funding of \$60-90m per year. An investment of \$4.5 million per year of additional funds would achieve a position of \$60 million dollars over a decade.

- **progressively expand the HOME Advice program as a preventive response to homelessness for families at risk of becoming homeless to at least \$60m per year.**

#### **5. Resource early intervention for at risk young people.**

23.31 School-based early intervention responses for recently homelessness young people, such as the Reconnect program and other related early intervention support services, have been effective in reducing homelessness. Researchers found that the reduction in the number of homeless 12-18 year olds from 26,060 in 2001 to 21,940 in 2006 is mostly attributed to 'early intervention'. Early intervention works but not enough is being done to have the effect it could have, so the Commonwealth Government needs to:

- **treble Reconnect (from \$20m to \$60m per year) to reach a larger proportion of the at-risk population and ensure that every community in the nation has sufficient early intervention capacity to impact on the number of young people at-risk of homelessness or recently homeless**

#### **6. A new national approach for the care and protection of children in all states and territories**

23.32 Australia's Care and Protection system is in crisis. The Commonwealth Government to date has had little responsibility for care and protection, which has been a

state responsibility. State programs are under-resourced and leaving care support needs major development. The lack of a national cooperative approach and timid reform in the face of potentially adverse media are major barriers. A courageous and radical national review of care and protection is urgent. It is not possible to estimate how much this would cost, but it is likely to require a significant increase in current expenditure. Young people who have been in State Care are heavily over-represented in the population of homeless youth. Immediate action is required. The NYC urges immediate action including:

- **a full Human Rights and Equal Opportunity inquiry to expose the issues and develop proposals for a national response.**
- **a strengthening of care and protection for at-risk 12-17 year olds;**
- **urgent remedial attention to staff resources and incentives for experienced staff to remain in a critical but difficult area;**
- **leaving care support on a needs-basis for all young people exiting care and protection..**

## **7 Ensure supported accommodation is accessible in all communities**

23.33 Supported accommodation (ie SAAP) remains a core component of Australia's response to homelessness and an exemplar of innovative diversity by international standards, despite being in a no real growth position for over a decade. Strengthening this sector will ensure that every community has the capacity for a supported accommodation response to youth homelessness. An estimate for an adequate extent of community based supported accommodation might well be closer to \$500-600 million per year compared to \$348m currently, and youth services would comprise approximately \$170 - 200 million annually. About one third of SAAP services are for young people so approximately an additional \$50 million for youth services would be required to:

- **expand supported accommodation using a national community template to ensure that every community can adequately provide supported accommodation for young people in need.**

## **8 Redevelop employment, D&A and mental health programs for homeless young people**

23.34 Employment is central to a sustainable livelihood for homeless young people. A continuum of labour market support programs need to be developed which address education barriers to employment and prepare young people for training, provide vocational training and assist young homeless people to engage with the labour market. The absence of specialist and appropriate labour market options for disadvantaged young people has ensured that homeless young people have been largely excluded from participation in the 'full-employment' Australian economy.

23.35 Existing options for drug and alcohol services or mental health services are too often unable to provide timely assistance and treatment or are unable to accommodate

young people while they are dealing with drug and alcohol issues.

23.36 Drug treatment services for young people are uneven around Australia. In Victoria, drug services are funded to a level of \$15-16 million per year. An additional \$5 million per year would achieve state-wide coverage as well as providing sufficient outreach services at current levels of need. Other states spend less than Victoria. The proposed expansion of both mental health services and drug and alcohol programs will serve not just homeless young people but any young person, who need this kind of assistance.

23.37 A large amount of public funds are expended already in Job Network and on unemployment benefits. While we have not costed the employment support required by homeless young people a major part of these funds could be found by reallocations of expenditures elsewhere. To respond in these crucial areas, the NYC calls for:

- **the development a national system of accessible drug and alcohol services for young people. National funding of an estimated \$100m would be required to deploy a system adequate to meet existing need, with an urgent need for \$20m initially.**
- **the development of a national program at an estimated cost of \$25m, to work intensively with homeless young people who have mental health issues, their families and the workers who support them.**
- **the construction a continuum of employment programs for homeless young people incorporating JPET and offering appropriate foundation education, training, vocational options as well as new models of supported employment that build new links between support, accommodation, and education and employment programs.**

## **9 A new form of youth housing which links housing to education, training and employment programs**

23.38 An Australian version of the UK/ European Foyer youth housing model should to be developed to link accommodation with other support, particularly education and training. Other initiatives should include accommodation for homeless school students, and 'boarding school' projects linked to Indigenous communities. The total extent of this type of housing will need to be assessed in terms of need and demand and what the sustainable expansion of this housing might need to be. One third of the homeless are young people. Based on the Government's election promise of housing for the homeless, the NYC argues that:

- **one third of the \$150 million committed for housing for homeless people should be applied to develop a new layer of youth housing that is connected to education, training and employment.**

## **10 Post-vention support**

23.39 Returning to homelessness is common for young people because even after they find housing, problems can reoccur. Post-vention support would ensure that recycling back into homelessness is minimised. A new type of flexible, tailored, post-vention outreach support will ensure young people can sustain their independent living arrangements. It will radically improve the outcomes of supported accommodation programs. Every homeless young person moving beyond supported accommodation should be able to access this kind of support. We have estimated that a substantial national capacity could be created for \$35 million. Implemented over 10 years this would be \$3.5 million of additional funds every year for a decade. The NYC proposes that:

- **all young people moving from SAAP into some form of independent living should receive needs-based outreach support (an estimated \$30-50m per year would be required for a fully developed national response).**

23.40 In terms of preliminary costings where there is existing evidence or a sufficient basis for making estimates, it would cost approximately cost \$1 billion in new money over a decade, \$100 million in the first term of the new Federal Government after the 2007 election result, and approximately \$20 million additional funds every year. This notional estimate excludes the costs associated with a reform of the care and protection systems around Australia, and the additional services required in mental health and drug and alcohol fields to more effectively service the significant group of their clients who are homeless young people. The total cost of redressing the affordability of housing for young people could not reasonably be estimated at the time of this report, but it will be a considerable sum, and also, the cost of reformed employment services for homeless young people has not been estimated. The cost of not doing what needs to be done will be a large cost to the community into the future.

## ENDNOTES

- 1 [www.facsia.gov.au/internet/facsinternet.nsf/aboutfacs/programs/house-nhs\\_home.htm](http://www.facsia.gov.au/internet/facsinternet.nsf/aboutfacs/programs/house-nhs_home.htm)
- 2 Ibid.
- 3 Tony Newman (2003) Paper to the 3rd national Homelessness Conference 'Beyond the Divide.
- 4 Henderson, R. (1975) *Poverty in Australia: Main report Volume 1*, Canberra: Australian Government Publishing Service.
- 5 Levitas, R. (1998) *The Inclusive Society? Social Exclusion and New Labour*, Basingstoke: Palgrave.
- 6 See Lister, R. (1998) 'From equality to social exclusion: New Labour and the welfare state', *Critical Social Policy*, 18(2) pp. 215-226; and Jordan, B. (1996) *A theory of Poverty and Social Exclusion*, Cambridge: Polity.
- 7 Alexiadou, N. (2002) 'Social inclusion and social exclusion in England: tensions in education policy', *Journal of Education Policy*, (17)1, pp.71-86.