

Dear Committee Members,

I am pleased that the Senate has referred the **Human Services (Enhanced Service Delivery) Bill 2007** to a committee for its consideration and the receiving of submissions from the public even though, time is against others who would like to participate.

The Committee has been tasked with examining the bill's provisions which relates to;

- a) the intended scope and purposes of the card;
- b) the information to be included in the cards register, card's chip and the surface of the card;
- c) the range of offences which prevent requiring such a card for identifying purposes and;
- d) preventing other improper uses.

As a person who clearly remembers the public/parliamentary debate re the Australia Card in the late 1980's, it is my belief that the government is attempting to have its own version of that card.

As the Australian Senate and the people of this country opposed such a card in the late 1980's, the current government's position and argument for a replacement of its Medicare Card and other cards needs to be challenged and is, to a agree flawed..

As time is against those Australians to lodge a submission with this committee, I'm yet to be convinced for the need to have a card.

Since the government announced its intentions, it has been disappointing that many thousands of Australians haven't responded to a issue that is clearly, going to affect them all especially when it comes to accessing government services such as Health and Welfare.

Whilst I acknowledge that there are other important issues facing us all, I do oppose the various Health Cards provided under Repatriation law being replaced with a Access Card.

As a person who first became interested in veterans law and various issues affecting them – back in 1992, the silence from veterans and their ex-service organizations is of concern but perhaps they haven't been given an opportunity to participate considering the limited time imposed by the government.

Noting the comments from the Secretary of the Department of Veterans' Affairs at the last round of Estimate's hearings, the ALP questioner was directed to the Department of Human Services as project manager for answers.

From reading through various Hansard records from the committees, the ALP questioner was given a interesting response from the Department of Veterans' Affairs that there could be some exceptions etc. Finding this of interest, it highlights that the government is attempting to rush its project through even though, more legislative changes will be required.

With the House of Representative's now debating the legislation, I note with concern the comments from the Minister for Human Services where he will amend the legislation when the Third Reading stage is put.

As the report from this committee will provide some interesting material, the passage of this bill should be delayed.

On following the debate re the Access Card; what meanings do we give to this card along with an National I.D card and Smartcard?

The definitions of a I.D card is; *a card identifying its carrier, having on it such information as name, age, and often an address and a physical description or photograph;*

a Smartcard is; *a small plastic card containing a microchip that can store personal data and bank-account details, enabling it to be used for identification and to pay for purchases;*

a National I.D Card is; *owned, maintained, or controlled by the central government of a nation*

In a news report of February 27, 2007, I note this detail.

Some young people to get 'smartcards'

February 27, 2007 02:15pm

Article from: AAP

ONLY under-18s who have Medicare cards will be able to get their own government services smartcard under a measure agreed after a federal coalition backbench revolt.

The measure would not apply to under-18s who did not already have their own Medicare card, a joint party room spokesman said today.

Liberal backbencher Mal Washer was among those pushing for people as young as 15 to have one of the Government's proposed access cards so they could visit doctors without parental consent.

But other backbenchers, including Nationals Senator Barnaby Joyce, argued that minors should not be able to see a doctor without their parents knowing.

The access card will replace a string of welfare and health cards for adults under legislation being considered by parliament.

Human Services Minister Ian Campbell is expected to announce the new measure in his third reading speech.

Whilst this provides a interesting position, as a parent and grandparent, I wouldn't support such a provision which over-rides parental consent.

The access card established by this bill has none of these features and has limited uses which are clearly described by the bill. The card:

- ✳ will not be a national identity card;
- ✳ will not be compulsory for every Australian;
- ✳ will not be an electronic health record;
- ✳ will not record your financial details;
- ✳ will not be required to be carried at all times;
- ✳ will not be required to transact normal everyday business;
- ✳ will not be required to be shown to anyone other than for the provision of health and social services benefits provided by the Australian Government and to confirm concession status.

On reading through this extract, it remains to be seen but even with the government's stated position, it can be challenged on this extract.

As to the card itself, it will only have limited information on display—less than all state and territory drivers licences currently show. The bill provides that the only mandatory information on the card will be

- ✳ a photo of the card owner,
- ✳ the owner's name,
- ✳ his or her digitised signature and the
- ✳ card's expiry date and number.

A future government will not be able to require any further details to be added to the surface of the card without full debate in this parliament and an amendment to the legislation.

Didn't the government invite representatives from the banking industry to an briefing?

David Tones,