

ASHLEY, YOUTH JUSTICE AND DETENTION COMMITTEE - LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL, MET IN THE TERRACE ROOM, 2ND FLOOR, PARLIAMENT HOUSE IN ADELAIDE ON 21 FEBRUARY 2007

DISCUSSION WITH Mr CHRISTOPHER KLEINIG

CHAIR (Mr Hall) - Thank you very much and welcome to everybody. I would like to welcome to the Table our first witness today, Christopher Kleinig, and we have already talked about his birthday. Thank you, Christopher, for making yourself available today. I know you have had a look at our terms of reference. You might just let committee members know your background, and then we will just have a general discussion on the way you see our terms of reference and then I will let members ask you some questions.

Mr KLEINIG - Thank you very much. My name is Christopher Kleinig; my initial training is as a social worker so I have a degree in social work from the University of South Australia. I also have a post-graduate teaching qualification from the University of Adelaide, and I suspect I have said on my resumé that I have almost completed the masters, but I am not sure I am going to get to complete that. I am half a unit off. My research on my masters was education and training programs for the deaf, so I have a reasonably broad background.

My working history is that I started working for the Government of South Australia for the old Community Welfare Department in about 1973. I resigned not long after because I was actually working in a detention centre on one of the old remand homes that the community welfare ran down at Glandore. I found it a tad intolerable turning the keys on kids as young as eight and six and things like that, as we could do in those days. I actually resigned, went back to study and then returned to community welfare, I think in 1975, and worked in the community with young people and offenders. I completed an associate diploma in social work and then I went on and did a Bachelor of Social Work after that.

I ran the community welfare office down at Victor Harbour, which is about 80 kilometres south of Adelaide, and worked in a holiday area around there. I worked with young offenders and their families and with children at risk, as they were known under the legislation in those days. I have worked in a number of other programs since then. I have worked with young people at Noarlunga; I have worked as an assessment social worker when I was based up at McGill in what was known then as McNally Training Centre. I worked as a manager of the intensive neighbourhood care program down in the Port Adelaide area.

From there I went and worked for two years in the Solomon Islands as an Australian volunteer abroad. When I came back, I spent some time with the Crippled Children's Association. I then worked with the Drug and Alcohol Services Council for a couple of years as an education officer working with youth workers before going into TAFE. I have been in TAFE for about 16 or 17 years.

That is a potted history of my background, which I think is moderately well covered in my resumé.

Once I became aware of your terms of reference, I was interested in commenting on a number of areas. I have a brief comment on legislation and I have a number of comments or things that I would be happy to say about the Intensive Neighbourhood Care (INC) program as it ran when I worked there in 1985. That is an alternative to institutional detention, that's how it was run then. The scheme, I believe, doesn't run in the same format in South Australia anymore, and hopefully some of your other witnesses today could comment on how and why, because I have an opinion on that but it may not be accurate.

CHAIR - What was it called again?

Mr KLEINIG - The Intensive Neighbourhood Care scheme, otherwise known as the INC scheme if you like acronyms.

Mr WILKINSON - Did you think that was good program?

Mr KLEINIG - I did think it was a very good program. I was planning to talk in a little more depth about that, and I am certainly happy to answer questions about it. Unfortunately my wife is not available, but she was also involved in the program for much longer than I was, and was in from the very early days. She would be able to give much more in-depth insight into it.

I would then like to make a few comments about education and training in detention, I have just had some experiences working in TAFE. I started off working in TAFE at Regency TAFE and made a number of visits to the Cavan training centre because I still knew some of the people who were in the education unit there. So I have a number of comments about that if you wish to hear those.

CHAIR - Yes, that would be good.

Mr KLEINIG - My first comment is really about the legislation, and my comment was that the old Children's Protection and Young Offenders Act in South Australia which was the act we operated under at the time when I was working as an assessment social worker in 1984 required that an assessment report be submitted to a judge or senior magistrate before they could sentence anyone under 18 to a detention order.

The assessment panels that prepared those reports were chaired by experienced social workers or psychologists, and what they drew on was an incredibly broad base of information that included psychiatrist reports, psychologist reports, school reports, social background reports that were prepared by community-based welfare workers or social workers. They met with the family to prepare the reports, and the family, the young person, and generally all of those people met as a panel to discuss the issues and put together some recommendations that would then go into a formal report for the judge or magistrate. The act required that that had to be done before a judge could impose any sentence of detention, whether that was to be suspended or not. I saw that as an incredibly positive thing because what it did was seek a breadth of information and it went just beyond getting a psychiatrist's or a psychologist's opinion, but went to the school and could even invite opinions from community-based people such as youth

workers or ministers of religion. People who knew the young person could then be invited to make a contribution to that panel.

I think it was really important that they were chaired by experienced people. You wouldn't want to take a new graduate from social work school or straight out of university with a psychology degree and give them that job. I think it was important that people had some sort of community experience or experience in working with people in the community who chaired those because it was also about having a knowledge of some of the community resources and being able to be creative in recommendations to the court and having a clear focus on the best interests of the children.

I worked as an assistant social worker for about a year. I was based up at the youth training centre at the time and that is when I became reasonably familiar with the staff in the education centre. In chairing those panels they were some of the major contributors to the report, as well as the residential care workers who, when the young person was remanded in detention, would contribute to that report as well. That is my significant comment about legislation. I don't know the Youth Justice Act in Tasmania so I do not know whether you have similar provisions or not.

Mr WILKINSON - I don't know it really well but I was here a number of years ago when we followed the South Australian model with the Youth Justice Act so ours is pretty well a mirror, but for a couple of changes, to South Australia's as it is now.

Mr KLEINIG - The Intensive Neighbourhood Care scheme was set up, as I understand, as an alternative to institutional detention. The scheme had two arms: the remand side and the detention side. The scheme was one where families were recruited and paid to provide accommodation in their own homes for one young offender or, in those days, we also had a category of 'adolescents at risk' and they could also access the program. That was either on remand or for the duration of their detention order. It was for a period of time determined by the court and was probably related to their order being under the guardianship of the minister, but I will focus on young offenders.

My observations of the scheme were that it worked really well. The scheme had very clear guidelines and parameters. When one young person was placed with a family it generally worked very well. Occasionally, as it happened - and there were variations because the scheme was running four different regions around four metropolitan areas; I was working in the western region, down at Port Adelaide - when there were two young people placed with one family I saw that as a problem because there was often too much competition for the attention of the parents. I saw that as an erosion of the program and that was where some of the problems arose. My observation would be that, if you were considering any sort of program like that as an alternative to detention, when you have those guidelines that there is some activity enforcing those guidelines. One young person with a family, particularly an offender who is either on bail or on a detention order, I think is incredibly demanding.

The money that was paid to the families in those days was quite good and nowadays I think the equivalent would need to be in the order of \$300-plus a week. It is an incredible impost on the families. Some families, what we call 'INC remand families', they would wait; they wouldn't have a young person with them, they would get a phone call at, say, six o'clock at night saying, 'We have a young person here who we think is

eligible for INC remand, can you be in youth court at ten o'clock tomorrow morning?'. So those families would effectively be on call so there was an on-call allowance paid to them.

Mr WILKINSON - Did they get the family in to speak with the person who was going to go into their care so they could see whether they mixed or bonded with that person?

Mr KLEINIG - Yes, and they could refuse and that was the other part of it. The really important part of it was with the recruitment, the training and support of families. Couples were recruited through advertising campaigns, through word of mouth and certainly I am aware that in the southern region of the program my wife used to say quite consistently that some of the best families she had were the ones that were recruited by the other INC parents. They knew another couple and they came. They would then be offered a place after an interview and an initial assessment in a training program. That training program was generally run in the evenings but it included a lot of information about the Young Offenders Act and the Justice Act and also about the department at the time and getting the people to share with each other and explore their values. The training program was also part of the weeding out process because as you gave the families more and more information they either said, 'I'm not sure I can do this' or 'Yes, I want to be in it'. We found fairly consistently that if there were young children in the family that could be okay, but if there were older children in the family - some of those beyond 18 had moved out of home - in the age range 10 to 17, I did not consider it always to be a good placement or a good opportunity because often there was too much competition between the children and the young offender placed in that home. So families where they were experienced parents, their kid had grown up and they were maybe even grandparents, generally were very good in families and it was really important that those people were supported. So there was an INC manager for each region and those people had an on-call roster so that if there was an issue that cropped up - say the young person had not come home at two o'clock in the morning - they would be on the phone and they would deal with it. They would involve the police if necessary and things like that.

So the support of those families was really important and certainly when my wife Margaret was first involved in the program she actually spent 14 months on call without a break. Then someone said, 'Shouldn't you be getting an on-call allowance', and that was all dealt with eventually but she did the first 14 months on call. For 24 hours a day the phone could go off and sometimes I would go with her because we were fortunate in that we did not have children and we actually spent a lot of our energy focusing on work and working with young people and their families.

CHAIR - Perhaps we could have members questions whilst we are dealing with that.

Mr WILKINSON - How did you find that then because you would be a good sounding board in relation to children? I have acted for a lot of kids who have been in strife because of my criminal law background but, as in everything, they are all different. However, sometimes you can find these common threads - you talk about their families are not good, they are dysfunctional and because of the family life and because of their peers and their families themselves being involved with crime, it is going to be pretty hard for them straightaway to turn the corner. As a whole, what do you think about those children?

Mr KLEINING - Significantly, I would stress the need for some clear limits and guidelines because one of the consistent things in my 30 years in working with people is the need for clarity of the guidelines. When I worked in community welfare what came across to me was that young people were successful in playing one parent off against the other. They were very successful in creating loopholes and then walking through them and the parents, because they were confused, because they were not confident in their role of parenting, of putting limits, or because they needed to be liked or whatever, allowed that to happen so placing those limits was incredibly important. When I am talking to parents they often talk about their children and say, 'Well, they are 17 and they are doing this' and I say, 'When they are 25 they will be saying that the limits that you have been putting on them were really appreciated. Certainly over the years that would have been my observation.

The other significant thing I find is - and it is something I was going to talk about later because it is something that the Smith Family have put together some research on. It is the process of finding a mentor or the young person developing a relationship with some person. It does not have to be a family member, it does not have to be a youth worker. You will occasionally hear stories: it could be quite simply the person on their way down the street each morning; it could be some old guy or a person who says good morning to them, who greets them and acknowledges them. It allows them to form a link, an anchor, to something that is normal, to someone who has a sense of community values. It is someone they can go back to, someone they believe that they can trust. It actually becomes a basis for their making decisions to change their behaviour, or it gives them an anchor while they seek to change their behaviour. I think some of those things are really important. I think there needs to be a process of being able to link young people with mentors. I know that is not easy nowadays because we have incredible concerns about predatory sexual behaviour where people may go to work for OARS - Offenders Aids and Rehabilitations - or some of those organisations. There needs to be incredibly good screening. You find that some of those relationships just do work and allow the young person to have that anchor, that degree of stability, to change part of their behaviour. They would be the two significant ones.

Mrs JAMIESON - I would agree with your theory anyway about the brick wall, that you need to know where the brick wall is and how far they can go in their limits and what have you. With all the changes in society and the fact that we have become a much more of a secular society - I am not talking about religious conviction as such but it was a focal point and there were kids' activities in Sunday school - do you think some of that sort of thing is missing in the community now?

Mr KLEINING - I think there were values that are and were associated with that. They probably are not espoused as they were when I was growing up; certainly I would say that it is one of the big differences. I continue to be amazed at my present employment because I still run into significant numbers of young people, maybe different young people because they are in education and training, who have amazing values and an amazing sense of personal integrity and commitment to being green and to the environment.

Mrs JAMIESON - But that is in an older age group. If you go back to the 10-year-olds, we are trying to get kids before they get to the detention centre, but they just seem to be almost directionless - some; I am not saying everybody of course.

Mr KLEINING - If you are being secular then what are some of the secular activities they can be involved in? Can you actually pick up on sport or on some other activity? Certainly they would be the things I would consider as alternatives.

Mr DEAN - What serves as a limitation on the types of offences or background of these youths being placed in a family? What was the limit?

Mr KLEINING - Yes, there were, one that we knew when we met some of these young people. That is the reason for the previous comment about whether the families got to meet with them. There were some young people who had been so damaged, because of either abuse or distrust, that they actually could not cope with family. For them there was almost no alternative but to say, 'Fine, it's institutional detention'. So there are young people for who the distrust is just so high. If you stick them with a mum and dad or you stick them with a couple in a family situation, it is foreign and they will fight against it. That was really important and so part of that assessment process was important too. When you got information about that, or when you got messages from the young person or indicators about their behaviour that they had been abused or were so distrustful, then that became part of the selection or weeding out process. Does that answer it?

Mr DEAN - Yes, that answers it, but what would be the extent of criminal acts that might identify whether they should be placed with a family? If you have a 14-year-old or a 10-year-old or 15-year-old who has been involved in a whole heap of stealing and so on, they would probably be suitable?

Mr KLEINING - Yes.

Mr DEAN - But if you then had a youth 14 years of age involved in rape, he would not be suitable?

Mr KLEINING - Potentially suitable.

Mr DEAN - Is there a cut off?

Mr KLEINING - No. My understanding was that there was no preclusion on that ground. If the family said, 'We won't have someone who's allegedly committed that sort of crime', that is fine, the family would make that decision. Certainly, as managers or as people involved in the program, we would be strong in advising them if they had young children in the family and were concerned about that. We had a number of INC families who had no children, so they would say, 'That's not an issue to us', and they could take those people in.

My understanding was that the legislation actually set that. When the judge or a magistrate was considering remand in custody, generally the prosecutors or the people in the court knew roughly what the tariff was - this person has x offences, so x plus one equals detention in custody or remand in custody. The court would then order the assessment panel report, and then the assessment panel would consider all of those

circumstances. But even for a remand in custody, if the magistrate or the judge was considering that, then it could be offered as an alternative if a family was available.

Mr DEAN - Where a child was placed with a family, when then would be the situation for the removal of that child from that family? If you had a child you would then, I guess, be able to simply say, 'I or we cannot control this child or this person'. Is there more to it than that, or was that a value?

Mr KLEINIG - No. If the family basically said, 'We're unable to control this child because they're running away', or, 'Their behaviour is just so extreme within the family', then they would actually be removed and they would go back. We would have to get them back before the court because their order would then need to be amended by the magistrate. They would probably be remanded in custody. It wouldn't necessarily preclude them going to another family because sometimes you will make bad placements and the mix wasn't right.

Mr DEAN - That's not dissimilar to the system we had running in Tasmania. I don't know how well it operates now - foster family placement and so on.

CHAIR - Perhaps we can draw some parallels and some analogies with that.

Mrs JAMIESON - How long would they actually stay? Was there a prescribed time at all? If you bonded with that child, could you keep them longer and adopt them, sort of?

Mr KLEINIG - That occasionally did happen. There is a story about that. Remand was determined by the court, so it was a two-week to three-week remand. Detention was for the period of the detention order, normally, so if it was a six-month detention order then that would be normally the length of placement with the family. There were some extended remands that I was aware of; one instance I recall was for causing death by dangerous driving. It went before the Supreme Court, but the young person was actually on remand so the remand order was continued. They were with a family for about seven months before it went to court. It meant that we had a very good report from the family on their behaviour in the community, and it certainly better informed the assessment panel report we could put before the Supreme Court, so we did see that there were some big positives in it.

There one or two instances where the child bonded with the family so well. Part of their training was that you would not be able to remain in the INC scheme. They were then advised or encouraged to move over and become foster parents, or as the child approached 18 and if the child chose to attach to the family and the family was happy with that then that became a private arrangement. However, the family probably moved out of being intensive neighbourhood care parents.

The other observations on secure care are really part of the point that was made before. There are some young people who can't go to families. Sometimes your only alternative is institutional care or a group home or some sort of program where they are supervised by paid staff. I believe Mary Lindeman is coming today. She was involved in a training program in detention for young people and that was about their behaviour change. Certainly my observations and understanding were that they had some incredible successes. My wife tells a wonderful story of having to pick up one of those

young people to take them back to the youth court for a hearing. She actually picked them up from work, took them to the city watch house, at which point the policewoman said, 'Who's the prisoner?', because Margaret must have been on a day off and this other young person worked in a doctor's surgery and was immaculately dressed. Certainly there were some very positive outcomes that I was aware of from that program with young women. I think there was a similar program set up at McNally as well.

One of the comments I started to make earlier was about the Smith Family. The Smith Family is based in Sydney and some of their research is about the importance of education to help people break out of a long-term poverty cycle, and their Learning for Life programs and things like that. The committee may be interested in contacting the Smith Family because they have a research unit. They have a couple of dedicated staff in Sydney and they use PhD or masters students on placements as research assistants. They have done a lot of research about using mentors and providing other support - fees, funding for kids - to people for educational training in the community. I believe there may be some parallels with some of the supports you would provide for young people who may be in detention. I think there may be some parallels that could be drawn from their research. If any barriers exist, young people often say, 'It's too hard. I can't do it. I can't go to school'. If it's TAFE in South Australia then, 'I can't afford the fees. I can't afford the kit if I have to have safety boots'. Any processes that minimise the impact of those small barriers are important, because they can become an excuse. It is probably important to look at ways to reduce them or get rid of them.

When I worked at TAFE I made visits to the training centre to talk to the Education department about the use of online study and one-to-one support from the teachers in the detention centre's education centre to get young people to consider completing subjects or courses within the vocational education and training area. A lot of the young people in detention have good hand skills, good hand-eye coordination, but certainly don't have a good academic performance. We should encourage using online resources and computer-based learning with one-to-one support, possibly linking them with community mentors so that on their release there are people who can help them make that transition from detention back into the community. Then we must have a process of being able to reduce some of those barriers. Certainly here in South Australia, as a result of the Mulligan inquiry into abuse of young people in State care, one of the responses of the Government has been to put in a rapid-response program whereby any person who has been on a guardianship order and wants to undertake a vocational education and training course at TAFE will be able to have it free of charge - that is if they are under 25 years.

Mr WILKINSON - That is a State initiative?

Mr KLEINIG - That is a State initiative here. It only happened in November 2005, I think.

Mr WILKINSON - You have a terrific CV and have been involved in the area of youth detention and alternative methods of sentencing for many years now. If you were to start up a fresh system in Tasmania what would be the major things you would be looking at?

Mr KLEINIG - I would be looking at a similar program to the intensive neighbourhood care program, which is a community-based program. For those people you had in detention, I would probably be looking at a similar program to the guided-group interaction program so that there is active intervention, almost coercive intervention, with the young person

to coerce them, actively encourage them, to change their behaviour. As adults, I don't think it matters that a young person is sticking their finger up at us if they are not offending when they go back into the community. If they think they have beaten the system and got out early, from my perspective it is absolutely irrelevant. If we can offer them a system that allows them to change their behaviour, maybe even to get released early and go back into the community and continue some of that behaviour which means that they don't reoffend, then that is a significant outcome. Then you are in a better position to work with them in the community, and that is where I think having mentors is important as well. They would probably be the three things.

Mrs JAMIESON - There seem to be many more kids in detention now with disabilities - psychiatric or acquired brain damage that may or may not have been diagnosed. Do you have any comment about mixing them with just the normal tough hardened crim type of person?

Mr KLEINING - About 18 per cent of the Australian population who probably have a disability. Certainly our records in TAFE show that only about 5 per cent or 6 per cent declare it. Because of the range of disabilities, we go from mental health issues to physical issues to maybe things like Asbergers and learning disorders, I do not have a significant comment I could make. I would be uncomfortable mixing them in with someone who is probably a hardened criminal, say, heading for Risdon or for Yatala and often you pick that information up fairly early on in terms of a person's career in that some young people do have an offending career. I work with a number of young people who ended up going on to Yatala and you think after, 'Okay, that's really unfortunate' but I also work with a number of young people whom Margaret and I would still have contact with 15 or 20 years afterwards. So in terms of our relationships, we also saw those relationships as important and that is where I am happy to talk about that process of having community mentors, of the relationships between staff and young people are very important but the clarity is really important. Your staff might not agree with the sentence, they might not agree with whatever but they do need to have clarity about what their purpose is and their purpose is to work with the young person, to assist the young person, to turn their behaviour around and to start to generate behaviour that is acceptable in the community.

Mrs JAMIESON - It is fairly challenging sometimes -

Mr KLEINING - It is very challenging with a disability but it is also challenging when it is a staff member and you are not getting on with a person you are on shift with and things like that - you do not like your boss, you do not like the public service conditions you work under. I find it really important for people to go back to their job description and say, 'Hang on, why am I here? What am I getting paid for? I am being paid as a public servant to do this job and this is the job'. I am getting passionate, I am sorry.

Laughter.

CHAIR - Any further comments or questions to Chris?

Mr WILKINSON - The courts and sentencing under the act to me have not worked on a lot of occasions. The community is saying to members of parliament, 'Lock them away and throw the keys away'. They keep forgetting that the person gets out after a certain

amount of time and probably because of what they did it starts all over again. But in relation to different methods of sentencing do you believe there is any other jurisdiction that has a good sentencing process in place? In other words, we are looking at Operation Flinders later on today. In Tasmania for a while there was the Project Hahn where they would take the children away and give them experiences for self esteem, confidence and respect and team building, that type of behaviour. To me, if it can be continuous that type of penalty would be far more beneficial than just sending them away.

Mr KLEINIG - I would agree with that and I think that is important. I think the difficulty probably is in renewing and refreshing those sorts of programs. The Intensive Neighbourhood Care program ran in South Australia for a number of years but it does not run any more. Did someone think it was too expensive or whatever? I do not have the answer to that and I alluded to that right at the beginning, but one of the things that I found really important was that the senior judge and the senior magistrates in the youth court or the children's court, as it was in those days, were always involved in discussions about changes to the legislation; they were involved in training programs with staff; they were involved in training programs with the assessment of social workers and some of those key people. I believe that it is really important to have some of the key people involved. They have a legal perspective. We have people like Judge Crowe and Judge Newman and some of the senior magistrates and they were very good to work with because you knew where stood, you knew when you had done good reports and you were prepared to stand up in court and talk to those sorts of things.

Mr KLEINIG - I find it important to have those people on side. We may have a high volume of people here and in Tasmania with your population you mightn't be able to have as many specialised judges and magistrates but I do think it is important to have them involved. I don't have an answer as a politician how you deal with the people, except to say we are going to make the best decisions we can because the best interests of the children as future citizens are still very important. The cost of keeping them locked up is horrendous anyway.

Mr DEAN - I think you're saying that the program is successful, how is that measured?

Mr KLEINIG - Probably individually with the young person and recidivism. I don't have the statistics on that. I suspect the department may have kept some statistics on that, certainly there would have been initially in the early stages of the program. Probably there would have been a measure that said 'Six months after your release from detention or whatever had you reoffended, was there any recidivism?' There would have been some recidivism measures done. There was a research branch in the department at that time.

Mr DEAN - The reason I am asking is if it was so successful - I am not saying it wasn't successful because the foster system back home in Tasmania was reasonably successful - I wonder why it was allowed to fall apart. You are saying it may have been money -

Mr KLEINIG - It may have been money and I would say there is an aspect of management. When you allow an erosion of the standards and, say, allow two young people to be placed with a family, I think that is a bad decision. Those decisions then start to discredit the program because when there are problems with it people say, 'See, it doesn't work'. Whereas, when you maintain the guidelines and the rigidity around them, it was a

different matter. There were community-based welfare workers that I didn't want to deal with because you knew they wouldn't tell you the truth. They would tell you a story to get their kid in the family.

Mr DEAN - Do you believe - and you might not want to answer this - that there is a mentality there now that, rather than take that sort of an option with a child who is causing problems and the costs involved with it, it is better off just to stick them into a home?

Mr KLEINIG - I don't believe it is. We have just had the Mulligan inquiry - and it is still going on - and we know that there was significant abuse that occurred within those homes. We can't manage that. When you have a detention centre that is built with individual cells, it is slightly different but they can still be incredibly abusive. My belief is that any community-based option, if you can make it work, is preferable but because there are some people who will be so recalcitrant and intent on not being controlled, for those people when are you locking them up I think it is important to have as much in the way of training or education that will encourage them or foster behaviour change, but you still won't win with them all.

Mrs JAMIESON - Your involvement in TAFE and your thoughts about its involvement as an educational process in the detention centres and also the reintegration of students who have come from the detention centre back into the real world in TAFE, are the kids well accepted? Does anybody know their background, for example?

Mr KLEINIG - Not necessarily. I know because often they will talk to me, but we would have people in TAFE who were on home detention orders so they would have bracelets on their ankles or whatever. We will have young people who do have an offending history. If they don't talk about it, it certainly would not come out. But I do see TAFE and that opportunity for online learning, computer-based learning while they are in detention and then that transition into the community by studying by attendance is a linkage that could be utilised while someone is in detention and then to have them coming in to study or training when they are out of detention.

Mrs JAMIESON - Is it being fostered by the Government at all?

Mr KLEINIG - Not to my knowledge.

Mrs JAMIESON - Would you like to see further involvement?

Mr KLEINIG - I would like to see it. That is why, when I worked at Regency, I went to Cavan because I was looking to foster relationships between even Regency TAFE, but TAFE and Families SA - or Community Welfare, as it was in those days.

CHAIR - Thank you very much for your evidence, Chris.

THE WITNESS WITHDREW.