

24/04/2011

I disagree with the roll back of the legislation role back to 2006 legislation. This role back would be detrimental to children and the ir relationship with parents particularly fathers, who seem to have less rights to children than mothers purely based on gender.

*It might be noted that child homicide has reduced by almost 50% since the introduction of the much fairer 2006 reforms according to NSW figures. The NSW Child Death Team Annual Reports stated:*

- In 2005, twelve children aged between 0-17 died by fatal assault*
- In 2007, nine children aged between 0-17 died by fatal assault. 2007 had the lowest child mortality rate observed over 1996-2007. This is the year directly after the reforms were instigated.*
- In 2009, seven children aged between 0-17 died in six incidents.*

*These results indicate the 2006 reforms reduced the lethal danger to children. It is our belief that child homicides could well go back to their pre 2006 levels with the new proposed reforms. This would be an appalling outcome for our children."*

*Bettina Arndt was right when she said, "No gender has a monopoly on vice." Both mothers and fathers are responsible for terrible tragedies involving their children. Whilst many have suffered grief because of these tragedies involving the death of innocent children, this is not cause for ill-considered and hasty change to a family law reform process that has actually reduced child homicides."*

*Warwick Marsh of Dad's for Kids stated recently, "It is often presumed that fathers are the main offenders in child homicide cases. However this is not the case. According to Men's Health Australia, the Australian Institute of Criminology (AIC) showed in its 2006-2007 annual report there were eleven homicides involving a mother and eleven homicides involving a male family member. However, when the 'male family member' category was broken down, five perpetrators were biological fathers and five were de-facto partners of the mother who lived with the child.*

*Regards*