Men's Rights Agency

Family Law | Pre Mediation Advice | Child Support
Domestic Violence | False Allegations | Discrimination

P.O. Box 28, Waterford, Q 4133 Australia
Tel: 07 3805 5611 Fax: 07 3200 8769 Mob: 0409 269 621
Email: admin@mensrights.com.au Web: www.mensrights.com.au

26th April, 2011.

Committee Secretary
Senate Legal and Constitutional Committees
PO Box 6100
Parliament House
Canberra ACT 2600
Australia

Senators,

Family Law Legislation Amendment (Family Violence and Other Measures) Bill 2011 [Provisions]

This is the fourth time since the announcement last year of Richard Chisholm's review into the relationship between family law and family violence that interested parties have been asked to put forward their views about the Attorney General's proposed changes to the Family Law Act 1975, which includes the more recent shared parental responsibility amendments of 2006...

I have repeatedly made the complaint that there seems little point in responding to inquiries when the outcome has already been decided and our views are ignored in favour of pandering to a small, but noisy and well funded group of women, who are vehemently opposed to the notion of shared parenting and who rely incessantly on false claims that men are the only perpetrators of abuse and women the only victims.

Since the introduction shared parental responsibility legislation in 2006, which was really only a rewording and re-emphasis of the old guardianship laws, the courts once "responsibility" is apportioned, are obliged to consider firstly, shared parenting time or secondly, substantial contact (about a third of the time). The final outcome remains with the judge and he is required to take into account issues of domestic violence or abuse allegations against parent or child, before making any decisions for shared, substantial or any contact at all finally relying on what is in the child's best interest.

The changes were introduced after an extensive inquiry, chaired by Mrs Kay Hull MP, wherein fathers and father's representatives felt they had been given an opportunity to be heard for the first time since the introduction of the family law legislation. Mothers and their representatives were given equal opportunity to put forward their views in open forums.

It is now forty years since women's groups discovered the money spinning and coercive power available to them using the totally incorrect claims that one in three women are victims of domestic violence. Erin Pizzey, the founder of the first women's refuge in Chiswick UK in 1971 has written frequently about the calculated motivation of the more extreme in the feminist movement who infiltrate a very genuine service that was attempting to provide safe haven for women in fear of their lives, in order to fund their own activities. Erin Pizzey found herself ousted from the refuge service she founded, when she wrote in her book *Prone to Violence* that out of the first 100 residents in her refuge, 62 were just as violent as the men they claimed to be in fear of.

Extreme feminists who have no love for men or acceptance of their worth, apart from as money earners have in the intervening years, built a strong movement covering many westernised countries; universities have allowed their courses to be filled with reference to false claims about the level of violence to women and children whilst denying the level of violence perpetrated by women against men and children; easily identifiable academics have joined in promoting the notion of women as victims and men as perpetrators using their access to tax payer funds through research grants to develop questionnaires designed to come to a predetermined conclusion. (See the One in Three website for details exposing the publication of false statistics www.oneinthree.com.au)

Any academic veering off course is quickly silenced with threats of loss of tenure and removal of grants. Politicians are a soft touch when asked to respond or fund domestic violence programs to protect women and THEIR children. No politician wants to be seen to take a questioning or a harder line when asked to support additional monies for what is on the face of it, a worthy cause. But, ask yourself, of all the money spent on reducing domestic violence – how much has been achieved? Why there are no services protecting men and their children from violence? Do we see any validated reports of refuge usage, by how many genuine victims; how many nights accommodation is provided, and what is the outcome for the people using the accommodation and counselling services? As far as I am aware the domestic violence service industry has never been asked to justify or validate the huge

amounts of money handed out to them. Neither have their programs been evaluated to judge their efficacy.

Is the current system working or has it failed miserably because of a failure to address both sides of the problem? I believe that is the case. Without treating both sides of the equation, violent men and women and victim men and women, we are ignoring significant areas of need that if attended to may prove a more successful response in reducing the incidence of domestic violence.

We do not and never have denied that some men are violent towards their spouse, but then comparable numbers of women are just as violent and abusive, not only towards their partner but even more so towards their children. Add in the equation of mother's boyfriends and one is faced with the seemingly unpalatable information that mothers and mothers' boyfriends present a far greater risk to children than biological fathers. (I refer you to the Men's Rights Agency response to the Richard Chisholm's *Family Law, family violence review* – see attached)

So why is the Attorney General being coerced by a group of women, many of whom have endured their own battles in the family court, into believing that the family court is giving children to violent fathers. Why is there no mention or consideration of violent mothers? Why is there no evidence supporting this claim?

Oh sorry, I forgot after reading some of the recent decisions about mothers/women who have seriously harmed their spouse/partner or children it appears we must excuse their transgressions because they are mad not bad! Women walk free - fathers get thirty plus years for the same/similar crime!

There is absolutely no reason for society to continue with this fraud and false belief that women and mothers are beyond reproach and must be excused any transgressions. Feminist jurisprudence is perverting our system of justice and any man now accused of a crime against a woman or a child knows he is more likely to be found guilty than not, even though there is no independent evidence to support his conviction.

Domestic violence legislation is the starting point, where false allegations abound and are frequently made to gain an advantage in family court hearings; remove the father from the home and gain possession of the residence; access emergency funds or crisis

accommodation or even to gain residency status in Australia. (Once again, I refer you to the Men's Rights Agency response to the Richard Chisholm inquiry for more detailed information –see attached).

I come back to my original question why has the Attorney General allowed himself to be coerced into believing the changes to the family law act in 2006 have placed more women and children at risk. Cleary he was visibly moved when Darcey Freeman was thrown from the Westgate Bridge by her father. Every thinking, feeling person was distressed, but I don't recall such an emotional reaction when Gabriella Garcia strapped her 22 month old son to her chest and jumped from the same bridge less than 12 months previously. She jumped because she feared the father was going to make an application for residency of the child – he in fact had no intention of doing so.

The Attorney General has fallen victim to continued pressure from a group of women who see no value in fatherhood, especially when it is far more profitable for them to deny fathers all contact with their children. He has responded with a knee jerk reaction that makes him feel good. Consideration of the children's best interest and their need to have both a father and a mother in their life has fallen victim to the increasingly dangerous elevation of domestic violence to include all claims and beliefs, justified or reasonable or not; allowing false allegations to be made without penalty; the removal of the suggested friendly parent provisions and the centrepiece - the *sacred cow* that we must not blame mothers because they are not really bad people, just victims of circumstances beyond their control!

In this day and age I personally am surprised that most thinking women are not as annoyed as I am for my gender to be taken en masse as being in need of special consideration because we are seen as victims of outside influences and have no choice in the outcomes. What unmitigated rubbish and an insult to us all. The people who should be condemned are those who produce self serving studies designed to come to a predetermined outcome and those who rely on finding, and convincing more women to unnecessarily believe they are victims as a means to increase funding and secure their future earning capacity.

If the abundant monies made available to domestic violence services were more closely monitored and directed towards programs that are inclusive of both genders, as victims and perpetrators, we would have far more success in reducing the incidence of domestic violence. After all, that is what the money is for isn't it? Or is it just to pander to women's

groups in the hope of retaining their vote and being seen to be sympathetic to women's issues without question?

I often ask myself the question if we have female politicians, (Emily's list- members included) insisting they are in parliament to look after women's interests and male politicians becoming the knights in shining armour to protect the so called 'damsels in distress', just who in our parliament is looking after men's issues? No one as far as I can see!

That is not how democracy is supposed to work. Politicians are supposed to represent both genders and protect the interest of Australian citizens without bias.

The Attorney General has predetermined changes to the Family Law Act are needed based on false and misleading information. He has presumptively foreshortened the time allocated to allow the 2006 changes to bed-in properly and moved with unseemly haste to introduce changes which we predict will undo whatever benefits or minimal increases that have occurred in parent participation in their children lives over the past 4 - 5 years. (I refer you to the Men's Rights Agency response to the AG's release of the Family Law (Family violence) Bill – see attached.)

In our opinion, not only has the outcome been predetermined based on false claims that the family court is giving children to fathers who are violent towards them or the mother, but the Attorney General is asking the people of Australia to 'trust him' with his claim that 73% of responses to the proposed bill are in favour. If he is so sure of his claims why has HE REFUSED TO PUBLISH THE SUBMISSIONS?

The same secretive behaviour has occurred with submissions made to the "Chisholm Inquiry into Family Law and Family Violence – NOT PUBLISHED

The ALRC inquiry into family violence – not only DID NOT PUBLISH SUBMISSIONS, but displayed blatant bias in its approach to the subject and in choosing to only consult women's groups. This Agency also raised the question of the Attorney General's misuse of the ALRC that undoubtedly compromised their independence and integrity. (I refer you to the Men's Rights Agency letter to the ALRC addressing this issue - see attached)

Freedom of Information applications have been made for both the submissions to the Chisholm Inquiry and the Attorney General's release of the bill to roll back shared parenting.

The AG's officers who deal with FOI applications could not even manage this properly – They mistakenly decided the two separate requests from two different organisations, referring to two different inquiries applied to the same inquiry. As a result, a limited number of submissions to the Chisholm Inquiry have been released and will be received by this Agency shortly, whilst the other FOI request for the submissions to the AG proposed Family Law Family Violence Bill is still in abeyance, well beyond the 60 days allowable for the processing of FOI applications.

The 2006 introduction of the Shared Parental Responsibility provisions into the act provided some measures to change perceptions that children belong with mothers only whilst fathers provide financial support and are relegated to become an occasional visitor to their children.

As with any major shifts in policy there will be those vehemently opposed, some may never be persuaded of the benefits to children of having both parents fully participating in their lives, even after separation.

However, a small measure of improvement in shared parenting has been seen, but the changes have not been allowed enough time to filter through to those who depend on family dysfunction to make their living.

But here we are talking about a small number of dysfunctional parents, who resort to violence in their family, either against each other or against their children, perhaps because of drug/alcohol usage or some psychiatric/psychological impairment or just plain bad temper. Violence against any person, man woman or child is a criminal act and should be dealt with under State laws which adequately cover domestic violence, violent assaults, sexual abuse, neglect and emotional abuse. If a conviction is recorded then the Family Court of Australia which admits it has no ability to conduct further investigation as to the truth of various claims made by the parties against each other, is in a position to make an informed decision about a parents continuing involvement with their children.

The vast majority of parents are good parents, doing their best in difficult circumstances when their marriage/relationship fails. The family law legislation should not be based on the worst examples within our society; there are other laws to deal with such transgressions.

The proposed changes are already causing a difference in family court outcomes.
In recent times we have observed the willingness of the family courts to ignore the suggestions of family report writers who find some mothers are toxic to their children, and would prefer to see the father take the primary role as the better parent. The courts instead, are sending children to live with the mother purely in the hope of pacifying the mother's hatred towards the father. The courts appear to be using the children as the panacea to cure the mother's ills or psychological impairment rather than properly considering the children's well being. It is apparent the court, on occasions, caves in to a mother's demands even when there is a fear she will harm the children if she does not get her own way.

We have also observed a singular reluctance to hear "Contravention Applications" against mothers, despite there being a requirement for these to be heard promptly and before any other proceedings listed. The judge/magistrate will keep postponing the contravention application until they are able to declare, "well this old now, there is not much point in proceeding with old claims". Or they are summarily dismissed without proper hearing because the "time has passed".

We are also seeing an increase in domestic violence allegations to avoid family dispute resolution counselling; a denial of contact since the Child Support Agency was given the power to ignore court ordered contact by relying on unproven "claims of *actual care*".

Fathers are being denied shared parental responsibility due to 'unresolved or irresolvable conflict", but the courts fail to hear or ignore evidence as to which party is causing the conflict. Surely the parent causing conflict should not be rewarded with absolute control of the children's future. It sends a very poor lesson to our children that a person, in this case one of their parents, will be rewarded for their bad behavior.

Prior to the changes to the Child Support legislation the bottom line for contact before any reduction in support occurred was 106 nights. The new child support act provided a lower bench mark of 52 nights. Now, as expected and predicted by this Agency, fathers are being "allowed" less than 52 nights with their children, a significant and unnecessary reduction.

The family law system is still failing fathers and their children. Fathers, in particular, who are forced to spend many thousands of dollars to ensure they remain in their children's lives, whilst mothers are funded by Legal Aid, are becoming completely disillusioned with our distorted form of justice. A family court judge once told me that family law has nothing to do with fairness or justice - "just interpreting the law" was his answer and that is a sad indictment of our family law system.

The family law legislation does need further improvement, but not a rescinding of measures intended to ensure a child and parent their right to spend as much time in each other's company as is possible and practicable.

We are opposed to and reject:

- the changes to broaden the issues regarded as domestic violence and the removal of the 'reasonableness' requirement;
- the removal of cost penalties for knowingly making false allegations and
- the removal of the friendly parent provisions.

We provide our Statement of Claim covering issues which if acted upon will ensure a better outcome for Australian parents and their children.

We also attach the three previous submissions produced in response to:

Family Courts Violence Review (review by Professor Richard Chisholm)

Letter to Prof Croucher - ALRC inquiry into family violence

MRA response to the AGs release of the proposed Family Law Amendment (Family Violence) Bill 2010 - Exposure Draft

Each submission contains information relevant to the discussions that will/should take place before any decisions are made to accept, alter or reject this bill.

Fathers in Australia are sick and tired of being treated with such disrespect. They know they have much to offer their children and are deeply concerned, particularly when they consider the likelihood that their children, raised in single parent households, may end up in trouble with police, using drugs, failing academically and entering into unsuitable relationships at a young age that may result in early pregnancy. Their patience is running out and in our opinion they have been remarkably reserved in their response to date

STATEMENT OF CLAIM:

In consideration of the previous commentary we present a Statement of Claim which includes recommendations to uphold a child's right to have both parents in their life and a parent's right to maintain their role in the child's life. We also include our reasons for including a recommendation.

A parent should be considered no less of a parent because employment or other unavoidable circumstances might be prevented them from participating in 50/50 shared care. In all family separation the expectation should be that parents will care for their children equally or at least have the opportunity to do so.

1. **Results of family law decisions should be followed up to ensure 'good' decisions are being made for the benefit of both children and parents:**

Interestingly, Professor Richard Chisholm when he appeared before the Committee in his position as a judge of the Family Court of Australia answered a question from Mr Pearce MP as to whether they ever heard from people involved in cases as follows:

Justice Chisholm—It is a subject that I am particularly interested in. I was an academic before I was appointed—and, who knows, I might be an academic after I finish. It would be wonderful, frankly, to be able to have access to information about the consequences of our decisions. It might be painful in some cases to look at them, but as an educational thing I could imagine it would be very good.[1]

We endorse that suggestion. There is a lack of follow-up inquiry about how court decisions are affecting the children and parents. (see comments below)

2. **All family law cases should be published:**

There are benefits to be gained if the family law courts authorises the publication of all decisions, rather than concealing transcripts which might give encouragement to fathers to apply for the children to live with them or for shared care. An environment of openness, ensuring adequate scrutiny of decisions will alleviate concerns and criticisms of the courts to date that they operate under an agenda that is dismissive of the importance of fathers and a child's right to have their father actively involved in their life.

[1] Chisholm R., 10 October 2003, House of Representatives Standing Committee of Family and Community Affairs Child Custody Inquiry, Hansard, p.15

Two examples immediately come to mind — a father successfully applied for care of his child in a case which was described as being the worst case of parental alienation seen[2].

The father was granted custody of his child, the mother appealed, but was wholly unsuccessful[3]. Access and reference to this case would supply an adequate precedent to follow in other cases of a similar nature and would serve to illustrate how a transfer of care from the mother to the father can be successfully achieved.

It is not easy, but it can be done with good psychological counselling for all parties, including the mother and with a father willing to go through several very difficult months until the damage caused by the mother is undone and the child comes to trust and understand that the father loves the child unconditionally. Now the young adult in question has grown into a self-assured, confident person who loves both mother and father. The young person might never have known or enjoyed the benefit of the father's love and care if the case had been decided the other way.

A further case is hidden from view, but should be available to all parties making an application for shared care[4]. Justice La Poer Trench in making a decision for the parents to share the care of two children on a week and week about basis contrary to the family counsellor's advice used 47 of the 157 page decision to analyse studies and consider previous court findings about shared care. His Honour acknowledges there are "circumstances where shared residence is not appropriate", but considers "the advantages for children are significant, however the greatest advantage is that at its optimum, shared parenting is implemented in circumstances where the parents create the arrangement themselves without outside intervention. He also found that "from a judicial point of view some degree of disharmony between parents is not a disqualifier". Which tends to support our argument that notions of conflict are being unnecessarily inflated to use as a reason to refuse contact.

3. Transcripts should not be altered:

We have been aware for a number of years that some transcripts are altered before being provided to the parties. The transcript is supposed to give an accurate account of the

[2] Family Court of Australia, Brisbane, No BR6845 of 1996 Date of Judgement 29 August 2001
[3] Full Court of the Family Court of Australia, Brisbane Appeal No NA46 of 2001, File No. BR6845 of 1996, Date of Judgment 21 June 2002.
[4] Family Court of Australia, Sydney No SY3605 of 2001

proceedings and sometimes comments are made by the judge or others appearing in the court that could be considered discriminatory or providing ill advised directions/comments. Parties order transcripts with the expectation that all the comments made during the hearing will be included so they can then base their appeal on the way the case evolved. Bias is difficult to prove when prejudicial or biased remarks are deliberately removed.

4. **Conflict – the parent or parents (if mutual) causing the conflict must be properly identified:**

The Courts are failing to identify which parent is causing conflict and routinely appear to be removing the father from shared parental responsibility and limiting his further contact with his child even though it is the mother who is causing the conflict. This is unjust and unfair and risks leaving the children in the care of a parent who is bad-tempered/ violent/ aggressive and generally dysfunctional.

5. **Fathers excluded from their child's life … in the best interest of the child?**

Recently we have observed a trend for the courts to give children into the mother's sole care[5] despite evidence given in family reports supporting a father's claim for contact or other evidence provided to the court under oath about the behaviour of the mother in alienating the children or her abusive behaviour towards her family. Inexplicably, the father is refused contact and is only allowed to send cards on special occasions and receive school report and the children remain in the care of the abuser. We can only conclude in these cases the

---

[5] 1. Arlington, K. 4 Jan 2011, *Mother wins custody despite 'delinquent attitude'*, The Age, Melbourne
Introduction: HER "delinquent attitude" to parenthood was denounced in the Family Court after she waged a campaign to alienate her two children from their father.
But the woman still won sole custody of the children, who are so distressed by the prospect of a reunion with their father that a judge ruled they should not have to see him.
[2010] FamCA 1111 decision Wiggins & Wiggins
http://www.familycourt.gov.au/wps/wcm/resources/file/ebad524ebf45ec7/2010_FamCA_1111.pdf

2. Dennison & Wang [2010] FAmCAFC 182 Family Law – Appeal – Children – With whom a child lives and spends time.
Where the trial judge ordered the mother and father have parental responsibility, but for the children to have no time with the father – Unsubstantiated sexual and physical abuse allegations made by the mother against the father – where the trial judge made adverse findings against the mother – where the children could be emotionally and physically harmed if order required the children to spend time with the father.
http://www.austlii.edu.au/cgi-bin/sinodisp/au/cases/cth/FamCAFC/2010/182.html?stem=0&synonyms=0&query=Dennison

mother has intimidated the court into believing she will harm the children if they go to live with their father or shared care is ordered. It is outrageous that the court should take the view that pandering to the mother's bad behaviour should be rewarded with sole care of their children. This is not in the best interests of the children?

Provisions can be made to protect children from harm. We know there have been cases where residency has changed and prior to hand- over to the father, the mother has killed the child[ren], sometimes taking her own life as well. These situations can be managed providing the courts and counsellors are aware that mother's may react negatively, just as a father may do when permanently denied contact to their children. Intense psychological counselling must be provided for parents of either gender who might be denied contact with their children. "No contact orders" should only be issued after stringent inquiry to confirm the necessity of such an order. All "no contact orders" should take into account that after a period of counselling it may be possible to reunite the child with the parent. Reference to a previously mentioned (Item 2 case where a child was reunited with the father would be a useful study for those seeking solutions to parental alienation).

6. Deliberately made false allegations must result in penalty and compensation

False allegations made in family court proceedings or to gain a domestic violence order must be identified and taken into account in decision making. Compensation is essential whether provided by the state or the false accuser to alleviate some of the expense incurred in proving one's innocence. Damage to reputation also deserves compensation. The turn-around of the basic principle of being regarded as innocent before being proved guilty in family court proceedings has contributed to an attitude whereby the courts will make extensive excuses for those who make false allegations. When accusations of wrong doing are made in applications, the courts will immediately suspend access, remove fathers from homes and cause them to endure the full ambit of family court proceedings, family reports, etc that bear little resemblance to the fact finding investigation and cross examination process occurring in criminal proceedings. Proof is a little known commodity in family court proceedings. A parent wishing to make criminal allegations against the other parent should be required to raise these with the police, as the appropriate authority to investigate and bring charges if required against an alleged offender. The family courts should then only take proven offences into account. The previous Chief Justice of the Family Court of Australia admitted to the Child Custody Committee that the Family Court is not an investigative agency (FCA 5). He further acknowledged whilst explaining his view of whether an accusation in a

sexual abuse case is a “false allegation” or a “false interpretation” of what happened that this ‘not uncommonly does occur’[6]. Chisholm J following on the questioning about false allegations confirmed that, “…in practice, sexual abuse allegations are quite common”. [7]

7. Friendly parent provisions:

The introduction of the ‘friendly parent’ requirement must remain. It has been suggested the provision prevents parents from making complaints against the other parent for fear of being seen as not encouraging the other parent’s relationship with the children. We have stated before on numerous occasions that we doubt that if a parent had serious concerns and a belief that their child was being abused by the other parent, then nothing would stop them from making appropriate complaints. If a genuinely held complaint is eventually disproved, then perhaps consideration should be given to providing counselling to the parent making the accusation to alleviate their suspicions, which can arise very easily by listening to coffee club chatter and rumour-mongering.

8. Perjury

Perjury is a serious offence causing untold harm and must be prosecuted, particularly if occurring in family law proceedings. The Attorney General’s Department must revise current protocols and activate procedures to forward complaints to the DPP for prosecution without delay. Lying in family court is no less serious than lying in a criminal court and the person who is the target of the perjurer may suffer extreme harm to his/her wellbeing - resulting in removal of their family, their possessions and the life they have created or a person guilty of an offence may escape penalty.

Perjury is an offence which is prosecuted in all jurisdictions apart from family law, which can possibly be explained by comments made by the then Chief Justice of the Family Court of Australia. Alastair Nicholson told the 2003 Child Custody Committee when asked by Mrs Irwin MP, “Given that perjury is a criminal offence that requires police action and a decision to prosecute, what can the Family Court do to address this problem?”[8]

[6] Nicholson A. CJ., 10 October 2003, House of Representatives Standing Committee of Family and Community Affairs Child Custody Inquiry, Hansard,
[7] Chisholm R., 10 October 2003, House of Representatives Standing Committee of Family and Community Affairs Child Custody Inquiry, Hansard, p.6.
[8] Nicholson A. CJ., 10 October 2003, House of Representatives Standing Committee of Family and Community Affairs Child Custody Inquiry, Hansard, p.14

Nicholson CJ replied “If a judge feels that there are particular concerns about the evidence of a witness all they can do is refer that matter to the Attorney General’s Department. They cannot refer it to the DPP. My experience of having done that is that nothing happens.”

No doubt not too many suspected perjury complaints have been forwarded to the AGD due to the excuses offered in the now retired, Chief Justice’s explanation**, “**The person who is the victim of the allegation of abuse says it is perjury, whereas the judge who heard it would probably say that it was a misunderstanding or a heightened apprehension”.[9]

9. Legal Aid

Legal Aid family law funding is distributed to women in the ratio of $2 for every $1 granted to men. The reasons used to deny aid to men are:

- The matter does not have any merit (in other words Legal Aid does not think you are going to be successful).
- The cost doesn’t warrant the outcome (in other words LA does not think the case is worth pursuing).
- There is a *conflict of interest* (“we are already funding the other party”).

In the first two mentioned items it would appear Legal Aid feels confident in making decisions that would normally be reserved for when a judge hands down a finding after hearing all the evidence. We suggest this is not an acceptable approach in deciding who should be funded.

10. Include UN Conventions

The Attorney General has indicated the Convention of the Rights of the Child should be included. We believe that as Family law legislation encompasses the whole of the family, not just children, but parents and other relatives the legislation should also include reference to the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights (ICCPR) to provide protection from discrimination, and gender profiling while ensuring parental rights and the rights of the child are protected.

11. S60I Certificates and the requirement to undertake dispute resolution counselling before accessing court:

[9] Nicholson A. CJ., 10 October 2003, House of Representatives Standing Committee of Family and Community Affairs Child Custody Inquiry, Hansard, pg 6.

Whilst accepting that the introduction of a certificate process to encourage parents to resolve their parenting dispute without the need for court action is a positive move, there are occasions when the delays incurred through accessing the mediation process prevent a parent from recovering their children or seeing their children for too long.

There needs to be recognition that in some instances parents should be able to make an application to the courts to recover and/or have contact with their children without waiting months in a queue for an appointment with a Family Relationship Centre to just find out the other parent refuses to attend.

----- 0 ------

FATHERS WILL VOTE OUT ANY GOVERNMENT THAT FAILS TO RECOGNISE THEIR RIGHTFUL ROLE IN THEIR CHILDREN'S LIVES.

For further information please contact the writer:
Sue Price (BSocSc)
Director
Men's Rights Agency
P.O. Box 28, Waterford 4133
T:
F:
E: admin@mensrights.com.au
Web: www.mensrights.com.au