

## B. OUTSTANDING - Senator Carr – additional questions of 17 November 2020

Question	Senator	Response
<p>With reference to the 6 November 2020 article in The Australian entitled “Swamped: 659 cases for only one judge” and, in particular, the Attorney-General’s comment that “[t]he courts themselves made clear to the committee today that this bill will assist them to deal more efficiently with their workload”:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Do Mr Pringle and Ms Wilson agree with the Attorney-General’s characterisation of their evidence to the Committee?</li> <li>2. Do Mr Pringle and Ms Wilson agree with the Attorney-General’s characterisation of their evidence as being the evidence of “the courts”?</li> <li>3. To be clear, in precisely what capacity did Mr Pringle provide evidence to the Committee?</li> <li>4. To be clear, in precisely what capacity did Ms Wilson provide evidence to the Committee?</li> <li>5. Did Mr Pringle or Ms Wilson consult with the judges of the Family Court and Federal Circuit Court about the bills prior to giving evidence to the Committee?</li> <li>6. Have the judges of the Family Court and Federal Circuit Court told either Mr Pringle or Ms Wilson that the bill “will assist them to deal more efficiently with their workload”?</li> <li>7. Have the judges of the Family Court and Federal Circuit Court told either Mr Pringle or Ms Wilson that “there are a number of elements in the bills that would complement the court’s reforms”?</li> <li>8. Have any judges of the Family Court or Federal Circuit Court raised concerns about – or in relation to – the evidence that either Mr Pringle or Ms Wilson gave to the Committee on 6 November 2020?</li> </ol>	Carr	<p><b>Questions 1, 2 &amp; 6</b></p> <p>The evidence given by Mr Pringle and Ms Wilson on 6 November 2020 is clearly on the record. It is not appropriate for Mr Pringle and Ms Wilson as witnesses who have given evidence to the Committee to be asked to subsequently comment or speculate on how their evidence given on 6 November 2020 may have subsequently been characterised by any other person, including where doing so would require them to give opinions on matters of policy.</p> <p><b>Questions 3-5, 7 &amp; 8</b></p> <p>Please refer to the letter from the Chief Justice/Chief Judge to the Committee’s Chair dated 12 November 2020 (attached).</p>