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Proposal 2–1

Proposal 2–2

Proposal 3–1

Proposal 3–2

Proposal 3–3

Proposal 3–4

My mother’s second marriage ended rather acrimoniously, with police involvement, a restraining order against her and her second husband changing the locks on her. To this day, I have no idea how much money my mother spent on legal advice and representation. And to this day, I am still baffled by the thought of a large man who is nearly six feet tall (in the old measure) being so fearful of a woman who is at least six inches or several centimetres shorter and of a slighter build. Perhaps I am biased but there was no legal sanction for the person who essentially made my mother homeless after 30 or so years together.

Proposal 3–5

Proposal 5–1

While I understand the need for preventive legislation and safeguards, I am concerned that for people like me, some of this creates barriers and hurdles as well as bureaucratic processes to get through. I am an only child. My mother and I are the only ones in this country. Her siblings live in another country and so I would be unable to have another signatory to the power of attorney that my mother has signed over to me. It also took me a long time to ‘push’ for that power of attorney because I did not wish to take any of my mother’s independence or decision-making powers away from her. I thought I was being a good daughter; some of my colleagues asked me if I was “in denial” about my mother’s waning cognitive abilities.

I think that lawmakers have to  be careful about making ordinary citizens ‘lawbreakers’ or at least tarring most of us ‘accidentally’ by making us ‘jump compliance hoops’ or have to consult lawyers at every turn because procedures are too complex for an ordinary educated citizen to understand.

Surely a community’s policing and compliance resources are best directed to the law-breakers, the ones who do not do the right thing by our parents, grandparents or in-laws. Have laws that punish the guilty to the fullest extent of the law; avoid processes and procedures that treat the rest of us as potentially guilty of illegality when most of us who end up caring for parents or grandparents or in-laws are simply trying to make their last years as comfortable for them without having to give up our own jobs or lives.

Proposal 5–2

Proposal 5–3

Question 5–1

Question 5–2

Proposal 5–4
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Proposal 5–12

Proposal 5–13

Proposal 6–1

Question 6–1

Proposal 6–2

Question 6–2

Question 6–3

Proposal 7–1

Proposal 7–2

Question 7–1

Question 7–2

Proposal 8–1

Question 8–1

Please remember that 'family' now embraces quite a number of permutations and variations ... my example is that I grew up with cousins who consider me an 'older sibling' so as far as I'm concerned, family includes them.

Defacto couples who are heterosexual have the full protection of the law. What about defacto same-sex couples?

What about same-sex couples who have lived together for years BUT are not 'out'?

Other people will have variations of this theme: grandparents caring for grandchildren; surviving partners/spouses caring for people unrelated by blood but by marriage or relationship; indigenous families who define kinship differently; CALD (culturally and linguistically diverse) families like mine who also have a larger concept of 'family' or kinship or whom we are responsible for.

Proposal 9–1

Proposal 9–2

Proposal 9–3

Proposal 10–1

Proposal 10–2

This is all well and good. Will CENTRELINK be staffed accordingly and funded accordingly to handle the increased responsibility and processes? Are staff trained to do this?
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