Family Drug and Alcohol Court’s success

A PIONEERING PROBLEM-SOLVING FAMILY court in the United Kingdom saves thousands of pounds per case and has cut the number of children taken into care, enabling more families to remain together safely, according to an independent report published on 1 May.

Families who have been through the Family Drug and Alcohol Court (FDAC) process, as opposed to ordinary care proceedings, were more likely to stop misusing substances and, if they did so, were more likely to be reunited with their children, the study reveals.

The evaluation, carried out by Brunel University and consultants Ryan Tunnard Brown, found that 40% of FDAC mothers and 25% of FDAC fathers stopped misusing substances, compared with 25% of mothers and 5% of fathers who had been through ordinary care proceedings. The FDAC had higher rates of family reunification: 35% of FDAC mothers stopped misusing and were reunited with their children, compared with 19% of mothers who had been through ordinary care proceedings. The rate of neglect or abuse one year after children returned home was lower in FDAC cases than for parents who had been through ordinary care proceedings: 25% compared with 56%.

Bring lawyers under AML law

LAWYERS, ACCOUNTANTS, REAL ESTATE agents, trust and company service providers and high value dealers should be brought under the Anti-Money Laundering/Countering Terrorist Financial Regime, the Australian Bankers’ Association says in a submission to the Attorney-General’s department.

Currently, these occupations were in “tranche 2” of the regime, which had yet to be implemented.

“It is vital that tranche 2 is implemented to close the current gap in the legislation,” the submission said.

“Money laundering/terrorist financing incidents commonly involve a gate-keeper (solicitor, accountant), a high value goods dealer or a real estate industry person/entity. These parties are caught under AML/CTF legislation in jurisdictions such as the United Kingdom and United States but not in Australia.”

The lack of the implementation of tranche 2 introduces a “high jurisdictional risk” to Australia, the submission said.