

立法會
Legislative Council

LC Paper No. CB(2)1584/11-12
(These minutes have been
seen by the Administration)

Ref : CB2/PL/WS

Panel on Welfare Services

**Minutes of special meeting
held on Saturday, 25 February 2012, at 9:00 am
in Conference Room 1 of the Legislative Council Complex**

Members present : Hon CHEUNG Kwok-che (Chairman)
Hon WONG Sing-chi (Deputy Chairman)
Hon CHAN Kam-lam, SBS, JP
Hon LEUNG Yiu-chung
Hon TAM Yiu-chung, GBS, JP
Hon LI Fung-ying, SBS, JP
Hon Paul CHAN Mo-po, MH, JP
Hon WONG Kwok-kin, BBS
Dr Hon PAN Pey-chyou
Dr Hon Samson TAM Wai-ho, JP
Hon Alan LEONG Kah-kit, SC
Hon LEUNG Kwok-hung

Members absent : Hon Albert HO Chun-yan
Hon LEE Cheuk-yan
Hon Frederick FUNG Kin-kee, SBS, JP
Hon Ronny TONG Ka-wah, SC
Dr Hon LEUNG Ka-lau
Hon IP Wai-ming, MH

Public Officers attending : Item I

Ms Doris CHEUNG
Deputy Secretary for Labour and Welfare (Welfare)1
Labour and Welfare Bureau

Ms Wendy LEUNG
Principal Assistant Secretary for Labour and Welfare
(Welfare)1
Labour and Welfare Bureau

Mrs Anna MAK
Deputy Director of Social Welfare (Services)
Social Welfare Department

**Attendance by : Item I
invitation**

Labour and Welfare Group of Democratic Party

Mr Ricky OR Yiu-lam
Member of Central Committee of Democratic Party

The Hong Kong Council of Social Service

Mr TANG Chung-wah
Officer

Diocesan Pastoral Commission for Marriage and the Family

Mr Kevin LAI
Executive Secretary

Hong Kong Chinese Civil Servants' Association, Social
Work Officer Grade Branch

Mr Sam LEUNG Kin-hung
Chairman

Against Child Abuse

Dr Jessica HO
Director

Hong Kong Family Welfare Society

Mrs Cecilia KWAN
Executive Director

D. Dong

Mr Ken K C TSANG
Vice Chairman

Harmony House

Ms Queenie TAO
Executive Director

Mr Justin TSENG Wen-tien, Tsuen Wan District
Council member

關注孩子同盟

Ms Connie IP Wai-chong
Secretary

Parents for The Family Association

Mr H W LAI
President

The Law Society of Hong Kong

Mr Anthony HUNG
Vice Chairman, Family Law Committee

Mr Dennis HO
Member, Family Law Committee

The Society for Truth and Light

Ms FU Dan-mui
Assistant General Secretary

Hong Kong Federation of Women's Centres

Ms Eva LEUNG
Centre-in-charge

Hong Kong Single Parents Association

Ms YU Sau-chu
Chief Executive

Clerk in attendance : Miss Betty MA
Chief Council Secretary (2) 4

Staff in attendance : Ms Candice LAM
Senior Council Secretary (2) 4

Miss Maggie CHIU
Legislative Assistant (2) 4

Action

I. Consultation paper on Child Custody and Access

[LC Paper Nos. CB(2)717/11-12(03), CB(2)1132/11-12(01) to (02), CB(2)1141/11-12(01) to (02), CB(2)1187/11-12(01) to (02), CB(2)1234/11-12(01) to (08) and IN02/11-12]

At the invitation of the Chairman, Deputy Secretary for Labour and Welfare (Welfare)1 ("DS(W)1") highlighted that the objective of the consultation paper was to gauge the views of the public on the recommendations of the Law Reform Commission ("LRC") to implement the joint parental responsibility model by legislative means. Under the model, the custody order and access order currently provided for under the law would be replaced by the residence order and contact order respectively. The non-resident parent would still retain parental responsibility over the child and the right to be involved in important decisions affecting the child's well-being and future. This apart, specific issues order and prohibited steps order would be introduced to enable the court to give direction to address the disagreements between parents on issues relating to their children. DS(W)1 said that the joint parental responsibility model was a new approach for dealing with the arrangements for children after the divorce of their parents. Since the proposed changes would bring about fundamental changes to the existing arrangements under the family law and would have far-reaching implications on children and families on various fronts, the Administration had previously convened

Action

informal meetings with stakeholders to gauge their views on the LRC's recommendations. Having regard to the diverse views expressed, the Administration considered it prudent to launch a public consultation to gauge the views of the public before mapping out the way forward.

2. A total of 15 depositions/individual presented views on the consultation paper. The major concerns of the depositions were broadly categorized as follows -

- (a) promoting the concept of joint parental responsibility would be on the right track to protect the best interests of children;
- (b) the implementation of the joint parental responsibility model by introducing legislative means could not adequately deal with the disputes and settle the parental arrangements for the child during divorce proceedings, more concrete support services for divorced families should be put in place prior to implementing the model by legislative means, if so decided; and
- (c) joint parenting arrangement should not be the default arrangement for divorced families involving domestic violence.

A summary of the depositions' views is in the **Appendix**.

Discussions

3. In response to the views expressed by depositions, DS(W)1 advised that the Administration was aware of the concerns expressed by some stakeholders about the introduction of the joint parental responsibility model in Hong Kong through legislative means. DS(W)1 stressed that the Administration would fully take into account all the views collected during the public consultation before deciding whether the joint parental responsibility model should be implemented by legislative means. The Administration would consider the need for enhancing family services and promotion of joint parental responsibility, whether or not the legislative route would be taken.

4. Deputy Director of Social Welfare (Services) ("DDSW(S)") added that visitation service for children was currently provided by the Family and Child Protective Services Units ("FCPSUs") of the Social Welfare

Action

Department ("SWD"). In 2011, a total of 108 visits with the presence of social workers were arranged in various service units located throughout 11 service districts of SWD. The Administration had no intention to set up other types of visitation centres for the time being. DDSW(S) pointed out that the concept of family was evolving in the light of rapid social changes, and thereby existing family services had been extended to divorced families.

5. Ms LI Fung-ying said that the concept of joint parental responsibility was undisputable. However, she was concerned that the requirement of divorced parents to retain continuing responsibility was a complex issue which might lead to legal disputes and cause distress to the children and impede the healthy development of the children. In her view, the Administration should formulate adequate complementary measures to support divorced families before implementing the model by legislative means. In the event that the Administration inclined to implement the model by legislative means, Ms LI asked whether the Administration would further consult the Panel and the stakeholders on the details of the legislative proposals.

6. DS(W)1 advised that the Administration was mindful of the controversy and complexity of the subject, as the proposed model would bring about fundamental changes to the existing arrangements under the family law. The Administration would carefully consider the views collected during the consultation period and would revert to the Panel in due course.

7. DDSW(S) said that the Integrated Family Service Centres located across the territory provided one-stop, integrated and easily accessible support services to families including divorced families. Complicated cases and those involving custody and access arrangements would be taken care of by FCPSUs of SWD, and relevant training sessions had been organized for frontline staff of FCPSUs. Moreover, the Administration had launched public education programmes in this respect and the publicity pamphlets were available on the SWD website. The Administration would review the service needs as appropriate and seek additional resources if necessary.

8. Mr Alan LEONG noticed that deputations attending the meeting had raised no objection to promoting the continued involvement of both parents in the upbringing of the child after divorce, but most of them had called upon the provision of adequate support services for divorced families prior

Action

to the implementation of the joint parent responsibility model, irrespective of whether the model was to be implemented by legislative means. Pointing out that the court was provided with the flexibility under the existing law to grant the appropriate type of custody order according to the circumstances of each family, Mr LEONG invited the views of the Law Society as to whether the model could be promoted by introducing changes to the existing legislative framework.

9. Mr Dennis HO of the Law Society said that the existing family law of Hong Kong focused on parental rights, whereas the LRC recommendations would shift the focus of the law towards parental responsibilities. The concept of custody was different from that of joint parenting, which were premised on different legal basis. Notwithstanding that joint custody orders had been more commonly granted under the existing legislative framework, this could not help shift the trend for parental responsibilities.

10. Mr LEUNG Yiu-chung said that as shown from the statement made by Hon Mr Justice Hartmann in his recent court judgments, joint custody order had been the court's preferred type of order on the presumption that the parents possessed of sufficient objectivity to be able to make rational decisions in the interests of the child and would be able to cooperate with each other concerning matters of importance in the upbringing of the child. Mr LEUNG, however, cast doubt as to whether divorced parents would be rational and cooperative with each other to deal with arrangements for the child after divorce. Mr LEUNG was uncertain about the need for implementing the model through legislative means, as the court currently already possessed the flexibility to make a joint custody order where appropriate. He asked to what extent implementing the model through legislative means would be more effective in upholding the interests of the child than promoting the concept of joint parenting through enhancing support for divorced families, such as counselling services, without legislative changes.

11. DS(W)1 said that the Administration had made reference to some overseas common law jurisdictions. It was observed that some western jurisdictions had implemented the joint parental responsibility model by legislative means, while Singapore had not. The Administration would, having regard to the views collected during the public consultation, map out the way forward. DS(W)1 further said that the Administration was mindful of the calls from the stakeholders for provision of support services for divorced families and would critically consider the need to strengthen

Action

family services irrespective of whether or not the model would be implemented by legislative means.

12. In response to the questions raised by Mr LEUNG Yiu-chung, Mr Dennis HO of the Law Society pointed out that Hon Mr Justice Hartmann had stated in his recent judgments that the Administration should effect legislative amendments to the existing legislative framework to implement the LRC's recommendations relating to promoting joint parental responsibility. Mr HO reiterated his earlier view that granting joint custody order and promoting parental responsibility were premised on different legal basis. Having studied the existing law on child custody and access, and with reference to the requirement of the United Nations Convention on the Rights of the Child that state parties should uphold the principle that both parents had common responsibilities for the upbringing and development of the child, Mr HO considered that the Administration should effect legislative amendments. In addition, it appeared from recent court judgments in custody proceedings that the court had time and again called upon changes to the existing legislation to reflect the court's latest views on custody orders. As regards the concerns about the provision of support services for divorced families, Mr HO added that the LRC had made recommendations in its Report on a number of reform proposals which were collateral to the law of child custody and access. In his view, the Administration should strengthen public and parent education programmes on promoting the concept of parental responsibility.

13. Mr LEUNG Yiu-chung remained concerned about the enforcement of joint parental responsibility if the divorced parents were uncooperative with each other.

14. Mr Dennis HO of the Law Society said that the implementation of joint parental responsibility model through legislative means emphasized the continuing responsibilities of both parents towards their children, rather than their individual parental rights, and the child's rights to enjoy a continuing relationship with both parents if this was in the child's best interest. Under the model, the major decisions affecting the child would be specified in the legislation, and the court would be enabled to, in the light of the special circumstances of each case, grant specific issues order and prohibited steps order to give direction to address the disagreement between parents on issues relating to their children.

15. Dr PAN Pey-chyou said that deputations attending the meeting raised concerns about the implementation of the joint parent responsibility

Action

model by legislative means for the time being, although they did not object to promoting the continued involvement of the divorced parents in the upbringing of the child. Noting that there was an increasing trend of Mainland-Hong Kong families, Dr PAN was concerned about the enforcement of the legislation on joint parental responsibility, if enacted, on Mainland parents.

16. DS(W)1 said that the Administration was aware of the concerns including the enforceability of the legislation relating to joint parental responsibility. The Administration would map out the way forward on whether and how best the LRC recommendations concerning the implementation of the model should be taken forward in the light of the views and comments received during the public consultation. On the arrangements for cross-boundary families, the initial thinking was that the resident parent should contact the non-resident parent who resided outside Hong Kong, as far as practicable, on the major decisions affecting the upbringing of the child. Principal Assistant Secretary for Labour and Welfare (Welfare)1 added that cross-boundary families were not unique to Hong Kong. The Administration would give due attention to the concerns in preparing the relevant legislative proposals, if so decided.

17. Mr Dennis HO of the Law Society said that reference could be drawn from the experience of Australia and New Zealand in which both governments had made reciprocal agreements on law enforcement.

18. Mr WONG Sing-chi appealed to implementing the joint parental responsibility model by legislative means so as to uphold the children's rights and to promote the concept of continuing responsibilities of both parents toward their children rather than parental rights. However, the Administration should first take action to address the concerns about the need for providing concrete support services to divorced families prior to the enactment of the relevant legislative proposals and effect policy changes to housing and welfare services to tie in with the implementation of the legislative proposals.

19. Mr TAM Yiu-chung was supportive of the concept of joint parental responsibility. Having regard to the concerns raised by various parties, the Democratic Alliance for the Betterment and Progress of Hong Kong had not formed a position on whether the model should be implemented by legislative means. Notwithstanding that, the Administration should take heed of the community calls for more resources to enhance public education programmes to promote the concept of joint parenting and

Action

strengthen support services for divorced families.

20. At the invitation of the Chairman, Mr H W LAI of the Parents for The Family Association and Mr Ricky OR of the Democratic Party reiterated the need for providing concrete support measures for divorced families before introducing the legislative proposals to implement the joint parental responsibility model. Ms YU Sau-chu of Hong Kong Single Parents Association added that the Administration should also strengthen the manpower for providing support services for divorced families.

21. In concluding the discussion, the Chairman said that some stakeholders expressed reservations about the introduction of joint parental responsibility model by legislative means, but that did not necessarily mean they opposed to promoting the concept of joint parenting. Given that LRC had highlighted the need for strengthening public education programmes and support services for divorced families, the Chairman considered that it was incumbent upon the Administration to formulate concrete work plans to promote the concept of joint parenting, irrespective of whether the model would be implemented through legislative means. The Chairman added that the Panel would follow up on the Administration's way forward on whether and how the model would be implemented.

II. Any other business

22. There being no other business, the meeting ended at 11:00 am.

Panel on Welfare Services

Special meeting on Saturday, 25 February 2012 at 9:00 am

Consultation paper on Child Custody and Access

Summary of views and concerns expressed by deputations/individual

No.	Name of deputation/individual	Major views and concerns
1.	Labour and Welfare Group of Democratic Party [LC Paper No. CB(2)1234/11-12(01)]	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● agreed in principle to the proposed joint parental responsibility model with the objective to best protect the well-being of children and families ● in addition to implementing the joint parental responsibility model, the custody order currently provided for under the law should be retained such that the court would still have the flexibility to make the appropriate type of custody order according to the circumstances of each case and needs of each individual family, i.e. the court might make a sole custody order, a joint custody order or a split order for the best interests of the child ● the Administration should provide more resources to the Integrated Family Service Centres and non-governmental organisations to strengthen family support services, in particular counselling and mediation services ● the Administration should strengthen mediation services in anticipation of an increase in the number of litigation cases as shown from the experience of overseas common law jurisdictions following the relevant law reforms
2.	The Hong Kong Council of Social Service [LC Paper No. CB(2)1234/11-12(02)]	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● supported the concept of joint parental responsibility with a view to maintaining the continued involvement of both parents in the upbringing of their children after divorce ● expressed reservations about the merits of the joint parental responsibility model as set out in paragraphs 3.3 (b) and (c) of the consultation paper and whether the implementation of the model through legislative means only could adequately help resolve the contention between divorced parents and the fight for custody

No.	Name of deputation/individual	Major views and concerns
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● as shown from the Australian experience, in addition to implementing the model through legislative means, the Government's commitment in providing support services and enhancing public education was equally importance to change the mindset of parents in dealing with arrangements for their children after divorce ● the Administration should consider the following complementary measures prior to the implementation of the joint parental responsibility model - <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (a) reviewing social policies which had impact on divorced families such as public housing allocation, education and welfare services; (b) setting up dedicated service units for divorced families to provide one-stop service on counselling, mediation and legal advice; (c) putting in place a mechanism to identify divorced cases involving domestic violence as these divorced parents could no longer cooperate with each other; and (d) conducting evaluation studies on the applicability of the model to the local context
3.	Diocesan Pastoral Commission for Marriage and the Family [LC Paper No. CB(2)1234/11-12(03)]	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● concerned about the adverse impact of the increasing trend of divorce cases on the development of the next generation ● although it was good intention to implement the joint parental responsibility model, the Administration should be mindful of the following prior to implementing the model - <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (a) it would be difficult to change the mindset of parents on their parental rights and thereby the Administration should step up family education programmes on joint parenting; (b) adequate resources should be allocated for providing timely intervention and appropriate preventive services to families at risk of breakup; and (c) family education on parental responsibilities should be promoted and avenues of counselling and mediation should be provided for divorced parents to resolve their

No.	Name of deputation/individual	Major views and concerns
		disputes
4.	<p>Hong Kong Chinese Civil Servants' Association, Social Work Officer Grade Branch [LC Paper No. CB(2)1141/11-12(01)]</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● as noted from the custody orders which required assessment from social workers of the Social Welfare Department, the existing arrangement was not desirable as the custodial parent might exclude the non-custodial parent from access to the child ● to address the concern about the possible increase in the number of litigation cases after the implementation of the joint parental responsibility model, consideration should be given to setting up a tribunal to deal with disputes over simple custody and access cases ● to cope with the increasing workload arising from the implementation of the recommendations in the LRC Report, additional resources and manpower for social workers should be deployed to handle custody and access cases ● concerned that issues relating to the allocation of public resources, such as tenancy of public housing, social security payments, etc, would become the thrust of disputes between divorced parents in implementing the joint parental responsibility model bearing in mind that the non-resident parent would have to assume similar responsibility of the resident parent
5.	<p>Against Child Abuse [LC Paper No. CB(2)1234/11-12(04)]</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● agreed in principle the concept of joint parental responsibility ● in accordance with Article 12 of the United Nations Convention on the Rights of the Child, divorced parents should consult the views of their child in making major decisions affecting the child concerned ● the Administration should step up promotional publicity on the provision of independent legal representation for children in divorce proceedings determining their future arrangements ● children should be provided with the appropriate support services during the divorce proceedings of their parents and the relevant information should be comprehensible by the children concerned ● the Administration should enhance training on communication skills with children for the related disciplines (including legal professions, social worker, teachers) in handling divorce

No.	Name of deputation/individual	Major views and concerns
		<p>cases</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● dedicated service teams should be set up to provide specific counselling and family support services to divorced cases involving domestic violence ● visitation centres should be set up to provide a safe environment for children to meet with their divorced parents as well as to provide necessary training and services for divorced families
6.	Hong Kong Family Welfare Society [LC Paper No. CB(2)1141/11-12(02)]	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● supported the implementation of the joint parental responsibility model, as the existing custody and access arrangements were focused on the parental rights, instead of child-focused ● the implementation of the model through legislative means could not adequately change the mindset of divorced parents to achieve joint parenting. The Administration should put in place complementary measures to promote the concept, such as launching public and parent education, before introducing the relevant legislative proposals. Moreover, support services for divorced families such as mediation, visitation centre, dedicated service units for divorced cases involving domestic violence should be made available ● children of divorced parents should be allowed to participate in the custody arrangement
7.	D. Dong [LC Paper No. CB(2)1187/11-12(01)]	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● it agreed to the introduction of legislative amendments to support and promote the concept. The implementation of the joint parenting responsibility model should aim to promote joint parenting and minimize the harm done to the children following the divorce of their parents ● raised concern about the introduction of "specific issues order" and "prohibited steps order" as mentioned in paragraph 3.7 of the consultation paper as this would give rise to more legal disputes by divorced parents. Therefore, the implementation of the model should be complemented with supportive measures as well as disincentives to prevent divorced parents from taking minor cases to the court ● the Administration should set clear objectives for implementing the joint parental responsibility model, and review the effectiveness of the implementation and refine the model if necessary

No.	Name of deputation/individual	Major views and concerns
8.	Harmony House [LC Paper No. CB(2)1132/11-12(01)]	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● agreed to the concept of joint parental responsibility to focus on the child and to promote the continued involvement of both parents in the upbringing of their child even after divorce ● the applicability of the joint parental responsibility model to the unique local context should first be examined and family support services should be put in place before implementing the model by legislative means. Otherwise, this would give rise to other social problems ● concerns from stakeholders about the implementation of the model for victims of domestic violence should be addressed if the model was to be taken forward by legislative means ● it might be more effective to promote joint parenting through family and parent education, provision of professional support service for divorced families, such as setting up visitation centres and providing counselling services
9.	Mr Justin TSENG Wen-tien, Tsuen Wan District Council member [LC Paper No. CB(2)1132/11-12(02)]	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● supported the concept of joint parental responsibility but the model should be implemented by legislative means only after complementary support services for divorced families had been put in place ● reference should be drawn from the studies conducted by overseas common law jurisdictions to evaluate the effectiveness of the model ● more importantly, the Administration should inject more resources for family and parent education to prevent and resolve family problems and disputes
10.	關注孩子同盟 [LC Paper No. CB(2)1234/11-12(05)]	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● objected to the implementation of the joint parental responsibility model through legislative means as it would be difficult for divorced parents to reach consensus on issues relating to the upbringing of their children. This would also complicate the family life of either divorcee who had a second marriage ● highlighted the difficulties to be encountered by single parents in the event that the joint parental responsibility model was implemented by legislative means. Specifically, it was concerned that non-resident parents would not provide financial support for their children if they were only required under the legislative proposals to continue their involvement in the upbringing of the child

No.	Name of deputation/individual	Major views and concerns
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● with reference to overseas experience in implementing the model by legislative means, it was concerned that more legal proceedings and thus greater burden on the Administration would be resulted ● considered that the existing custody and access arrangements under the law was suffice as it provided an option of joint custody as appropriate ● the Administration should, through legislative means, require parents to receive counselling service before making a decision on divorce to protect the best interests of the children
11.	Parents for The Family Association [LC Paper No. CB(2)1187/11-12(02)]	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● objected to the implementation of joint parental responsibility model by legislative means as it did not subscribe to the view that parental rights should be separated from the obligations of joint parenting after divorce ● the Administration should enhance public and family education to resolve family disputes and strengthen support services for divorced families ● took the view that the Administration should conduct studies on prevailing family problems to better understand the causes attributed to the problems ● in addition to dealing with custody and access cases by the Family Courts, consideration should be given to setting up family mediation centres to provide preventive services for families
12.	The Law Society of Hong Kong	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● supported the LRC's recommendations on joint parental responsibility ● joint parent responsibility model emphasised the continuing responsibilities of both parents towards their children, instead of jointly taking care of the child by the divorced parents ● although LRC had studied how other common law jurisdictions like England and Wales and Australia promoted the concept of joint parental responsibility, the Administration should in the light of overseas experiences work out its own model

No.	Name of deputation/individual	Major views and concerns
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● in making the recommendations in the LRC Report, LRC had examined the concerns about the impact of the legislative changes on divorced families, the need for providing supportive measures for divorced families and the handling of divorced cases involving domestic violence
13.	The Society for Truth and Light [LC Paper No. CB(2)1234/11-12(06)]	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● while agreeing to the concept of joint parental responsibility which promoted continuing parental responsibility, the Administration should be prudent to promote the concept by legislative means. It was worried that as shown from the experience of Australia and England and Wales, the legislative changes would result in more disputes and legal proceedings due to abuse by trouble-making parents ● under the existing legislative framework, the court was empowered to make a sole custody order, a joint custody order or a split order, subject to the circumstances of each individual case; and in fact, the court had been issuing more joint custody orders in recent years, this approach was considered to be more flexible ● the joint parental responsibility model was considered not applicable to families involving extra-marital affairs and domestic violence as well as Mainland-Hong Kong families ● considered that prior to the introduction of legislative means to implement the model, the Administration should ensure the provision of support services, including pre-marital counselling, public and parent education programmes, family services, mediation and counselling for divorced families
14.	Hong Kong Federation of Women's Centres [LC Paper No. CB(2)1234/11-12(07)]	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● as revealed from the findings of a survey conducted by the deputation on the model, concerns were raised - <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (a) the joint parental responsibility model would lead to more disputes and legal proceedings as well as cause stress to the divorced parents if they had to maintain contact on issues relating to the upbringing of the child; (b) specific arrangements for divorced cases involving domestic violence should be set out under the legislative proposals; and (c) the access parents must pay maintenance towards their child's upbringing in exercising

No.	Name of deputation/individual	Major views and concerns
		<p style="text-align: center;">joint parenting</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● suggested that divorcees could be allowed to choose whether to opt for joint parental responsibility, and mediation centres should be set up to provide professional service and support for families at risk of breakup ● the Administration should study how to enhance the legal rights of divorced women in recovering outstanding maintenance and put in place adequate support services for divorced women
15.	Hong Kong Single Parents Association [LC Paper No. CB(2)1234/11-12(08)]	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● considered that the proposed joint parental responsibility model would give rise to more conflicts and disputes if the divorced parents could not cooperative with each other on issues relating to the upbringing of the child ● concerned about the impact of broken parental relationship on the development of children ● prior to the introduction of legislative means to implement the joint parental responsibility model, counselling service for divorced families should first be provided