The Committee Secretary
Standing Committee on Family
And Community Affairs
Department of the House of Representatives
Parliament House
Canberra ACT 2600

Public Hearing Date;
Monday, 1 September 2003
Wollongong, NSW.

Inquiry into Custody Arrangements in the Event of Family Separation; Enquiry into Shared Parenting

In acceptance of the Honourable Kay Hall's offer to make a submission to the Committee, please find said submission for your records and notice.

Sections One,
Terms of Reference
Reply; Comments In support

Section Two
Standing Orders
Points; Comments in support

Section Three
History

Section Four,
Opinion of Illawarra Legal Inc.
Notice given for calling a Royal Commission

Forming my submission to the Inquiry into Custody Arrangements in the Event of Family Separation.

Sincerely, with gratitude

Section One:

Under the terms of reference as listed in the 'Inquiry into Custody Arrangements in the Event of Family Separation';

That, (a) (i) "What factors.." *for detail refer to comments summation*
"..in particular.." 'That child(ren) have equal contact with the child farther and the child mother.
"..if so," The presumption that 'That child(ren) have equal contact with the child farther and the child mother under circumstances that remain provable to best practice standards of social or legal duty.

That, (a) (ii) In Every Situation that facilitates the contact between the child and the father and the child and the mother with equal contact as determined by consentual agreement from either; the parties, from mediation or court hearing.
and "..including their grandparents." In every situation that facilitates conduct between the grandparent and child, with regard to the equal contact between the child, the father and mother.

That, (b) No, it does not;
and "..and contact with their children." No, it does not.

That , (c) That the nominated reporting date be extended till February 2004 or to the life of the next Parliament, if no final decision is tabled before that sitting Parliament.

I submit to the Standing Committee the following reasons are to be considered with regard to the above responses.

Comments

This present Standing Committee hearing by virtue of the terms of reference fails in its duty to the public (formally notified) of Australia and its Territories by upholding moral and legal duty owed to the public of this nation. It is in contravention of existing Federal and International law as it does not nor will it not resolve its constitutional duty with regard to the bias (97.5+%[1]) that exists, to allow the review, comment, resolution of or having matters that may be of unethical or of a criminal nature perpetrated by that body, presently in name and practice by the Family Law Courts, (F.L.C.) and the Child Support Agency (CSA) herein referred jointly or severally as F.L.C.C.S.A

Any action to address the bias of the judiciary of the F.L.C.C.S.A no matter how well intentioned by the Standing Committee will by the virtue, of setting up the Terms of Reference endorse the continued misrepresentation and abuse of the moral and legal system as it is presently manifested in the F.L.C.C.S.A. It must be noted that the projected 97.5% may be inferentially drawn to represent the majority of the F.L.C.C.S.A that are caring, good and honest of nature. The bias, as the public perceives it, as it is acknowledged by Parliament, proclaims that that bias is morally if not criminally unjust.

[1] Prime Minister John Howard, ABC, News, in essence that the child and subsequently the father have a 97.5% chance of being discriminated against with regard to custody.

This submission is simply that until that bias, the acted arrogance to enforce the secular moral and legal duty on the Federal Government and the people of this nation is addressed, those that enforce that bias are removed from the judiciary, complete, then any action here by this Standing Committee may and could rightly be seen as duplicitous. As this Standing Committee yet remains a politically motivated body, whereby no notice has been given that the members may vote according to conscious, free from party agendas and with the Executive of the Government setting said agenda(s) for the reviews and conclusion, then it shall and will remain, and justifiably so, an abuse of Parliamentary privilege. It is an affront to the vast majority of people in this country; the wasting of money on ensuring the a snake may remain or can work its way through the chicken wired fence to the eggs of future children of this nation.

Accordingly, there can be no assumption that the best interests of the child are paramount above the equal contact a child has with the father or the mother, from either a social or legal duty. Social or legal duty from the separation of a husband and wife define two separate forms of contact that the child has; One; with the father; and two the mother. This does not nor should it ever negate family; brothers, sisters and grandparents, which respectfully are also considered to have, child family interests.

There is no moral, social or legal duty that defines child father contact of less-a-value than that of child mother regardless the bias that currently exists, regardless the inferences drawn by those who have instilled this nearly one hundred percent abomination of justice. Any assumption is morally, socially and legally wrong. If enforced by legal ruling, it then becomes by definition, criminally biased and is if the law has legs to stand, imputatively and sanction-able by punishment must follow if one party is favoured above another.

This bias perpetrated against the child to date is unjust, contrary to the stated best interests of the child policy that is proclaimed. This policy has been determined, by a vested minority of persons, unrepresentative of the people of the country they claim to serve, with a nominated public and private agenda(s) who then enforce said agendas and are at present unaccountable to the law of this nation. No other section of private, public, business, or elected position has this unassailable right to protection from review as the F.L.C.C.S.A has.

It may be said that it is a fair inferences that would apportion most of the costs from the respective sums for family separation heard by counselling or through the courts could and could be attributed to the legal fraternity. Or a substantive portion of the $125M it takes to run the F.L.C are set in legally trained costs. Agendas succinctly made by the submission put forward by the Illawarra Legal Centre Inc's (ILC) nominated representative Karyn Bartholomew who actively supported the F.L.C.C.S.A's judicial and public opinion that the child's best interests are served by the severing[2] of contact with the non-custodial parent, contrary to International, Federal and States Laws of Australia, the moral and social expectations we consider to be acceptable of an often touted just society.

[2] By removing the non-custodial parent from influential involvement of their child's life

Section Two:

Standing Orders:

Under the standing orders for 'Community statements' I supply the written notes that formed by way the foundation of the points raised by me before that hearing.

With words to the effect and in no order;

1: That any Family Law Court, hearing or counselling success is directly related to the ability to purchase legal results with legal being read in parentheses.

2: Education as a course of support for the children is controlled, regardless of intent, by the custodial parent.

3: Whilst Judges are permitted to act contrary too the law, nothing said today will resolve any issue of responsibility

4: Child support should be directly related to contact.

Comment:

Point 1: Simply that the legal fraternity is protectionistic, activistic and self-perpetuating. They claim that unless there is legal representation the courts cannot act effectively. This argument appears simply to stand contrary to the interests of the child. If it is not acting effectively as they themselves claim and the cost of litigation is so prohibitive that one side in most situations is disadvantaged, then surely they are in contempt of their own thinking and judgements, if not the law, as they should have put in place practice and procedures that ensured self-represented persons would have a fair hearing and a fair opportunity. Yet they have not because of that secular and god-like control they enforce. Illawarra Legal Centre own advice is that they fully support the F.L.C.C.S.A stand on enforcing legal representation. Illawarra Legal Centre is by definition an activist who ensures that the integrity of the judicial system may and must be purchased.

Point 2: Being in the care of one carer automatically by virtue of having unrestricted control of the child's learned understanding of the situation they have been forced into; will prevail. If education is considered after the separation is not the same interpretation of what is said still controlled by that carers desires, opinions or private agendas?

Point 3: Section 121 of the Family Law Act is there for the protection of the judges. Look at it simply. In the child's world all of dad's and mum's friends and work colleagues know of the separation and are informed of what each parent and the child themselves wish to speak of. The school is informed of the separation, sports clubs they each belong are informed, any and all of their friends are informed of a *selective* point of view as to the separation. The child's world is made up almost entirely of people who know of the separation. Each portion, each group of persons, the school, the clubs, the intimate friends of the separation are informed, as the vested teller shall speak. So where is the need for hiding the ***facts?*** Factiously, heaven forbid the truth of a separation being told... Are the Family Law Courts that insecure? Do the judges really think they are that important? Delusions of grandeur, self-importance!!

As long as the family is not named or inference may be drawn (currently media rules prohibit the flagrant use of a child's situation for gratuitous media purposes, re-enforce them!) of the family or who they are, then judges should be at ease with their judgements being reviewed, *if they are honest judgements.*

Point 4: Child support infers a responsibility to make things up as one parent is no longer a part of the child's life. It's along the lines of fathers baby-sit their children, whilst the mothers nurse them. The opinion that the child's standard of living is sacrosanct is respectfully misguided and blind to rational understanding, fiscal responsibility and legal edict. Testimony was given, and is universally accepted that children adapt. What of the family who looses their family business or they loose their assets from a stock market crash or from a fire or flood. Double dipping of child support on the days non-custodial parents have custody is unjust, and quite rightly immoral.

Is the Illawarra Legal Centre suggesting the governments and public of this nation are responsible to ensure they are compensated to bring them back to a fiscal level they had before? Should potential parents be forced to take out insurance for legal separation? Was Illawarra Legal Centre being honest or responsible within the intended expectation of the law where it was claimed that the child must have everything it had before the separation?

What is not complicated to understand is that if the parents separate, then the standard of living for all concerned will change, must change and to suggest otherwise is misleading. According to Illawarra Legal Centre and the current opinion of the Family Law Court, the non-custodial parent's life style, standard of living, opportunity of having a standard of living must be held accountable for the child to have the same standard that existed prior to separation.

In reality the child might need to share a bedroom with their siblings or two, instead of having their own room with an ensuite as Illawarra Legal Centre demand. (In my own family we had up to four children in one room and yet there is not another family on this planet as lucky as mine). They might need to change schools, (are government schools not acceptable to Illawarra Legal Centre compared to private education if it means life after separation for everyone). They might not be able to go to Europe this year. Mum and dad both might need to re-address their jobs, their club membership, their social lives as was it not the parents who have decided the child future life practices, how they will be raised and on what values prior to separation?

The separating parents must in my view move/maintain residence in that immediate vicinity or a place chosen by the parents that affords the child the right or ability to be able to go to either parents home as easily as the other, to have contact in a substantial way. Either parent may pick up the child, drop off the child with little inconvenience. They must *re-address* their lives to *re-support* the chosen goals they jointly set for the child. The Child Support Agency, the Family Law Court or any federal body should in <u>NO WAY</u> be a part of any determination as to how much the child should or should not have, that remains within the guidelines of moral and societal expectations. NO self-respecting or responsible parent would enforce unjust conditions on a child or disregard that child's opinion.

Of course the consequence is to have the remarkably successful situation we have now.

A simple 16 Point plan, over 3 years with regard to addressing this inequity, supplied only with involvement, will be the re-organization of the F.L.C, the Child Support Agency, Department of Community Services, Legal Aid, Health Services and the setting of tax arrangements that support and encourage responsible and active parental participation into the child's best interests. According to the Tax Report handed down by the sitting Federal Government, potentially a reduction of $7.9 Billion Dollars[3] will be removed from the costs to government by stimulating both economic rationalism and responsibility.

The greatest concern we as Australians have, is the Family Law Courts and the Law Society who have openly stated their own agendas and vested interests by setting the standard for the Federal Government and the public of Australia, our moral and ethical obligations. These people are not elected. They enforce, by determination of contrived results to set moral and ethical demands on all Australians, and in particular what moral, social and legal duty is expected if you wish to appear before the, fortunately few exulted selves, regardless the public or elected representatives consider fair if not reasonable.

The moral fortitude that the Family Law Courts have set, since the coming of grace of Nicholson CJ has resulted in the greatest rise of murder suicides, vanishing persons or persons who opt out of society, the greatest increase in costs to the public, and the greatest loss of contact between one parent and that of the child this country has faced. Indeed it was Nicholson himself who set the Section 121 of the Family Law Act to its zenith whereby any connection to a matter that has or is in relation to a Family Law matter is, unreportable. That the connection, the recording of such details is private and confidential. They shield his judiciary from the demise of moral and social culture in this country.

How many deaths are attributable to these agendas? At what cost of life and dollar and how long can we as a people allow this to continue?

It is not a question of loving your child's other parent, as this is the reason why most people don't stay married, but that they must at least respect that the other parent is the beta of your alpha in the creation of your child's universe.

Section Three;

I supply this information for the Standing Committee and for their action so that an understanding may be drawn as to what is faced by self-represented person, before the Judiciary and in respect of the Child Support Agency, (colloquially known as the *hit men* of the *god-father*). Coupled with the stated Legal Aid Services claim that most, coincidentally about the same level of bias as the F.L.C 97.5% of their clients are women, thereby preventing men from getting any legal help, as I personally was subject too. I was not able to get legal aid as my estranged wife had applied, conveniently which prevented me from getting any assistance. Perhaps each legal aid office should be considered a separate entity unless there is a clear cross interest?

Of interest to you might be that I am now faced with a debt of not an unrealistic sum of $500K (taxable as ordered by the courts). This sum was payed by a family that has a far far greater ability than most to afford the results they purchased; *"legally"*. I like so many thousands of Australians are left in a situation whereby if I am lucky enough to get a job, at my age, or I may start a business considering the debts, I would within a few months be

[3] Wollongong University; 'Economics Faculty'; Reports in Consideration.

loosing up to 85%[4] of my wages to pay for the results as they stand. No one will hire me to date as they are, having been through this many many times before and rightly so, gun-shy of getting involved with the amount of interference and paper work the CSA and the Federal Government insists be done.

I shall remain, because of the unconscionable conduct of a few contemptuous judges on the outside of life. I can neither have nor expect to have any quality of life that involves a permanent partner, as their assets will be immediately drawn into play and according to current law also held for account. Living in my own home. I will have ***NO*** opportunity to have any nest egg saved for my retirement, or even in a wonderful situation of being able to pay of the debt inside the next 56 years, allowing for CPI of course.

I can only look forward to a life of subjected and continued harassment caused by these people. I take my share of the blame as well. I fully admit that I naively believed that justice would be served, that I would get a fair hearing; that the facts and the truth mattered. That's why I kept fighting, so that the many I have met and the unfortunate thousands more like me, would not be subject to the de-humanising process we are being placed in by Nicholson's Nightmare and Child Support Agonies.

Unlike others I have not reached the state of complete and utter realisation that this country is completely worthless. I have to date refused to lower myself to their level. I am equally aware that I, like a few others have placed ourselves in the *firing line* but as I have nothing to loose my children and I can only move upwards and if the standard of competence is improved then it might be argued that it's a worthy cost. Until such time as my efforts are *terminated* I will not cease. Accordingly I have put in place actions that will bring to the attention of those that matter, actions that may resolve this impost that has been perpetrated on my children, my family. I still look for that dream because, ultimately under Nicholson's auspices the Family Law Court has allowed the prostitution of our moral and ethical standards.

History:

In July 1997 I was forced to seek access to my children through the Family Law Courts at Parramatta before His Honour Justice Baker. My estranged wife and her family denied me access because they claimed that I had assaulted her in an attempt to kill her. Through this five-day hearing I was competently represented by a barrister, Mr Paul Sansom under instruction from Champion and Partners of Parramatta. Mr Mark Le Pour Trench, instructed by solicitor, Mr Michael Hewitt of Hill Thompson and Sullivan, her family represented my estranged wife. Ms Jan Stevenson, instructed by legal aid, represented my children.

Without trying to make it sound as simply as this, the crux of the matter was that the mother had claimed that because of the nature of the assault, the manner of the assault itself, the disturbed and inhuman attempt to debase her, no contact should be the result. Ostensibly over 80% of the final pertinent judgement given by His Honour focussed on this type of person and such relevant detail. Considered that children are not reliable witnesses, DNA tests, and fingerprints and other such detail excluding me, and a "machiavellian plot" I was given contact. It did not stop there however.

---

[4] If you take into consideration the gross wages v's real life expenses, before and after tax imposts to name but a few considerations

They appealed. Approximately 90% of their appeal focussed on the above mentioned 80% of His Honours judgement. Justice Kay sat on that appeal. They overturned the trial judges orders. As you should be aware in the Family Law Courts the standard of guilt is on the balance of probability, purposely known in most circles as **guilty until proved innocent** I was held accountable. Again no one could deny, honestly, that it was in the best interests of the children see me and so it was ordered, and they regardless of any pain I supposedly caused they expressly denied any contact with my parents and family inspite of previous significant involvement in our children's lives; however the mother and her family actively denied contact, on every single occasion.

Since that hearing date before the Full Court, new evidence came to light. It was new evidence to my 'legal team' as it was also shown to be to the Child Representative. Under standing rules of court I made an application to have the matter re-heard. One piece of 'new' evidence that came to light was that the nature of the sexual assault, the manner the assailant set about to debase the mother, the evidence to support the sexual assault, the horrific injuries sustained by the mother from that sexual assault were completely fabricated.

So according to the standard, on the balance of probability, I was found GUILTY, on evidence that had been in the control of my estranged wife, her family and legal team, and the police. My children's rights were bastardised by what may, very loosely, have started in good faith, but ended up in a wholesale cover-up.

The new hearing was held before Rourke J.. I had, I firmly believed a very good cause to argue and present in that I had before the courts evidence to support my claim of the withholding evidence from the courts, the fabrication of evidence how it was done the manipulation and the effect each action would have. Evidence that would show that my estranged wife, her parents and at least Mr Hewitt, sought to conspire to pervert the course of justice, to misrepresent their case, to ensure justice was indeed blind.

What I did not take into consideration was that Rourke J. was to act far below any moral, ethical or legal expectation that exists, at least in this country. Systematically he controlled how the hearing was to be treated, what evidence was to be heard, when and who was going to be able to present what evidence or comment on any point raised. What he failed to do was to inform particularly me a self represented person, nor the Separate Representative that any attempt by me to present, discuss, avail the courts of any information that supported any claim made, any evidence that would show clearly the validity of my claims *would not* see the light of justice.

He set about, successfully, to show the courts are nothing more than a tool that may be used to hide, pervert and destroy the truth. He proved to me, and all at the hearing that truth is a commodity no more relevant to the judicial process than water is to a cup of tea. This was day one. Having lit the fuse the bomb exploded. The next day after he had finished slashing the scales in two, I felt betrayed and devastated, by being left in no doubt

when he explained that at no time did he give any support to the possibility of any success in any part of my application. Regardless of subsequent matters he ruled in opposition to my claims to prevent evidence being presented if that evidence had any connection to any claim I made or intended to make. He did the perfect job. He must have been proud, as he set out to do exactly what transpired, with all but one of the results he hoped. That I would allow this to happen. Clearly Rourke and others are out of touch with the standard most Australians want for their judiciary.

One saving grace, one glimmer of respect that I could take away from this for my children and I was that the Separate Representative and advising solicitor sought me out and said they were with words to the effect, aghast of his conduct. They looked at the evidence that I had wanted to present, and admitted that it was never presented, regardless of subpoena or notice of discovery during the first hearing or the first Full Court hearing, admitting my children and my family had been denied justice. This was a nail in any respect I might have.

Any opinion that I had steadfastly held, of respect in the judiciary and for the law, contrary to the continued stories heard of the F.L.C. and its practice and procedures was then buried. The abuse did not stop there. Leading to appeal this *judgement* it was said by other judges that judges, are above accusation of this sort of conduct or they have acted corruptly, they are above the law from accusation (if not action) it is improper to say so, it is improper to attempt to prove so, they are in fact untouchable.

Before the Full Court of the F.L.C. hearing into Rourke J *judgement*, Kay J, (an original sitting Full Court judge) with Nicholson CJ had finished the wholesale destruction of any integrity that they ask or deserve or that at some time existed in the judicial system. I had set for them to see the evidence that would prove the first, let alone any subsequent acts of dishonesty, yet they chose not to look at it. They shut it down, no doubt on points of law, they might claim but that is interesting for several points least of all the integrity of the judicial system, let alone the interests of the children. How a judiciary can suggest that it is in the children's best interests to be deceived and lied to, is well that is their standard.

Clearly if it is not presented to the courts then they don't have to act on it. One would have considered that if the court had been misled, by an error or by design that it might have affected the decisions to date or that this misconception was important to the integrity of the judgements given, they would consider it. But these judges had set about to ensure that the control they have over the practice and procedures was to be grasped and chocked, contrary to all laws, contrary to the evidence, contrary to my children's trust.

However prior to the hearing before Nicholson having learnt who was on that hearing, I considered that I could more than likely be given the same respect as I was given before Rourke, so I put in place events I considered necessary to highlight justice; Nicholson style. To play on Nicholson's CJ own public opinion of himself, I set my own 'Machiavellian plot'; successfully I might add. For no other reason at the time than to show Nicholson as he is seen by so many in this country and Kay if he met the same standards for what they are; for what I had hoped they were not. I had arranged for a copy of the evidence that showed the first initial 'deceptions' on the court to be sent to the court itself, during the hearing, by registered post directly to the Full Court. Completely untainted by me from the hospital to the court without my hands influencing any path.

Accepting as he did his own grandeur I had come to realise, Nicholson could not stop his own inflated views from seeing that document. He opened it before the court, looked at it, showed it to Kay, the bench, and decide to do nothing about it. By design or ignorance he knew that this action would protect his judiciary, his control over the court and protect Rourke from honest scrutiny. The perfect cover-up, that if it occurred in public, government circles, business or church would and is considered a conspiracy to prevent justice from finding its own level.

Kay J's conduct is another matter. He looked at the document. Having refused to look at the evidence that I wished to present, that would support any remote opportunity that justice, even that the courts might have any integrity, let alone the best interests of the child, he looked at the evidence that I had arranged to send directly to the courts. Here was a Justice of a Superior Court who was now aware that evidence that had been relied on by previous courts, RELIED ON BY COURTS THAT HE SERVED ON, was not only fabricated it was or more than *on the balance of probabilities* would have had the effect that it would mislead the laws of the county that he had chosen, it appears for vested interests, to serve. Where has he looked at ensuring the judiciary has the respect it claims of the public? Justice first depends on people, all people being able to expect that the judiciary, the courts are and act fairly. He chose to ignore the rights of law, the judiciary, the public, my children; Kay sold out.

He then took to the task to ensure that puppet or not he could pull his own strings. I point out that I made entirely sure that he acknowledged to the court on record that he was the judge who heard the original Full Court hearing. By his actions, (with a bit of help from Nicholson) self-represented persons can not *and never will* get past the actions of a judge who wants or actively sets about to shut you down. It is impossible, respectfully for any person to stand and argue a case when, firstly the Constitutional and Federal issues involved are daunting in themselves, but when as he did with (Nicholson smiling whilst this is being done), set insurmountable hurdles.

Having gone to the High Court seeking leave to appeal, it is simple to note that the court, having sole discretion to reject any application if they believe the application if the matter can not be set under proper and legal principals or that it might be argued with all diligence, it may set it aside. I don't believe the High Court did anything but take the easy way out. I hold no disrespect for the High Court, I do however wonder do they realise how low the FLC has shrunk. I cannot believe that the bench on that day did not understand my claims, particularly with the Family Courts sending their senior representative to sit in the rear seat, but having said that they too also realised that I like so many more thousands of other litigants can not do justice to a legal system that actively suppresses self litigants.

Justice Kay, acted far below the expectation the public of Australia should expect. If reviewed by an honest court I have no doubt his conduct would be shown for what is **corrupt**. He is a stone on any fair body of persons He did, by design, ignore evidence that he then knew to be fabricated, that council and instructing solicitor, not just more than likely played a part, HAD played a part in perverting the truth; to be pillaged as it was. Where was his concern that if this is true, did they play a part? Did they know of the withholding evidence? Was it perjury, fraud?.. he didn't care. He just made sure it went away. Did or were they aware that this information completely in or some significant (97.5% perhaps) contradicted evidence that affected the outcome of several legally constituted courts, particularly one that he sat on? OR what part if any did they actively play in opposing the presenting of this evidence and the suppression of such evidence.

Kay must have known or at least considered his actions would protect a fellow judge from scrutiny as it was being levelled. He allowed the judiciary to be bought and manipulated. He neither cared to investigate or act. HE KNEW.

Nicholson's CJ you might say was another matter. He might claim that by ignorance instead of design his court was manipulated to pervert natural justice. Yet where did he try to 'right the wrongs' by actually checking to see if any or part of my claims were valid. Kay was sitting right next to him. Did he ask Kay why there is a substantial discrepancy between the fact that the mother, her family and her legal advisors has used a set of facts now shown to be false, known to the mother her family and potentially her legal advisors as being false all along, on no less than 50 occasions is contradictory? Where has he acted to protect the integrity of the judicial system? What actions has he set about to re-address the conduct of the mother, her family, her legal advisors, what practice and procedures has he set in place? Or he might just say that He did not know that this evidence suggested what I had alluded to. And he claims to represent the ethical standards of this great nation. Where is his duty to his office?

Perjury is an accepted norm that is tolerated in his jurisdiction. Fraud is tolerated. Perverting justice and the standards that are tolerable in his judiciary is calculate-able, just don't upset the apple cart. Why, because it suits his standards, which are morally, ethically and legally far below that of what we would expect of a judiciary that claims to serve the best interests of the child. Justice has a price, I just don't know whose is costlier. The courts for sending out the message that if enough money is thrown to protect a deception you will succeed or the fact that litigants can literally purchase officers of the court who according to those justices may act with impunity to their obligations.

For these reasons, that one-day my children will know the truth, the assailant is brought to task, that people like Nicholson and in particular Kay will not grace our court structures I will fight. I as a citizen of this country, which I greatly admire and respect, regardless of any action that the Parliament may take of their own, shall be seeking a Royal Commission into the Family Law Courts, which by definition will and must consider the role DoC's and Child Support Agency. Following are the notices and forms that I shall be setting in place to facilitate this action. I intend to be actively involved in this matter until such time as the law in this country can have meaning and respect.

Section Four;

The spoken opinion and paper presented by Ms Bartholomew on behalf ILC was respectfully possibly the best and worst predetermination one might encounter that supports self interest bias towards and against the unrepresented, clear support for the machination of dishonest and unrepresentative god-like delusion and self interested autonomy over moral and legal opinion. This pollution would **GUARANTEE** that instead of the costs met by all Australian with regard to the spewing sums being checked, they would in fact boil over and drown the economy and line the pockets of self-interested groups. If I owned a company according to market laws this equates, respectfully, to insider trading. Her unabashed support equates to control, manipulation and profiteering by the suppression of the self-litigant and the further distortion of the so-called rights of the child and the moral and legal abrogation of our self-respect.

Disregarding the case study's presented, as I too could present contrary views, for any view that I would claim, the argument presented was predicated on the bias that the

courts have put in place what is an unassailable position. She herself refers to the present bias in support of her claims, but was I not of the belief that this inquiry was to readdress the bias that has been created. Further does not her submission; the "war games" have as a foundation the endemic bias that has been wrought on the parents?

As ILC push forward, as most people consider the costs of the separation to be in the top two concerns then let me address this those terms. Children are by nature of life itself, common and of ecclesiastical law the property of the parents. Not as a possession but of moral and responsible right to act with a duty greater than one expects of oneself. Are parents not required to provide, act in their interests, set standards that are reflective of themselves or our culture?

Therefore by any imagination, as long as the 'ownership' is held with respect and trust by the parents is not just to account such 'ownership'. What is pertinent is that the parents do in fact have the right over the best interests of the child by the virtue of having that very responsibility. The ludicrous suggestion might be made that the law, in particular ILC held law, that it is not permissible for parents to move their child to another part of the country that might not have all the advantages life presents, say in the centre of Sydney. By the not to loose opinion of the presentation she made and the documents supplied and referred too, no parent can make any choice that may lesson the standards of the child.

By any good opinion and what should be held with trust and respect, children are the property of the parents, on the acceptance that they act accordingly. There must be *joint ownership* and *equal care* responsibility to provide for that 'ownership.' The difficulty is that the body of opinion, enforced as it standards 97.5%, considers it prudent to separate that responsibility and enforce the burden.., *proportionally!!* By any rational of thinking the parental responsibility one has to a child is directly related to 'ownership'.

So as ILC and F.L.C.C.S.A are so focussed on the dollar, which they don't "get", then why not set an opt out agreement, whereby the type of person who would like nothing to do with their child, those that choose to ignore all civil and moral duty (This is not the person whom is forced into an untenable situation such as we now have many many thousands of) by purchasing that freedom. Paying a set sum that would allow that person to leave. The child would be better off as they would not have such a morally deficient person in their lives. The other parent would be free to be able to get with their lives without the hassle, or expectation that this person might see the light, would bring into that contact this obviously rewarding attitude. This opt out facility is of course subject to be met fiscally, which automatically again favours those that can afford it, possible again those that can afford legal support in the present F.L.C.C.S.A situation.

Child support is not contingent as Ms B suggests but rather that child support is related to contact. How many times have we heard that one parent wants more contact yet the other can't see their way clear to assist this. Whose interest is being let down here? It is not easy, and respectfully I don't try to suggest that it is, what I do openly opinion is that lawyers, judges, and respectfully politicians are or should be the last people that should decide.

Set a body of persons who are unaligned to the above to sort it out. Who knows the spending of $20 million dollars on setting up something such as this might even save the alleged $800 million presently outstanding. Start from the most negative position we can act from as a culture of supposedly good people and work your way up as you have less to

fall. Presently the heights that are being scaled by this Committee leave no place to go, but down. There is no net below, just in case you haven't looked. I can assure you no position taken by the above vested interests, no matter how well intended or positive will resolve this matter; not least the sacrifice of many more lives and of countless children's hopes.

For your records I stand on notice that all I say is verifiable and am subject to the action of the Parliamentary rules of conduct. I greatly appreciate this opportunity and respectfully hope that something worthy of its intention is forthcoming.

I do not believe that these people will argue that I have had a fair hearing but then again being found guilty on the balance of probabilities on fabricated and withheld evidence for these people is the same as having a fair hearing were the judges can fabricate Kay style integrity.

I, like so many people would like all this to just go away, wake up one morning and believe this to have been a nightmare instead of the living one that I now exist in. After 6+ years of fighting for what I believe does take a toll, both on my health and for those I care about. The constraints on me will not allow me to pretend this is a nightmare. As there is no alternative, that I might be able to get past that would allow me to move on, perhaps you might now understand why I can't let this go.

I want a life, to share with people I know to be honest and responsible and respectful of the values I hold.