LONE FATHERS ASSOCIATION NT Inc

~~Post Office Box 980~~
PALMERSTON NT 0831

Phone 08 8932 3339
ABN 46 494 951.173

26 October 2003

Committee Secretary
Family and Community Affairs
Child Custody Arrangements Inquiry
House of Representatives
CANBERRA ACT 2600

Dear Chair and Committee

ADDENDUM

Re **Darwin hearing 25 September 2003**
In reply and further discussion

We have been bothered since by relevance, substance and intent of some questions formulated by The Committee. We are concerned with valuable opportunities missed to address such as the theme of our submission in the terms of reference of The Inquiry. That being the unlawful conduct of many employees of states and territories service providers who interfere with the course of justice of parents and children by falsely reporting their case facts to place motherhood ahead of fatherhood, in the parenting "entity". Thereby betraying several laws and the trust of Government, politicians and families. We now have the benefit of corrected Hansard of the day and make the following response to improve the committee's interactive perspective.

The Inquiry Panel of Committee

Observed from a professional perspective as a panel of inquiry. Whilst the members were personally most genuine to get to the causes of an obviously failing system, it seems they had not been adequately briefed on their primary necessity to know how the system of their responsibility "administratively" and "managerially" works or fails, and how the terms of reference of the inquiry applies to the system itself. That being. Governments' responsibilities to structure laws, provide service deliveries to those laws, and ***control*** staffs to the standards of those laws in services along the family law pathways. To then in the terms of reference of the inquiry to deduce what factors cause the evolution of parenting ratios. **That is, ALL the factors setting parenting ratios different to and inclusive of the parents own choices.** Whilst it is appreciated members may ask any questions they please, it appeared members *[with respect]* seemed inhibited to probe any 'administrative' relevance. Far too much emphasis and blame was misplaced upon the 'private' conduct of parents instead of the wider role of the inquiry.

(a) Committee understanding of the pathways services seemed restricted only to the extent of their learning from constituent's own personal, limited and often confused description of their experiences by describing 'consequences' to themselves or others. This form of description gives no indications beyond the claimant's limited and uninformed 'expectations'. It does not explain **how, where and why** any 'administrative' processes of government

responsibility work or fail. Save to excessively blame The Family Court or Child Support Agency, or parents per se, but seldom any states and territories interlocutory factors. Therefore unless the recipient Parliamentary Members are well versed in all the 'administrative' and interlocutory laws and system(s) including States and Territories, then *[with respect]* The Member(s) will be prone to not correctly identify any of Governments' own primary responsibilities as being a cause. Leastwise how staff employed mostly in states and territories, as legitimate Family Law Pathways Gatekeepers have become instead illegitimate "gender ideology gatekeepers" who in their employment falsify the families case facts, and use children as 'trading chattel'. Thus they unlawfully distort the expectations of legislation, politicians and paternal family members in particular. Consequently it is the administration that crates the gender 'war' between parents over what otherwise would be more equitable and acceptable if staff misconduct was stopped by government(s). These are pivotal and very serious factors in the terms of this inquiry, and their relevance is now probably missed.

(b) Committee seemed not to comprehend the 'stand alone' legal entity of parenting. An entity of a legal framework containing three or more persons but legally treated *[on partnership law]* as a single entity. This is the legal form of the family unit being 'administered' or 'managed' by Government. Committee appeared to not grasp that their responsibility was not to mothers or fathers or children singularly per se, but jointly to them via the existing laws to them all as the parenting entity. Then secondly interfacing the "family" entity and its case facts as presented to the service provider under these and any other interlocutory laws. It is at this interface that much interference with the course of justice to the parents and children's justice occurs by the service provider staff. **Please note again these entities cannot be administered lawfully through only one parent {partner} as a "sole proprietorship". Even in family separation.** Please note section 'E' of our submission, 'Understanding the present laws first'. **Service providers by unlawfully favouring one partner on gender have caused the current system to fail grossly** and produce a gender war between parents and children*]*. It is therefore **IMPERRATIVE** that The Committee should not recommend legislating any laws applying directly upon parents to offset the current inequities caused by staff misconduct. Staff conduct is a daily **managerial** responsibility of Public Service and NGO employers. For which there are already sufficient "employment" and "punitive" laws to not only rectify the present situation, but to have prevented it happening in the first instance. Note our recommendations 1 to 10 {especially #5}, 26, 27, 34, 35,38, and 39. The legal responsibilities of government(s) are currently grossly ignored in gender quests by most service delivery staffs. Committee must be more analytical as to what the problem actually is, where it resides, and recommend strategies to fix it in those areas. Committee cannot do so unless it firstly understands the legal character of the parenting entity and its existing facts to secondly examine the administrative stream back the 'causes' of conflict and dissatisfaction. Note recommendations 13, to 19 inclusive, 27 to 44 inclusive. Most parenting ratio problems and their 'consequential' parental tensions arise and are inflamed 'administratively' and 'managerially' by staffs unlawful interferences. As set out in our submission and decipherable from many other evidences to this inquiry.

(c) Committee seemed not to understand **that parenting ratios are currently set in a "lase fare" environment** not in the federal jurisdiction but principally through a combination of laws and other "ad hoc" factors interlocutory in states and territories jurisdictions. **In which service delivery staff have for years been allowed unhindered to ignore the laws of their employment and through betrayal of trust during case control, TO UNLAWFULLY ALIENATE THE FATHERS AND CHILDRENS WISHES, and so set DIFFERENT parameters which then set parenting ratios ONLY to the mothers desires.** The service delivery staff and Family Court have between themselves evolved the 85 –15% parenting ratio as an "ideology" that assures motherhood prevails over fatherhood. They then have continually worked cyclically and hand in hand to retain the predetermined 85 – 15% status quo ratio continually favouring mothers. This is most unlawful as the father and children of the entity consequently get no outcome as to what they want, but only what the mother and staff decree they will receive. It was disappointing not to have been able to address this criminal conduct with the Committee Panel at the Darwin hearing.

Note our submission recommendations referred to again in (b) above. Note further our recommendation for the formation of a Commonwealth Family Tribunal and Commonwealth Parenting Plans to give a formalised structure to this current unaudited "lase fare" and "ad hoc" situation without form, in the states and territories jurisdiction. With that control being clearly placed in the Federal Jurisdiction where the 'registration' of the parenting entity formally resides along with family benefits payment, child support legislation, family law act and family court. It be an environment without duress and distortion of family facts, without opportunism of self-interest gender advocates and opportunists as currently employed throughout the family law pathways. . It will instead be in a new environment of balance for parents and their children to be assisted to evolve their own parenting plans.

(d) Committee dwelt far too much upon an apparent recalcitrance between motherhood and fatherhood *[within the **parenting** entity]*. A clear result of Members hearing so much from their constituents relating their "personal consequences". Better briefing of The Committee would have made it clearer about governments' responsibility to the service delivery systems of federal and states jurisdictions. ***As to what creates parenting ratios other than the parent's own decisions or The Family Court].*** In fact service providers staffs' behaviours did not rate a single mention at the table, although it was the prevailing point of our submission and other evidences. It seemed erroneously by The Committee that all service provider staffs' were infallible and not a problem in delivering what the law prescribes. So the problem was mistakenly identified as either 'the law' or 'recalcitrant parents', ***of which it was mostly neither***. The real problem lays with service delivery staff substituting a "professional" decision based on laws and fact with a "personal" decision not based on case facts or legislated laws. Thereby perverting the course of justice so as to stigmatise the father in the case. These causes and responsibilities clearly belonging to Government(s) and can be only rectified by Government(s).

(e) Committee probed absolutely no discussion as to how service provider staff misconduct could or would be any factor in setting parenting ratios between

motherhood and fatherhood. Yet through Federal Members own electorate offices The Nation is 'orally' condemning the government system as 'unworkable' because of its 'feminist' facilitation and canonisation of 'motherhood' versus the ***obstruction and stigmatisation*** of fatherhood. *[When gender is not a factor in law, why then baulk at the overwhelmingly obvious gender biases of services delivery staffs? Has the price of 'feminist' advocacy and domination of family administration in support of sole parent motherhood been worth the price of 53,000 divorces and 1660 separated male suicides annually? It would seem not and must be addressed in this inquiry]*

(b) It therefore seems that much of the evidences given to this inquiry would not be recognised by The Committee for what it actually is. The Committee seemed far too much to be on a public "opinion poll" about bickering parents seeking the consensus preferences of motherhood or fatherhood. Instead of in the terms of reference of the inquiry (a) **the causes of unpopular parenting ratios** and (b) **how to achieve more acceptable parenting ratios.** The Committee seemed inadequately briefed rather than personally unwilling.

(c) Committee seemed to be looking for a simple "silver bullet" solution of appeasement between the parents. A simple solution does not exist. Because the entire spectrum of the family law pathways system is stricken by staff interfering with the course of justice favouring motherhood, and it is which is the major cause of severe parental conflict. This unmitigated misconduct has then been unjustly blamed upon the justly complaining and disadvantaged father as a male character deficit causing conflict. A nonsense well embedded in the psyche of family law pathways staffs and used in almost every case as a "rule" against fatherhood parenting. A clever underhanded way of sustaining female dominance within the system. The Committee *[with respect]* should have been better focused upon the whole service delivery shebang. Right down to the effect of calling police to the home on alleged family violence, about which 80% are vexatious and role playing for police to issue a restraining order. *{Lollypop rewards Members for role playing]*. Especially in states and territories jurisdictions where case decisions are no longer in compliance with the law and family case facts as set out in this submission. The only "silver bullet" would be to remove all gender advocacy and manipulation from throughout the entire family law pathways service delivery staff, or remove the offending staff. At times both, and why not? Such outstanding unlawfulness is the consequence of government delinquency to not remedy it as a day-to-day managerial responsibility.

(d) The exception to these *[constructive]* criticisms in Darwin was during the questioning of Dawn House Women's Refuge. Whereby the refuge revealed that by adhering to exaggerated or vexatious allegations of violence they could deny children and fathers their lawful relationships and achieve their motherhood ideology. **Local examples** Members please note, as you asked for. Examples in states and territories jurisdictions that *[[unlawfully]* set parenting ratio's favouring the mother upon her entering The Family Court seeking residency status of the children. *[See further note below on refuges].* Which until the court hearing, is held interlocutory by police or local court restraining orders. Well done Committee on revealing this point as a significant extraction of local but universal evidence. *[Did Members not recognise the NGO's unlawful detention of children in the refuge as bargaining chattel to bolster mother's qualifications in obtaining public housing, family court orders for residency and the maximum ratio of child support payments?].* Note submission pages 9 to 18 under

"Further indicators for change" in which fathers and children are deliberately and unjustly excluded from their decision making processes. These are "local" factors The Committee were seeking at the table but could not recognise nor understand were under Government(s) day to day responsibility, right before their own eyes.

Note on Women's Refuges. It is typical behaviour of women's refuges to take bookings weeks to months ahead from mothers not the subject of victimisation, but falsely alleging it to be the case. Simply to do a "Runner" without making parenting arrangements with the father and children. Thus misusing the "refuge status" as a "transit depot" and "status creator" to unjustly gain political and legal leverage at the taxpayers, father and children's expense. To then take the children with her into the women's refuge to falsely set a parenting ratio ***in which the father and children get no say***. This status is then preserved under retraining orders and by the Refuge staff until public housing is provided *[another taxpayer rort]* and the matter enters the family court with parenting arrangements unjustly canted in her favour. This is most frequently consolidated by solicitors including of the father and children's representative solicitor to deliberately delay court action until the mother has established a lengthy 'parenting' ratio in her favour as 'primary caregiver'. **A status of parenting ratio, which it is well known that The Family Court will not alter**. And so the parenting ratio has been set permanently against the father, children and paternal grandparents. Note again our submission pages 9 to 18. It is common that after several days in the refuge most children want to return home to dad, their friends, and their normal school. They phone dad to come and collect them but restraining orders and refuge staff do not permit fathers attending and collecting the children. Furthermore refuge staff side with the mother and the staff behaves unlawfully by withholding the children against their wishes from returning to their normal home. In these instances **parenting ratios are set by NGO staffs and the mother** unlawfully outside the father and children's wishes, and this also examples other NGO similar misconduct such as change-over centres being in concert with mothers against fathers. Note again pages 9 to 18.

Moving on. Member Quick with great relevance to the inquiry sought further evidence as to how Government may be more instrumental in "controlling" the system. Member Draper asked only one question and it could have been the most profound of the entire session, if time and circumstances would have permitted its expansion. Note Hansard @ Darwin 25 December 2003 page FCA21 para 5 Member Draper and Member Quick on a family tribunal and parenting plans bore most relevance. A full discussion on this would have revealed that service providers falsify reporting and recording using children as bargaining chattel to achieve their desired outcomes favouring mothers, by falsely claiming "In the best interests of the children". *[Note previous paragraph on refuges].* Indeed much child abuse is knowingly created and reinforced in a number of ways by service providers to achieve their gender based ideological outcomes. A pity Member Draper did not raise this question earlier.

Had time permitted to fully answer Member Drapers simple question the entire system could have been exposed as being brutally uncaring about children, so long as the service provider served the mother's desires by no matter how much dishonest staff behaviour it takes to achieve it.

It matters not to staffs how often they lie and reinforce lie with lie, to interfere with the course of justice, to deny fathers and children their fullest possible parenting relationships. Including concealing abusive mothers or other child abusers in her home or a plethora of other instances of deceit and falsification of case facts. It is so simple for these providers to deceive, as their case conduct has never monitored for their adherence to case facts and the law(s) to which they work. Such is the conduct of many employees The Committee appears to still consider 'infallible employees. Some in the system would also prefer to know, conceal and condone such staff misbehaviours as "empowering" women". This is the most common staff psyche ruining the better intentions of legislation, politicians and reasonable citizens.

Setting the record straight about Lone Fathers Association NT Inc.

Oddly some Members -seemed more suspicions and concerned about the credibility of our Lone Fathers Association NT Inc than they were about the gross failure within their own sole responsibilities to a failing government system. Such suspicions were totally erroneous and unfounded. This is an everyday and obvious symptom of the 'male hate' and 'spite' and 'genderisation' ideologies entrenched in the family law pathways to 'stigmatise' fathers and to 'canonise' mothers. Whereby mothers are then mistaken as infallibly truthful and fathers and the whole paternal family are regarded as pathological liars and abusers with no credibility. This is the fundamental nonsense LFANTInc and separated fathers face continually by workers in the family law pathways. This inquiry must be impartial and insulate itself from becoming an unwitting party to the gender advocacy and gender biases of the pathways workers. The gender of the parents or children is a legal and administrative irrelevancy. The Inquiry is into improving the "administrative" workability of the parenting entity of motherhood, fatherhood and children

Members please note our submission page 3 para 2. Note our general information and our contributions to other Government Inquiries. This should have been adequate briefing and some precursor to avoid an undue quizzical concern about our organizations integrity to truthfully report on our members and interpret their experiences. And that if uniformity of national reporting appears as collusion The Committee has erroneously misinterpreted the National consistency of existing facts as the reason. A rather odd view by The Committee when very obvious collusion in misconduct by governments(s) own staff has made the family law pathways unworkable for the purposes it was intended to serve, and caused yet another inquiry

We invite this Inquiry to obtain and read our previous submissions as listed @ page 3, para 2 of our submission, and considered them in conjunction with this inquiry. Members will be surprised at (a) the independence of this branch (b) the output of this and other branches to Government inquiries (b) our unbiased understanding of the subject matter (c) our focus on the "managerial" responsibilities of government in maintaining best aligned submissions in those inquiries (d) advocacy for the cohesion of families to support children. Helped no doubt by this Co-ordinators years of membership of The Australian Institute of Management and other professional organizations. With 35 years of direct experience in businesses, and community organizations, and some 14 years in family law matters.

It is erroneous to decide that because our organization is predominately male that we are incapable of unbiased and rational problem solving and reporting on the full spectrum of family matters. Such has been the overwhelming success of stigmatisation of males by 'feminists' identifying parents by 'gender' and anything perceived male to be deemed inferior to female and open to ridicule. We have no intentions of conceding to normalising such underhanded controls over paternal families. We shall continue our legitimate role to have the laws of our country prevail over any ideological control of families. Or as Chair Hull was to say, "pushing the envelope". Save for the terms of reference, we perceived the Inquiry would not have any envelope of boundaries. We stand by our evidence.

Chair Hull appeared to allege our organization and submission was lacking in some way on recalcitrant child support non-payers. This will be addressed below. However we did say in our written submission that we would not have much to say on child support in this submission. Our reasons being

- In our written submission we declared our CSA discussion would be short, because we considered most features of CSA to be outside the terms of reference of this inquiry. Save for the points we did make, as below.
- The ratios on which Child Support are made and paid are not set by CSA, but in the parameters external to CSA as given throughout this submission.
- We did make some CSA discussion and highlighted the major points to which the terms of reference of this inquiry may apply. Please note CSA recommendations 12, 24, 25, and as interlocutory 16. This is another example of some Committee members apparently not knowing where and why their own government systems are failing. Instead looking for innocent scapegoats of the parents or their representatives, but not the government's own employees [and NGO's}, the main culprits of systemic failure.
- Considerable pressure has recently been brought to bear upon CSA, by the last Australian Audit Office Review. CSA now appear to be in improvement mode and requires time to demonstrated their improved status.
- We believe our other work about CSA set out on page 22 of our submission and recommendations 24 and 25, and as given below is worthwhile enough. .
- We therefore were tolerant to CSA in this inquiry as stated on page 22 of our submission 08 August 2003

Note. The Committee Member in Darwin who implied we may not be strident enough with unknown or known non-payers, could not have been more wrong in their baseless assumption. We should not be blamed for Governments own employees failings. We are unfunded volunteers and should not be held responsible for back-up to the paid servants of Government. Who could have done more in the last thirty years than our Lone Fathers Association to sincerely assist Government in their family cohesion strategies and administration?

<u>Setting the record straight about Lone Fathers Association Australia Inc.</u>

All Members of The Inquiry will be aware of the Fatherhood Foundation launched 26 June 2003 on the 12 points strengthening and supporting fathers and children. However, how many politicians will be aware of our Lone Fathers Association Australia 30 years of similar contribution to our Nation's family cohesion, including a number of National Family Law Conferences held in Canberra.

We were not aware of Fatherhood Foundation or its launch when we compiled our [NT] submission to this inquiry in August 2003. You will however note that LFAAInc too have espoused most of the same points as Fatherhood Foundation do. This confirms that others now independently recognise the same National problem LFAAInc have been working on for the past 30 years financially unsupported.

Our Lone Fathers Association of Australia Inc and its 24 branches has held and espoused the same philosophies as are inherent in The Fatherhood Foundation. However for being earlier on the scene we have had to endured the intense era of male stigmatisation and 'feminism' purporting females "single mum's" to be **"the only"** authority on all parenting and family responsibilities. We therefore have been erroneously labelled with perceived gender bias to null our excellent efforts of jointly parenting children. "Johnny come lately" makes the same points as us with a great deal more fanfare and funding to scoop the limelight that our LFAA ever had to make our many achievements.

In 30 years we have been forced to become more politically savvy. Realising that government has blatantly allowed the ***parenting*** service provider systems to be run unlawfully on gender ideology by their staffs favouring 'single mum' parenting. Predictably as time passes, unless this inquiry rectifies it, Fatherhood Foundation may also have to become politically more savvy and focused on the failure of government mangers. Fortunately however citizens are increasingly realising that most separated fathers strongly want to uphold their fatherhood responsibilities to their children. But are ***prevented*** from by the illicit control by the service providers who prevent them, and fathers simply give into the continual 'opposition' by the staffs. Some fathers will then suicide as a consequence.

Hopefully, Fatherhood Foundation may not have to change tact if this Inquiry has the gumption and courage to address the most fundamental flaws as outlined in our submission. We are further politically savvy that there are entrenched forces within and outside the family law pathways at all levels that will prevail so long as they have opportunity to stigmatise and destroy fatherhood and impost children "to empower women". A subject raised by Member Irwin but quickly put down by Chair Hull as me pushing the envelope. We appreciate the formation of the Fatherhood Foundation and like organizations in support of better parenting. However they must concurrently address the failings in service delivery staff who by case control, "male blame" fathers solely and continue to cause their suicide.

Please note LFAA are not gender biased nor gender advocates, when as 'the messenger' we speak of gender being a problem in the 'management' system. Gender has been introduced unlawfully into the 'management' system by 'the employees' of the system and **not by LFAAInc.** To demean us or "shoot the messenger" for reporting the facts, is only a traditional mechanism to retain illicit control. Would it not be only a sham inquiry if it does not take proper account of staff conduct and influences? Possibly outside Chair Hull's envelope but within the terms of reference of this inquiry.

Chair Hull appeared to allege our organization and submission was lacking in some way on recalcitrant child support non-payers. We have given our organizational support to legislation over the years since the inception of Child Support, long before Member Hull's election to parliament.

Our current National President is a member of the CSA Registrars Advisory Panel and was a member of the travelling Senate Select Committee in 1996 that returned almost two hundred recommendations on child support to the Keating Government. Nothing eventuated from the inquiry. Under the Coalition Government our organization has been party to empowering CSA on many responsibilities including debt collection and penalties. What the Member was observing on recalcitrant payers was a CSA failing and not our LFAA failing. Our policy is not to condone non-payers. . ***[The shock hits home when it is revealed mother payers [9% of all payers] mostly have been non-payers and not pursued by CSA for collection. Their debs have regularly been "excused" but not the case for father payers. Mother payers now owe about half of the total CSA debt from CSA gender favouritism of mothers.*** *The Committee please note].*

LFAAInc have an excellent record of cooperation with CSA since its inception. LFANTInc have an excellent 5 years working relationship with CSA senior staff including Registrar. We are current member of the Child Support Registrar's Regional Advisory Panel. We have also submitted to Commonwealth Attorney Generals contact and penalties legislation giving CSA greater debt recovery powers and penalties. We have submitted to the Australian Audit Office Review of CSA services and apparently were heeded with CSA planning now advanced on employee courses cloaked in "more uniform" service delivery. Plus numerous correspondences to Minister Anthony. With respect Committee, please ask Minister Anthony and your other parliamentary colleagues what they know of our strong unbiased 'family' concept support to his CSA Portfolio?

In closing this section. Let it be well understood our organization has a 30 years history of unadulterated family cohesion advocacy and contributions to the administrative and legal systems of families in separation. Therefore should there be a good outcome from this inquiry then we would not be saying a victory for men / fathers nor a loss to women / mothers. Nor visa versa. But a victory for the restoration of lawfulness to a system administering families that should never have been allowed by Government to become unlawful.

Other and Further Discussion

- Just briefly here. We noted in the public 3 minute evidences Relationships Australian NT gave argument against '50 –50 rebuttable shared parenting. That is their prerogative. However it has long been known to us that such 'counselling' organizations are not impartial in their counselling and mediation services to separating parents. Inevitably they like others encourage fathers to accept 'the 85 –15% 'fathers package'. These organizations get considerable Federal funding to provide 'assistance' services, not 'advocacy' services. Likewise why should Relationships Australia be running a 'Fathers After Separation' course? Only ***after*** these fathers have suffered intense, vilification, parenteral alienation and persuasion to accept 'the fathers 85 – 15% parenting ratio. Why do not fathers [and children] receive earlier their proper and timely information like mothers? ***About*** making their parenting plans ***before*** family court proceedings have ***concluded***? If fathers could be equally assisted from the beginning, then there would be infinitely fewer father suicides. To victimise persons and then counsel them ***afterwards*** to accept their victimisation is only re-victimisation. Another horrid outcome of

Mr Jerry Orkin's 'gender' programs from Commonwealth Family Services. *[Shame, Shame]*.

•

REDOMMENDATION 45

Government must cease providing funding streams and devising services or courses on the gender of marriage and parenting partnerships partners.

At the Darwin inquiry The Panel sought 'Local" instances.

- We ask you to note the annexure to our written submission "Complaint to Northern Territory MLA's" *[gender discrimination against biological fathers and children]*. Will The Committee please note @ section 2. Top End Women's Legal Service is an NGO funded primarily by The Commonwealth Attorney General. A typical area of Common\wealth jurisdiction which by control of funding can prevent gender discrimination in states and territories. This case in point is the legal firm that discriminated against a number of fathers 'on their sex' refusing to provide them 'family law information'. **An offence under the NT Anti Discrimination Act**. You will further note the decision of The (NT) Anti Discrimination Commission also failed in a court appeal on the grounds of bias by The Commission itself. To the extent the court ordered the investigating [female] officer not to be involved in a court ordered review. Such is the entrenchment of gender bias and gender gatekeepers as a regime cortol. We invite you to read fully the court decision.
- Also read the 'complaint to MLA's' for relevance in the terms of reference of this inquiry, through the interference with the course of justice in states and territories jurisdiction by 'gender gatekeepers' in setting parenting ratios. This is only a 'tip of the iceberg' of revelations. The Inquiry must heed the relevance that the "ad hoc" parenting ratio set in the states and territories jurisdiction is only "used" and not altered in the Federal Jurisdictions for such as child support and family benefits ratio's. Fathers and children are being denied their legal and legitimate say in their own parenting arrangements by workers in the system in states and territories jurisdiction.

REDOMMENDATION 46

a) Government must become fully aware of the degree of gender discrimination occurring in states and territories jurisdictions under Public servants and NGO's being inadequately supervised by Governments. Victimised citizens should not have to be the triggering criteria for remedy to an ailing system. The daily conduct of staff must be better controlled according to Public Service Employments Acts, Departmental Acts and NGO's contractual responsibilities.
b) A Commonwealth Government funded women's free legal services are an outdated notion that are unlawfully discriminatory which intrude into family legal entities. Since the legal profession per se is now predominately female staffed and with an abundance of private female practices specialising in women's services. Women's taxpayer funded free legal services are an acronym of time and should be ended on the basis of discrimination and a modern day excess.
c) The Commonwealth Government must cease discriminating against families, through sole gender programs and funding streams that are used to intrude into separated family entity joint responsibilities. As an example The Taxpayer should not be made to fund Women's Legal Services that discriminate against

biological fathers and their children. Department of Family Services and other funding and programs should be better aligned towards family cohesion.

With respect Committee.

The Inquiry requested and probed me for "Local" characteristics of service deliveries as if none were presented. With the greatest of respect did it not dawn upon the Committee that is what was predominately being presented by me and other witnesses. Dawn House was a self-evident example of a local problem of unlawfully withholding children from fathers, their normal homes and schools. Seemingly it was Committee who could not make the connection between local incidents and Government(s) responsibilities. The audience had no trouble making these connections and were clapping their recognition as they arose.

If The Committee recognised any similarity between Darwin and other places it was simply because those similarities exist. They were not as implied by The Committee, from imported concoctions of evidence by LFANTInc nor indeed others we observed in evidence. On the one hand there was a consistency of system failure because of a national networking of staffs' hidden agenda flourishing throughout the service delivery system, producing nationally the same basic evidences On the other hand our reporting consistent with better informed witnesses reporting from 'outside' the family entity naturally gave similar evidences. Why should it have been suggested that we colluded via 'The Net' to make inadequate evidence substantial? Clearly some Members had little comprehension of the great magnitude and uniformity of the problem demanding their fullest inquiry attention.

Did it not dawn upon The Committee that Government(s) have a nationally consistent problem from the same failing of staff's being allowed for over 30 years to dispense their own gender based ideology? Who has not been listening to this common constituents "gender inequity" complaint for the past 30 years? More importantly why were politicians not heeding their constituents and such as LFAAInc complaints for the past 30 years? The messengers of the same factual news cannot be the cause and blame simply because they report similarly upon the same circumstances. Why is it taboo in an inquiry such as this not to state the obvious cause? It raises suspicions if the underlying principle of failure that brought on the inquiry is not addressed by the inquiry. We therefore attach examples of several of the numerous "Feminist Manifestos" that predominately underlay many of the predominately female staffs cantankerous attitudes toward fathers that inspires them to alter family case facts against fathers and children. It cannot be denied that these attitudes do not exist in this stream of employees and it is the responsibility of this inquiry to make due considerations of its influences in the terms of reference in setting parenting ratios so predominately with "Single Mums".

We LFAANT Inc endeavoured to keep our evidence to the inquiry upon managerial responsibilities instancing the ***systems failings*** with actual events. We did not only state ***consequences,*** as most other evidence seems to do and then followed on to be only gender advocates. Thereby leaving it a guessing game for the Inquiry Members to figure out the causes and remedies.
Hence we gave 44 clear recommendations to lead the Inquiry to consider their 'managerial' and 'administrative' responsibilities of Government.

What is before The Committee is a system of government responsibility that appears to function to the law, but it is one only of a façade and appearance of respectability. From the service delivery end it is obvious law and facts count for naught and families are treated on gender preference for mothers and stigmatisation for fathers. The Committee is duty bound to seriously view the system also from the service delivery end

On this The Committee had much available in our written submission "on local incidents" in Darwin and did not discuss it as well as could have been done. Our "Mr J" and "Complaint to all Northern Territory MLA's" annex contained enough discussion material to solve both the Federal and States and Territories jurisdictional problems. We guess The Committee too are a little frustrated with the shortage of discussion time, and these annex evidences should be well studied before Committee recommendation are made to Government. We remain available for further discussion.

Whether The Committee eventually understands the full interaction of the system, its staffs and the evolution of parenting ratios becomes far less relevant, if The Committee will recommend to Government the formation of a Family Tribunal and Parenting Plans as set out in this submission. Good luck Committee in bringing order to a disorderly system.

Sincerely

Robert E Kennedy Coordinator

• SUMMARY OF FURTHER RECOMMENDATIONS

REDOMMENDATION 45 *page 10*

Government must cease providing funding streams and devising services or courses on the gender of marriage and parenting partnerships partners

EDOMMENDATION 46 *page 10*

d) Government must become fully aware of the degree of gender discrimination occurring in states and territories jurisdictions under Public servants and NGO's being inadequately supervised by Governments. Victimised citizens should not have to be the triggering criteria for remedy to an ailing system. The daily conduct of staff must be better controlled according to Public Service Employments Acts, Departmental Acts and NGO's contractual responsibilities.

e) A Commonwealth Government funded women's free legal services are an outdated notion that are unlawfully discriminatory which intrude into family legal entities. Since the legal profession per se is now predominately female staffed and with an abundance of private female practices specialising in women's services. Women's taxpayer funded free legal services are an acronym of time and should be ended on the basis of discrimination and a modern day excess. The Commonwealth Government must cease discriminating against families, through sole gender programs and funding streams that are used to intrude into separated family entity joint responsibilities. As an example The Taxpayer should not be made to fund Women's Legal Services that discriminate against biological fathers and their children. Department of Family Services and other funding and programs should be better aligned towards family cohesion.