

House of Representatives Standing Committee
on Family and Community Affairs

Submission No: 1421

Date Received: 11-8-03

Secretary:

FCA.REPS@aph.gov.au

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

Inquiry

Brief.

Financial division is in progress.

I have two children (3 and 6) who reside with their mother, a 40 minute drive away from my residence.

My role, access and rights as a father, and my ability to ensure the welfare of my children are being hideously denied and impinged through divorce and custody arrangements.

I have growing concerns in relation to the welfare of my children. However, my Solicitor advised me, the Courts would not heed a custody arrangement as I wish to take the children for 50% of the time or at least initiate schooling and kindergarten care at a mid-way point so I may play a more active role in my children's lives.

- The following refers to the Courts prejudice toward mother, discrimination toward father, depletion of father's role, cementing of his paying full costs of

children while mother contributes no costs, just care, and her misuse of child maintenance payments. The impact is the removal of the father to play an active care role of the children. While I acknowledge the mother's role, I also acknowledge the equal importance and necessity for the father to contribute care of children, and equal necessity to pay for one's own costs in life. Children are not a meal ticket, but our society is turning motherhood into an opportunity to make money.

- **The mother has to show no accountability. The father has no rights to even discuss, or contribute, to the way child maintenance is spent. No reduction in child maintenance is allowed before the father has the children 30% of time annually. I can not afford to have the children for more time as the reduction after 30% does not enable me to meet their costs. I cannot travel to see them often as they live 40 minutes away and I work full-time. The mother can even use child maintenance to pay off a mortgage while she refuses to work. The mother sees my role as the money earner and even after we have separated (a four year relationship), she expects me to pay her costs in life.**

I believe the Courts are prejudiced toward the mother. Historically, the Courts have awarded mother's custody and this cements their biologically determinist position, although I was also a capable parent who had no option but to work and lose considerable time with the children. The mother even refers to being "stuck with the children" but as she can live off the child maintenance, it is unlikely she will give them up.

Marriage is nothing more than an opportunity to make money by the mother. I will be teaching my son to not "do the right thing" if someone he barely knows falls pregnant. Sticking around costs the man financially and emotionally. He also suffers through reduced access to the children, direct costs of child maintenance that do not end up benefiting the children and cannot be put into trust for them, and the knowledge he has no rights, and a vastly restricted ability, to be a parent.

The Courts are not ensuring accountability by the Custody parent (they just assume it will happen and even evidence like the mother impinging on the children's lives by her own costs is not important enough to change the custody arrangement). The mother is allowed to leave school at grade 10, work in nightclubs, waitress, property management (which she quit twice), not secure further skills, have no commitment to meeting her own costs in life, and still she is assumed by the Courts to be the better parent. She is allowed to walk out of or refuse work. If I reduce my hours this will impact on the

financial division, while the opposite enables the mother to obtain more money at financial division. By refusing to work, the mother cements her role as the custody parent as she has given majority care to the children while I was at work. I also provided as much care for my children as possible while I was living with them. By being responsible and doing what society wants, by working and meeting my costs, the mother's costs, and my children's costs, I now am forced to lose access to my children and my parental rights.

By continuing to favourably prejudice the mother's situation at financial division, and by granting them majority custody, the Courts are encouraging women to stay at home, as they will gain greater division of assets and receive child maintenance, ensuring they do not have to work. Meanwhile, my children will not go to private school, and will not have many opportunities I wanted them to have.

I have worked full-time at one employer for 14 years. I studied part-time to secure a degree for 7 years. I am a good parent and invest as much of my time as possible in my children. My time with them is completely focused on the children. Their development is my highest priority.

I lived with the youngest child from when she was three months to when she was two and a half. I lived with the eldest child til he was age 2 and from 3-5. I now see them every second weekend. I am now separated by this distance from my children and the eldest is in school on the north side. I will also contribute a further \$370000 to the children's costs although the Australian Institute of Family Studies says two children in a mid-income household cost \$400,000. The mother does not spend middle-income amounts on the child. The youngest is now at kindergarten two days a week and the mother has withdrawn the children from medical insurance. Therefore, I will have totally paid the costs of raising two children to the Age 20.

The Courts, my Solicitors said, would see no reason to reduce the children's time with the mother. This is despite my son missing me and my concerns for his development. This is a violation of mine and my son's rights.

The mother claims she has been threatened by me. 'Threats' are by definition by the mother, any attempt by me to discuss the welfare of the children. Any discussion between myself and the mother in respect of the children's welfare ends in her verbally abusing me.

Conversations between the mother and myself which she finds threatening include an instance when I discussed with her my son's action of demanding money from people, when he said "give me your money I want your money",

an act that I was concerned is evidence of a perpetuating welfare mentality. The mother did not see why his actions could be problematic or require addressing. On dropping the children home, I once discussed with the mother the situation the children are living in. This was necessary due to the depletion of child maintenance by their mother who has walked out of or refused two jobs this year alone. I asked her if she was looking for work and what plans she has for the children's future welfare and if I should take the children for a period of time while she sorts her life out. She became verbally aggressive again.

I have suggested I reduce my working hours to 3 days per week so I could spend more time with the children. This would have reduced my tax by \$13000 pa and still kept the child maintenance within the middle-income bracket and covered their costs totally til they reached 10. This would have given the mother ample time to secure a permanent job, contribute to her own costs, and to her children's. She said I could [REDACTED] and that she would have to "take more from me at separation then". The mother has worked for 32 weeks out of 7 years. She says her costs in life are my responsibility. I reject that she is my dependant. My financial responsibility to my children will end when they are independent. The mother is 31 and thinks I should pay off her house completely and \$20000 a year in child maintenance even though she can then put them into a poverty situation. She has bought herself a new car while reducing the children's costs. She and her new partner do not contribute to the mortgage.

- a. What right do I have to stop her involving the children, and verbally abusing me in front of them?
- b. What protects men from their ex-wives slander, and even false DVOs?
- c. How do men protect the welfare of their children while they have no right to question how child maintenance is spent or how the mother plans or manages the children's development?
- d. Why are men not enabled by the Courts to pursue shared care?
- e. Why does the mother not have to assist make shared care possible, or at least involve the father in the children's welfare?
- f. How do men protect social capital?
- g. How do men protect their parents from their ex-wives slander?
- h. Why do women receive majority custody?
- i. Why do women not have to show accountability for child maintenance or their own costs?
- j. Why is the mother's role as a parent, a better carer, and more important than the father?

Children's education. I have received a copy of one report card. I am not informed of parent-teacher evenings despite numerous requests to the school and mother to do so.

I hope the above points communicate some of my distress in relation to losing access to the children, being denied this by the Courts through their historical favouritism toward the mother, and the disinterest by the current judicial system to consider what is in the long-term best interest of the children: access to both parents, child maintenance for their own development not the mother's costs, and vital support and care given by their father and grandparents.

Sincerely

A black rectangular redaction box covering the signature.