

Submission No: 389

Date Received: 4-8-03

Secretary: _____

28th July, 2003

**Committee Secretary,
Standing Committee on Family
And Community Affairs,
Child Custody Arrangements Inquiry,
Department of the House of Representatives,
Parliament House,
CANBERRA, ACT, 2600
Fax (02) 6277 4844**

Dear Secretary and Committee Members,

Thank you for the opportunity of contributing to your Inquiry.

We write to you as (four years) alienated, grieving Grandparents of two male children, now aged fifteen (15) and sixteen (16) years respectively, and as the ageing parents of an alienated, disenfranchised, **custodial father parent**.

Given the unacceptably high suicidal statistics directly associated with the Family Court of Australia, furthermore, exacerbated by unwarranted abuses of power within the ranks of the discriminatory CSA (Child Support Agency), Family Law Reform, today, may be instrumental in saving the lives of thousands of fine, young Australian men, tomorrow.

Yours faithfully,

"A BIRD NEVER FLEW ON ONE WING – ESPECIALLY THE STORK"

SUBMISSION: The Submission has been broken into the following sections, viz:

1.	<u>Contact with Grandparents</u>	2
	1.1 Alienation	2
	1.2 Emotional Abuse of Children	2
	1.3 Grandparents in Distress	3
	1.4 Invisible Grandparents	3
	1.5 Sibling Cousins	3
2.	<u>Custodial Father Parent – Male Children</u>	3
	2.1 Custodial Responsibilities	3
	2.2 Failure of FCA to Uphold Custodial Law	4
	2.3 Suitability of Resident Parent	4
	2.4 Demonstration of Bias	5
	2.5 FCA Choice of Appropriate Resident Parent	5
	2.6 Lack of Duty-of-Care	6
	2.7 Male Children & Paternal Male Role Models	6
	2.8 Older Maternal Parent	6
	2.9 FCA Fails to Uphold its own Contact Orders	6
3.	<u>Observations</u>	6
4.	<u>Equal Time with Both Parents</u>	6
	4.1 Psychological Disturbance	7
	4.2 Objection by Chief Justice Nicholson	7
	4.3 Paradox	7
5.	<u>F.C.A. Has No Role in Family Law Reform</u>	7
6.	<u>CSA Pilot Programme Funding – Male Counselling etc.</u>	8
	6.1 Unprofessional Conduct	8
	6.2 CSA Implicated in Male Deaths	8
	6.3 CSA Image	9
	6.4 CSA Lack of Accountability	9
7.	<u>Observations & Experiences</u>	9
	7.1 Best Interests and/or Rights of the Child	9
8.	<u>Suicide Statistics</u>	11
9.	<u>BSU Study into Australian Costs of Caring for Children</u>	11
	9.1 CSA Continues to Implement Obsolete and Discredited “Lee” Schedule	11
	9.2 U.S.A. Based Data	12
10.	<u>Introduction of BSU Methodology</u>	12
	10.1 BSU Benefits	12
11.	<u>A Stolen Generation</u>	12
	11.1. Child Depression Illness	13
	11.2 Risk of Abuse	13
12.	<u>Sensible Alternatives</u>	13/14

1. CONTACT WITH GRANDPARENTS: It is in the childrens best interests to retain contact with loved grandparents. It is also widely accepted by medical professionals, that contact with Grandparents is beneficial for children, post divorce. Grandparents have an important role to play in the stability of developing lives of children. This is particularly so, when trusted grandparents have been part of the supporting family network, following the desertion of the children, by the mother parent, and ultimate marriage breakdown. The continuity and presence of the extended family network, in such traumatic cases, provides the necessary and reliable emotional security to both the (now) **custodial father** and his children, as they endeavour to come to terms with their new domestic situation. Such family network is supportive, on-going, loving and dependable. To deserted children, it is vital.

1.1 Alienation: Paternal Grandparents, who have previously enjoyed a close and affectionate life-time relationship with their grand-children, become ignored, isolated and too readily discounted, when excited children are taken interstate to live, by the (now) returning mother parent. This situation is particularly poignant where the Paternal Grandparents are the **ONLY LIVING GRANDPARENTS** of the children concerned. Children are thus removed from the only known biological family members of an earlier generation, who enrich the knowledge and experience of young lives. Grandparents are generally trusted, dependable, much loved and needed people in the lives of children. The value of grandparents needs to be recognised.

Realistically, the continuing presence of ageing Grandparents cannot be taken for granted. We are ever-mindful that the best part of our lives have been lived. We are constantly reminded of how few productive years may remain.

For children, the deliberate separation and alienation from their grandparents, may be total. There is no permitted correspondence, no contact, no information allowed. Correspondence and/or family photographs forwarded to children, maybe intercepted by the (now) resident mother parent. Simple birthday cards to children, are also not acknowledged. In this way, grandparents are marginalised. In this manipulative way, the children lose all touch and contact with their formerly, very important grandparents.

1.2 Emotional Abuse of Children: Children may be known to fret for grandparent and/or extended family contact. Without contact occurring, however, children may believe they have been forgotten, or are un-loved. Regretably, they may also begin to feel **guilt emotions**, associated with their earlier compliant actions, by departing interstate. Children do not know how to deal with guilt. The obvious method is to ignore what has happened. Children thus turn aside from family members, in order to shield themselves from emotional guilt. Denial of family contact, is a powerful tool in the Emotional Abuse of Children

1.3 Grandparent Distress: Conversely, faced with the continuing alienation from much loved grand-children, the daily lives of devoted grandparents become increasingly sorrowful. Every day is the same. The sadness is constant. There is no relief from the pain of loss of young children. It is as though these children have died. Yet no death has taken place. The raw wound of loss, remains permanently open.

Grandparents live with the knowledge that they, themselves, may not live long enough to see their grandchildren again. Grandparents further grieve, because they well understand how the children must also eventually grieve – upon learning of the death and permanent loss of their grandparents.

Emotional pain such as this, need not be inflicted upon children. Children need to be protected. Responsible, non-judgemental and stable families endeavour to provide full emotional protection for their children, at all times.

1.4 Invisible Grandparents: Under law, Grandparents are being ignored, or worse, contemptuously dismissed. In Family Law, Grandparents have become devalued members of family life. Grandparents are the side-lined victims of an iniquitous, pro-female legal system operating throughout Australia today. And the familial rights of our grandchildren are ignored.

1.5 Sibling Cousins: The “best interests” of children are not well served, by removal and permanent separation from grandparents, and/or other extended family members.

Children need continued familial interaction, particularly with siblings, in order to grow into confident, stable young adults.

Sibling cousins, furthermore, who have been “left behind”, following a child’s relocation interstate, also grieve for the loss of that sibling. There is no contact maintained between children.

But under the current family law, our children have no demonstrable family rights.

2. CUSTODIAL FATHER PARENT – MALE CHILDREN: Rarely do father parents gain Custodial Parent status of their children, through the biased actions of the Family Court of Australia.

For a father to be recognised as a Custodial Parent, there must undoubtedly be clear, mitigating circumstances.

The desertion of the wife, and mother of pre-school aged children, is one such pertinent factor which the FCA cannot ignore. Under such circumstances, the father parent thus becomes the recognised legal Custodial parent of his children.

2.1 Custodial Responsibilities: In order to provide an emotionally safe and secure home environment for very young deserted children, a responsible career-orientated parent makes far-reaching sacrifices. It is not widely recognised the extent of sacrifice and change a father parent is required to make.

A responsible and devoted father may find it necessary to resign from the workforce. This is particularly damaging where the father has long held an executive business position. With the established employment gone, the career path has also gone. Promotional opportunities and career advancement no longer exist. The salary (substantial in many cases), has also been forgone. Every goal a man may have worked to achieve, is now behind him. Domesticity becomes a full-time role.

With no employment prospects, and no early opportunity to earn an income to support his children within the foreseeable future, coupled with a substantial loss of assets, following the transfer of wealth as granted by the FCA in a generous property settlement to the former spouse, the Custodial father parent and his pre-school aged dependent children, face a financially lean future. This situation may remain constant for large periods of time. Two or more years, is not uncommon. The loss of a paternal parent's successful business life, career and income is ignored by the FCA. During this time, no Child Support payments may be made by the deserting mother parent.

2.2 Failure of Family Court of Australia to Uphold Custodial Laws: Under present law, should any father parent fail to return his children to the resident parent, following a child access visit, the father is promptly located by police, and may be given a lengthy Gaol sentence, handed down by the FCA. The (non-criminal) father parent now has a criminal police record.

Should a mother parent abscond interstate with her children, following an access visit, however, nothing happens. The children are taken from their established family home, and the custodial father receives no legal assistance and/or acknowledgement of his custodial status, by the biased and discriminatory Family Court of Australia..

It may be purported by the FCA, furthermore, that children of eleven (11) and twelve (12) years respectively, are of an age where they may "choose" their own resident parent. Excited, emotional children of young ages, however, do not have the maturity to enable them to know what they are doing, long term – either to themselves, to their Custodial father parent, or to their immediate families. The long term effects of their initially compliant actions, are only recognised with the passage of time. By then it is too late. The die has been cast. A child's genuine regret and/or remorse, does not appear to be recognised by FCA.

2.3 Suitability of Resident Parent: In the "best interests of children", the FCA has a legal responsibility and a duty-of-care towards children, to ensure the on-going safety and welfare of all children who are hastily removed from the safety of the established parental home, and re-located from the Home-State of the children.

In neglecting to ascertain the safety and circumstance of such children, the Family Court of Australia fails in its Duty of Care towards children, and places those children at grave risk.

(5)

One would expect that the FCA would be very interested in the following factors, prior to making a much-trumpeted decision regarding the "best Interest" of children, viz:

- (a) Does a parent have a history of marital desertion?
- (b) Does a parent have a history of child desertion from those marriages?
- (c) Does a parent have a history of mental and/or emotional instability?
- (d) Is there a history of mental/emotional instability in that family?
- (e) Is there a history of self-harm and/or suicide in that family?
- (f) Is there an on-going history of parental depression and/or other health factors?
- (g) What prescribed medication is being taken by the parent?
- (h) For what reason and/or medical condition is the parent taking prescribed medication?
- (i) Has the parent consulted a Psychiatrist regarding mental and/or emotional
- (j) instability?
- (k) Does the parent indulge in unstable, jealous, aberrant behaviour?
- (l) Does the parent indulge in extreme exaggeration?
- (m) What is the financial position of the parent?
- (n) To what extent is there an age discrepancy between the two parents?
- (o) Are there biological family members residing interstate?

2.4 Demonstration of Bias: It may be said with conviction, that were a Father parent to present with any, or all of the above conditions in seeking resident parent status, to the FCA, he would be ridiculed and laughed out of Court. It would be doubtful if he would be permitted to see his children at all, without supervision.

When a non-custodial mother parent absconds interstate with children, however, no inquiry is made by the FCA, no attempt made to understand the rationale behind the spontaneous and hysterical behaviour, and the children "assumed" to be in safe custody, because this is, after all, the mother parent.

2.5 FCA Choice of Appropriate Resident Parent: It is understood that it is within the jurisdiction of the FCA, to appoint the appropriate resident parent of children, when, or if change becomes necessary.

2.6 Lack of Duty of Care: Failure by the FCA, to examine the background and/or documented evidence of serial desertions of earlier marriages and other young families by the mother parent, however, corresponds with the FCA's profound failure and negligence to examine and compare the stable background and parental skills and history of the non-judgemental Custodial father parent.

The FCA is committed to granting residency status to the mother parent, irrespective of the dysfunctional background of that parent. This is clear evidence of bias. Furthermore, it cannot be said to be in the "best interests of children".

Cont.../6

2.7 **Male Children and Paternal Role Models:** The Prime Minister, Mr. John Howard, has identified the most pressing need of all adolescent children – that of needing male role models in their lives.

Male children, who have previously shared a close masculine environment with a Custodial father, Uncles and Grandfather, participating in sporting activities and sharing team sports with their father (tennis, and Indoor cricket and the like), may be suddenly thrust into a predominant female household. Opportunity for shared sporting interests are absent.

2.8 **Older Maternal Parents:** Where the mother parent may be several years older than a much younger father, it is unlikely that an older mother would suddenly become demonstrably and actively interested in youthful sports participation. In it's haste to recognise the mother parent as having "resident status", the FCA fails to recognise the masculine needs and role models of developing pubescent children. The FCA fails to consider the "best interests of the children".

The FCA fails to address or recognise the important masculine needs of developing male children.

2.9 **FCA Fails to Uphold its own Contact Orders:** On-going mother parent denial of allowing child contact with their father and known and trusted family male role models, is indicative of malicious and abnormal adult behaviour. Nowhere can it be said, that this aberrant parental approach to parental and/or family contact, is in the "best interests" of the child. Yet the FCA fails to uphold and enforce its own parental Contact orders. The children remain isolated and alienated. Children of divorced parents have no demonstrable family rights in this country.

3. OBSERVATIONS:

- (a) The FCA has breached its duty-of-care towards the children.
- (b) The FCA is condemned by its failure to uphold it's own law in respect to the status of Custodial Father parent.
- (c) The FCA has acted with unseemly haste, to grant the maternal parent "resident parent" status, without due investigation into the background and/or medical history of the parent concerned.
- (d) The FCA has failed to investigate the reasons for impulsive actions by the mother parent, leading to the relocation of children, interstate.
- (e) The FCA may have placed Australian children at grave risk.

4 EQUAL TIME WITH BOTH PARENTS: Where circumstances are appropriate, children ought to be able to spend equal time with both parents. Where this is not appropriate, school holidays periods would provide important continuity of contact with extended family members (i.e. Grandparents, Aunts, Uncles, cousins, and half-siblings from a paternal second marriage). Failure to provide continuity of stable family contact, may result in separated children becoming fretful, isolated and resentful. Delinquency and/or self-harm are other manifestations of psychologically damaged children.

4.1 Psychological Disturbance: Self-harm is acknowledged as a possible outcome of psychologically disturbed and/or damaged, unhappy children, coupled with delinquent behaviour and/or brushes with the police.

4.2 Objection by Chief Justice Alister Nicholson: Interviewed on ABC radio, following Prime Minister Howard's announcement that parents ought to have Joint Custody of children, Justice Nicholson was quick to refute the proposed reform. Joint parenting was "not practicable" and "not children focused", he said. People advocating change were, "not thinking of the children; they were thinking about the parents," Justice Nicholson went on.

4.3 Paradoxically, the Chief Justice then went on to highlight one of the extreme anomalies that is allowed, encouraged **and practised** by the FCA. Should one parent live in Alice Springs (for example) and the other in Melbourne, how would a child's time be divided between two parents, the Justice asked. "Do you shunt them backwards and forwards, by plane? And half the time, the parents can't afford it..." (Quite!)

This living arrangement and relocation of children interstate, permitted and encouraged through the discriminatory actions of the Family Court Australia, is clearly to consider the "best interests of the mother parent", over and above the "best interests" of the child (and the second parent).

This is particularly pertinent and revealing, when there may be **no biological family members living interstate.**

Children suffer their first traumatic experience of **Emotional Child Abuse** at the hands of the Family Court of Australia.

Impoverished father parents are severely disadvantaged by their children residing interstate with the mother parent. Failure, or an inability to maintain child visitation contact, therefore, gradually breaks down and ultimately destroys those trusting and affectionate bonds between father and child. This is a fact which appears to be well known, understood and pursued by family law personnel.

5. FCA HAS NO ROLE IN FAMILY LAW REFORM Given that Chief Justice of the Family Court of Australia, Alistair Nicholson, has served in this position for approximately fourteen years, it would appear that the only productive and worthwhile decision the Justice has made during this time, is to announce his impending retirement in 2004.

As the incumbent Chief Justice of FCA, with a lack lustre performance behind him, Alistair Nicholson has nothing more to contribute. Nor should he be invited to.

It is further understood that the Chief Justice actively participated against the proposal for earlier Family Law reform, in the 1990's.

6. CSA PILOT PROGRAMME FUNDING – MALE COUNSELLING ETC.

It was recently reported (Melbourne Age, 4/7/03) that the Child Support Agency was receiving Government funding to finance and conduct pilot programmes, offering counselling and support services to its divorcing male clients.

Why is no-one listening to the victims of the CSA.?

Funding the CSA in this way, is akin to putting the fox in charge of the chicken shed. It would be laughable, were it not so tragic.

6.1 **Unprofessional Conduct:** The CSA is a discriminatory and unprofessional Statutory Authority, known to practise malfeasance (and/or misfeasance), when dealing with father parent clients.

The operatives of this Statutory Authority routinely harass divorced father clients.

The CSA knowingly and systematically assesses clients in excess of the total gross costs of caring for children, and in excess of the client's ability to afford.

The CSA website, in early 2001, publicly stated that, **“Recent Australian research indicates that the child support formula requires higher income payers to pay more child support than the total gross costs of their children.”**

Without the obligatory Court Order and/or advice to the paying father parent, the CSA has been known to misappropriate funds from a Solicitor's Trust Account, (funds being held “in trust” for dental needs of dependent children).

The CSA has been known to misappropriate funds from clients' Bank accounts and to further misappropriate funds from clients Taxation cheque refunds.

The CSA has been known to en-act garnisheement of salary, without the procedural Court Order first being obtained and/or client being so advised.

The CSA has been known to ignore orders given by the payee parent, to forgive a level of monetary arrears.

There may be further evidence to suggest that these malpractices occur with the approval of senior CSA management.

The Attorney General may also have a duty to investigate whether the harassment of clients by CSA personnel, constitutes criminal activity.

THIS UNPROFESSIONAL STATUTORY AUTHORITY SHOULD BE IMMEDIATELY DISMANTLED AND ABOLISHED.

6.2 **CSA Implicated in Male Deaths:** Following the ruthless practises of this Statutory Authority, in dealing with emotionally distraught, divorcing fathers, and arrogant decisions regarding the welfare of their children, the CSA appears to have one single agenda. This agenda is to **MAXIMISE THE INCOME FOR THE MATERNAL PARENT.**

In pursuing its agenda for maximum income for the resident mother parent, furthermore, the CSA has acknowledged that those paying father parents earning a higher than average income, may ultimately pay a higher level of Child Support payments, irrespective of the figures relating to the cost of caring for children.

6.3 CSA Image: By accepting Government funding for counselling and support services to be provided through the CSA, furthermore, this disgraced Statutory Authority appears to be concerned with its image – that it may be seen to be “doing something” about the unnacceptably high incidence of deaths in its client register. (Perhaps this is also a disquietening confirmation the the CSA does, indeed, “keep figures” relating to the deaths of its clients – repeatedly denied in the past.)

6.4 CSA Lack of Accountability: The CSA may be acting outside its Charter, and breaching its duty of care to clients, whilst employed personnel act with impunity, and without fear of accountability.

The CSA is perceived to be well protected by legislation, and by the Family Court of Australia.

Protection of this nature, leads to systemic corruption within a department, and/or the legal system, resulting in a public loss of confidence in the legal system.

It has been said (quote): **“If the courts of common law do not uphold the rights of the individuals by granting effective remedies, they invite anarchy, for nothing breeds social disorder as quickly as the sense of injustice which is apt to be generated by the unlawful invasion of a person’s rights, particularly when the invader is a government official.”** (unquote).

7. Observations & Experiences

7.1 **Best Interests and/or Rights of the Child:**

- (a) Australian children of divorced parents, have no demonstrable, basic human or family rights. They have no “voice”.
- (b) The “best interests” of children are ignored, in preference to the “best interests” of the resident parent – predominantly the mother parent.
- (c) Children become useful FCA financial commodities, following divorce.
- (d) The FCA distributes assets generously to the resident/mother parent.
- (e) Assets may also incorporate substantial pre-marital assets, held by the father parent.
- (f) Children are predominantly used by the Child Support Agency, to maximise financial gain for the maternal, resident parent.

- (g) CSA maximises financial income to the mother/resident parent, by continuing to implement the obsolete and discredited "Lee" schedule of costs of caring for children.
- (h) Four years ago, the AIFS (Australian Institute of Family Studies), published a **discontinuation notice** relating to the obsolete "Lee" tables, in the Winter 1999 edition. The discredited "Lee" tables are understood to have been originally based on data collected in the United States Expenditure Surveys, in 1989.
- (i) Readers with an interest in the costs of children, were then directed by the AIFS, to the more recent research by the Social Policy Research Centre, University of NSW (the BSU Report).
- (j) The CSA has **declined to promote the need to revise the "Lee" rates.**
- (k) The CSA is understood to have actively hampered the adoption of replacement rates, when the BSU study into the cost of caring for children was published five years ago, in 1998.
- (l) **The BSU (Budget Standards Unit) was the outcome of a joint Select Committee Inquiry, commissioned by the Government, in 1993. The BSU recommendations for reform, were made public five years ago, in 1998.**

The BSU is reputed to remain a proper and proven Australian study into the Australian costs of caring for Australian children. The implementation of the BSU schedule is both urgent and overdue.

- (m) Until the fairer and more equitable BSU schedule is implemented by the CSA, distraught and impoverished Australian fathers continue to be robbed blind, and are driven to the brink of suicide.
 - (n) Suicide by a loved and trusted father, is the **ultimate grief for children.** How can it be said that this level of shocked grief is in a "Child's Best Interest"?
- This is a cruel and shocking indictment on our otherwise civilised society.
- (o) It is understood that an estimated three (3) male deaths per day, take place in Australia (Australian Bureau of Statistics). Three Australian fathers are driven to (preventable) suicide by a corrupt and callous Legal System – every day. Three families of children are bereaved – every day. And three extended families try to understand the injustices and abuses of departmental power that precipitated the suicide of a responsible, mature, adult man.
 - (p) The onerous and coercive tactics implemented by CSA, have undoubtedly been a major contributing factor in the high fatality rate of its distressed clients.
 - (q) **Failure for CSA to monitor its client deaths by suicide, is indictive of a moral bankruptcy.**

8. Suicide Statistics

The CSA repeatedly states that it does not keep data relating to the regular suicidal deaths of its clients.

When questioned, the **Minister for Children and Youth Affairs**, the Hon. Larry Anthony, also repeatedly states that the CSA does not keep data relating to the suicidal deaths of its clients.

Both the CSA and the Minister blandly state that it would be “innappropriate” to retain this information.

Given the high level of public interest in this matter, and the preventable deaths of healthy young men in this country, one would have to ask – for whom is it “inappropriate” to retain statistical data on these suicidal deaths? This cavalier attitude displayed towards the deaths of healthy Australian men and fathers of children, demonstrates a cunning wish to prevent accurate figures being made public.

The CSA in particular, needs to be held accountable to the affected children and aged parents and extended families, for the preventable deaths of its clients.

Any Corporate entity with a similar fatality record would have major corporate governance and legal issues to contend with.

(9) B.S.U. STUDY INTO AUSTRALIAN COST OF CARING FOR CHILDREN;

The Budget Standards Unit was the outcome of a Joint Select Committee Inquiry, commissioned by the Government in 1993, examining (in part) the operation and effectiveness of the Child Support Scheme.

The Joint Committee noted the need for the current Australian research into the costs of caring for children, in order to ensure that the formula percentages were appropriate. It is understood that the BSU recommendations for reform were made public in 1998.

The BSU remains a proper and proven study of the Australian costs of caring for children.

9.1 CSA Continues to Implement Obsolete and Discredited “Lee” Schedule:

Four years ago, in the Winter 1999 edition, it is understood that the AIFS (Australian Institute of Family Studies) published a discontinuation notice relating to the obsolete “Lee” tables. Readers with an interest in the costs of children, were then directed to the more recent research by the Social Policy Research Centre, University of NSW (the BSU Report).

The CSA, however, has declined to promote the need to revise these rates, and is understood to have actively hampered the adoption of replacement rates, when the BSU study into the cost of caring for children, was published in 1998.

9.2 U.S.A. Based Data: The "Lee" study was commissioned in 1989 and is understood to have been originally based on data collected in the United States Expenditure Surveys.

The American methodology, however, is now proved to be inaccurate, outdated and flawed. It is both inappropriate and mischievous for the CSA to continue using this obsolete American schedule of costs, when dealing with Australian families.

10. INTRODUCTION OF BSU METHODOLOGY: The implementation of the BSU schedule is both urgent and overdue.

The immediate implementation of this fair and accurate proven method of calculating child costs in Australia, must be seen to be both desirable and of paramount importance.

Until the Australian BSU schedule of costs of caring for children is implemented by the Child Support Agency, however, Australian men must continue to be robbed blind. There is no escape from this nefarious situation. Impoverished and distraught family men are being driven to early suicide.

10.1 BSU Benefits: With the immediate implementation of the Australian BSU methodology by the CSA, several areas of contention may be expected to substantially improve, including, viz:

- (a) Men's better health (i.e. reduction in heart disease, reduction of elevated blood pressure and increased risk of stroke), and ability to continue to be productively employed;
- (b) Reduced male impoverishment;
- (c) Reduced risk of male suicide;
- (d) Ability to financially support a second marriage and family;
- (e) Reduced expectation of the mother parent, to inappropriately high levels of Child Support payments;
- (f) Less malevolent PAS (Parent Alienation Syndrome) being en-acted by one parent towards another;
- (g) Better civility and less hostility en-acted between parents of children;
- (h) Higher level of child/father contact;
- (i) Happier, well-adjusted, emotionally stable children;
- (j) Less anxiety and distress-related illness in ageing paternal parents, and/or grandparents.

11. A STOLEN GENERATION: A new generation of Stolen Children? It is happening right now, across Australia. Tens of thousands of (white) Caucasian children have been stolen – and are continuing to be stolen – from their natural fathers.

These children form part of the almost one million dependent children, now being raised by single parents (Australian Bureau of Statistics).

11.1 Child Depression Illness: The deleterious effect of separation needs careful analysis. Already, confused and distressed children are reportedly being treated for depression, at unprecedented rates. Self-harm and delinquent behaviour may also be interpreted as further manifestations of grief, in bewildered children.

11.2 Risk of Abuse: The high risk of physical harm and/or child abuse posed to children, by the casual partners of the mother moving into the home, is also recognised and acknowledged, in professional circles.

Vulnerable children have no protection against adult strangers in the home. This is every responsible father's nightmare – that he is unable to protect his children from casual stranger abuse.

Put the protective father's back into the lives of their children.

12. SENSIBLE ALTERNATIVES:

- (a) Recognising and accepting that all children need a family in which to grow confidently, the "Child's Best Interests" therefore, are best served by retaining familial links with biological family members and siblings.
- (b) Parents to contribute equally to the financial cost of caring for their children.
- (c) Where Custodial Father Parents have demonstrated good parenting skills , the FCA to recognise and uphold Custodial Parent Status. This particularly applies to pubescent MALE children.
- (d) Children who have matured to the age of approximately sixteen (16) years of age, may apply to the FCA for a change of residency.
- (e) A "trial period" of approximately four (4) months may be necessary to ascertain the level of correctness and/or wisdom of the child's decision to change residency, before residency becomes permanent.
- (f) Recognition of Male Role Models in a male child's life. There is an urgent requisite for the FCA to recognise the special and unique parental needs of the male child. Failure to recognise these masculine needs, is clear evidence of bias and contrary to the "best interests of the child". Suitable male role models may be widely provided from within the male child's biological paternal family.
- (g) Failure by the FCA to enforce its own contact arrangements with respect to child contact with the non-resident parent, demonstrates complicity in ensuring that the child/children grow up alienated and without benefit or knowledge of family support and/or assistance which would otherwise be available.
- (h) That the continuity of a family network, and easy accessibility of the non-custodial parent be considered paramount in the "child's best interests".
- (i) Relocation Interstate: In a "child's best interests", the FCA to immediately cease permission for children to be re-located interstate, away from the child's Home State, unless there are compelling grounds for doing so.

- (j) Behavioural examination. Where serial marriages and/or desertions have historically taken place by a parent seeking residency, the FCA to be obliged to examine aberrant behaviour and/or marital history, child desertions, and/or mental health conditions in relation to spontaneous relocation of children, without FCA approval. FCA to be obliged to return young children under the age of sixteen (16) years, to the stable home of the recognised Custodial parent.
- (k) Emotional Child Abuse is first en-acted on children, through decisions of the FCA . Forcibly separating children from a loved and trusted parent , is a clear act of emotional child abuse. The FCA to immediately cease separating children from parents. The FCA to immediately accept that both parents share joint custody and responsibility for their children.

In the "best interests of the child", the FCA to recognise the importance of the presence of the second parent in a child's life. The FCA to recognise a child's emotional attachment to a father parent. The FCA to cease forthwith, discrimination against a child's father parent – unless there are mitigating factors present.

- (l) Family Law Reform FCA Non – Participation. The FCA has no role to play in Family Law Reform. Given that the incumbent Chief Justice of FCA is understood to have actively campaigned against earlier proposals for Family Law Reform during the 1990's, there is little evidence that the incumbent has a genuine interest in providing natural justice for children and/or their divorcing parents.
- (m) BSU Implementation: To facilitate a fair and just method of calculating child support payments, to reduce hostility between parents, to lower the resident parent expectation of unethically high child support payments, based on obsolete USA data, the implementation of the Australian BSU Schedule of child support is required to be commenced without further delay.
- (n) Capped Net Salary Figure: Irrespective of the Payer's gross salary, the implementation of a **capped net salary** figure to be used in the calculation of Child Support payments.
- (o) FCA to judge each case on its merits: A one-size-fits-all blanket approach to litigation, is not in the best interests of all parties concerned, and/or their children. The FCA needs to examine each case and/or the history of the participants, to arrive at a solution providing natural justice to all parties.
- (p) Suicidal Deaths: In the wider public interest, the Child Support Agency to immediately to disclose (male and female) data, relating to client deaths on its register;
CSA to immediately be required to implement necessary computer programming to ensure the accurate recovery of client deaths, per month;
CSA data on suicidal deaths to be made public and/or accessible to organisations with an interest in this matter.