## **Dear Committee**

I make the following written submission to your Committee re the Child Support Legislation Amendment (Reform of the Child Support Scheme . New Formula and Other Measures) Bill 2006. This submission is made by the due date of 22nd September 2006.

Whilst I commend the Government for introducing this Bill which effectively removes many of the inequalities from the previous Formula, there are two major items which I wish to see changed

1) I fail to understand the logical behind the Table in Section 55C (Cost Percentages).

Why for example is the cost percentage (24%) across the range of 14% to 35% percentage of care? From my point of view, there are two major fixed costs which have to be borne almost equally by both parents, the provision of transport (typically a car) and the provision of housing (typically a room in a house). This is true almost regardless of the percentage of care (except in the case of very low percentages, say less than 10%). Thus I would argue that whilst the cost percentage should obviously remain 50% at 50% care, the cost percentage should ALWAYS be numerically higher than the percentage care across the 10% (say) to 50% range and the cost percentage should always be numerically lower than the percentage care across the 50% to above range. If this is not then case then how can it possibly take into account that the provision of hosuing and capital motor vehicle cost have to be borne approximately equally regardless of time? At very least this Table should be linear.

2) My second comment relates to the Schedule: Costs of Children Table, and the accompanying ways of using it. This is extremely difficult to understand. I hold a science PhD and have spent my entire working life drafting technically and logically complicated documents, but I fail to understand the ways of using this Table as expounded. I thus propose that you have made an error. Can you please check that it is what you intend?!

Thank you again for seeking to redress the inequalities inherent in the current legislation.

yours sincerely

Dr M.C. Lawrence