

Committee Secretary
Community Affairs Committee
Department of the Senate
PO Box 6100
Parliament House
Canberra ACT 2600
Australia

Dear Sir,

With regard to the intended legislation regarding Child Support.

1. I can see that there would be a further reduction in the access Non Custodial Parents would have with their Children.
2. Also cut down the hours Custodial parents will have to work as they will have the children longer.

Already my husband cannot have all the access he is entitled to as his Ex Wife refuses access on the basis that if he has the children she loses Child Support if the limit is changed she will again deny access to him to ensure she receives the higher rate of Support.

3. The costs of raising the children should be fairly apportioned taking into account all income generated by both parents regardless of source.
4. Apportioning 2nd jobs and overtime to enable separated parents to re-establish themselves.

Many non custodial parents are struggling to re-establish themselves after going through the family settlement process in the family courts where the custodial parent is awarded the greater percentage of the assets of the family as they have the children in their custody it is still a rare case where either joint care or fathers are granted custody.

Most Non custodial parents are left with huge debts are trying to re-establish themselves in a home where they can have the children during access periods this is in effect having the NCP pay for 2 homes at no great reduction in the amount they are required to provide.

Child support still seems to have spousal support component.

4. Deeming of income

There should be no deeming of income.

The Child Support Agency has unusual powers in determining how much a payer should be earning even to the extent of a person in receipt of Newstart allowance has a deemed income that quite often exceeds what the actual income is.

A CS debt is quite often incurred because of the deeming of a person's income. The reason a person may have left his employment could have been as simple as like my husband the Ex Wife took the car at the separation and then he had no way of getting to the work that relied on him having that transport as part of his job. He was not sacked by the employer but asked to resign because he was no longer able to do his job. Because he was not sacked he was deemed to be earning the income that he had previously. He incurred a large debt purely on that deemed income. The amount he was expected to pay surpassed what he would receive on the Newstart payment.

The report into Child Support says that formula is flawed I say the whole Agency is flawed it harasses and abuses Non Custodial Parents. It continues and upgrades the bitterness that is already in place from the separation process and with it's continued anti male attitude it is fast becoming a discriminatory Government Agency.

5. We quite often hear that this is being done in the best interests of the children however what everyone seems to forget is that quite often what is best for the children is a loving and happy relationship with both their parents that is not possible when you have parents that are being kept at each others throats by a biased Agency that seems to perpetrate injustices.
6. Perhaps before changing legislation to give this Agency even more powers a proper enquiry into practices of the Child Support Agency should occur.

Thank you, for you time

Nicola Roy.