

Senate Inquiry Paid Parental Leave
Parliament House
Canberra

Submission

I refer to the Draft proposed "tests" which have the clear effect of disqualifying families and children from financial benefits otherwise available, where parents choose to provide the optimum nurturing for infants aged over six months, that is, by the full-time care and attention of the mother in the home.

These draft proposals financially penalise non-Workforce parents, who are predominantly mothers, who choose to provide the optimum level of child nurture, that is, a parent providing relatively constant care and attention to the children usually in the home, past the six months of age of the infant.

The resulting close nurture by the one person, bonded by natural affection, protection and responsibility, generally results in the child developing optimum levels of emotional security, the establishing of personal identity and leads the child towards effective socialisation, and a happy, productive life.

The consequences for the general community of full-time parental care is lower propensities of anti-social behaviors and social pathologies, and higher propensities for constructive social engagement and socially productive behaviors of children nurtured full-time in the home by a parent.

Case studies and surveys testify to the negative effects on juveniles, on parents, on impacted strangers, and on tax-payer-provided remedial services, of the absence of a full-time parent in the home in the earliest years of a child's life, when compared to averaged general behaviors of children nurtured full-time in the home by a parent.

Consequently, the proposals financially penalise families who choose to provide the most socially responsible care for their child.

The proposals also financially penalise the child whose parents choose to provide the most socially responsible care for him or her.

The proposals will penalise the ordinary citizen when he or she is the victim of anti-social and criminal behaviors, whose levels normatively increase with higher rates of infant non-parental full-daytime primary care.

The proposals will penalise the tax-payer because the anti-social and criminal behaviors, whose levels normatively increase with higher rates of infant non-parental full-daytime primary care, because higher financial costs of associated social pathologies.

The proposals will penalise the local community: Local communities will come to realise the unfairness and injustice of penalising the families who, in the main, provide the mums who volunteer their time, labor and transport for a multitude of community services. Service like serving in the school tuck shop and similar activities, to helping organise junior recreations, outings, sports matches, and looking after the local elderly and infirm, and a

miriad normal activities, without which local communities slowly become less happy and humane, due a lack of available willing volunteers, and more work falling on fewer shoulders.

Consequently, the proposals are bad policy, and would have bad social and bad Social Services budgetary effects.
They are unjust and unfair.

Consequently, the "work test" [sections 32 to 36] and "income test" [sections 37 to 41] should be withdrawn.

The allotted funding should be made available for all children on an equal basis, simply by distributing the amounts proposed for PPL as an addition to the existing "Baby Bonus" payments.

yours sincerely,
Gerard Flood