[redacted]

Committee Secretary
Standing Committee on Family and Community Affairs
House of Representatives
Parliament House
CANBERRA ACT 2600
Fax: 61 2 6277 4844

SUBMISSION TO THE STANDING COMMITTEE ON FAMILY AND COMMUNITY AFFAIRS INQUIRY INTO CHILD CUSTODY ARRANGEMENTS IN THE EVENT OF FAMILY SEPARATION

Dear Committee Members,

I am pleased to have the opportunity to make the following submission to your inquiry. Family Law Reform has become an extremely important electoral issue in recent years. Whilst, reform of residency and child support may be too late for my own, and others, circumstances, I can only hope my experience benefits my sons and other Australian children and fathers.

I have broken my submission into the following sections to address the Committee's Terms of Reference:

I believe the recommendations contained herein provide an effective and practical solution to inherent problems in the Family Court process which appears to have failed society through self-regulation (or lack thereof). The proposed remedies would apply natural justice through accountability to all professionals involved in family law and facilitate the removal of financial incentives for parents to fight over ownership of children or cause alienation.

If effective and proper remedies are not applied then the current adversarial system will simply evolve into a new form of abusing the process of law. This will most likely be through malicious abuse of Domestic Violence accusations. This process of law is currently abused by unscrupulous lawyers and will become the focal point to rebut the well intentioned shared parenting process. Abuse of legal process leads to violence and suicide in family law through frustration and oppression.

I have provided the Chief justice with a copy of my Application for Appeal to the High Court due to the serious allegations contained therein. However, to date, the appeals registrar of the Family Court has obstructed my hearing from progressing. This is how the Family Court works in practice. Self Represented Litigants are denied natural justice through petty bureaucrats quoting rules to prevent the Court hearing cases that challenge the status quo.

The Family Court has been given every opportunity to review the activities of the Deputy Child Support Registrar and Judicial Registrars but has consistently failed to conduct a proper review.

Copies of the various submissions to the Family Court are available upon request:
[redacted]

It is highly likely that the High Court will receive my case upon appeal from the Family Court before the date this inquiry closes. This appeal will present the High Court with ample opportunity to implement judicial reform to the Family Court and CSA, if they choose to do so. Unfortunately, going on past experience, I expect the Family Court will attempt to block my path to the High Court and I expect the High Court to be unwilling to hear my case. Such is the demise of justice in Australia. We have closed the gap between Malaysian and Australian standards of justice without improving the standard of law in either country.

[redacted]

1 Summary of Recommendations

1.1 Best Interests of Child

a) To ensure this paramount principle is not abused within the family law process it is essential that the conduct of professionals involved in family law be reviewed and measured against this principle.
b) All family law professionals should be answerable to an appropriate independent body of review with power to recommend compensation against breaches of the paramount principle.
c) The standard or definition of Appeal De-novo should be raised **to include** the process of decision making when the decision maker has a requirement to observe the paramount principle or the decision maker is a statutory authority. Currently, this is not the case.
d) The Judiciary should become less fixated on achieving Consent Orders in all circumstances. The focus should be on achieving early resolution of proceedings with fairness and equality to all parties.
e) Child Representatives and Family Report Writers should demonstrate total independence from political ideology (overt feminism) and be held accountable for any failure to observe the paramount principle.
f) Child Representatives and Family Report Writers should not be appointed by Legal Aid Officers or required to apply for costs on behalf of Legal Aid. These processes taint impartiality.
g) There needs to be a central independent body of review for complaints, review and accountability of Family Review Writers and Child Representatives.
h) Child Representatives should carry a Fiduciary Duty of Care to the children in respect to establishing shared residency orders with parents and contact with grand parents.
i) State Legal Ombudsmen need to apply higher standards of professionalism from solicitors practicing within their State. The L.O. may also be an appropriate body to monitor the conduct of Child Representatives and Family Report Writers.
j) State based Legal Aid Officers need to be monitored for sexual discrimination in client handling.
k) The High Court needs to take a more pro-active role in monitoring the behaviour of Federal Chapter III Courts and Judges to ensure they operate in a truly independent manner and remain free from political influence.
l) The High Court needs to apply a more liberal appeal process to ensure all litigants (including self represented litigants) have an effective right of appeal from Federal Courts.

1.2 Shared Parenting

a) Rules of evidence need to be observed where reasonable apprehension of false allegations of violence or sexual abuse are being relied upon to rebut shared residence.
b) Any grounds for rebuttal of shared parenting should be proven beyond reasonable doubt and shared parenting should not be rebutted on the basis of mere allegations.
c) False or mischievous allegations of violence or sexual abuse should be punished through property settlement percentages.
d) Property settlements need to ensure both parents have an equal ability to provide shared parenting accommodation to the children.
e) Child support needs to ensure both parents have adequate income to provide for the children.
f) Parent Alienation or denigration should be grounds for a change of residence arrangements favouring the disadvantaged party.
g) Non-resident Parents should be encouraged to relocate nearer to their children and to re-apply for shared residence post-relocation.
h) Child Support obligations should be suspended during periods of unemployment whilst non-resident parents relocate to be nearer their children. The paramount principle should mean that increased parent contact is more important than financial support.
i) Non-resident parents should be able to re-apply for shared residence after a reasonable change in circumstances, subject to sensible and reasonable safeguards against abuse.
j) Mothers should be encouraged to re-enter the workforce in order that they do not become dependent upon welfare or child support.

1.3 Contact with Other Persons

a) Contact for Grand Parents should be provided by default.
b) Issues to do with the cost of contact enablement for Grand Parents need to be considered.
c) Grand Parent contact should only be rebutted by agreement of all parties, including the Child Representative on behalf of the children.
d) An appropriate level of contact for Grand Parents would be a minimum 1 or 2 weeks per year depending on distance.
e) The child's representative should be responsible to ensure children maintain contact with Grand Parents.

1.4 Child Support Formula

a) The Child support cap should not exceed a fair and equal share of the total gross cost of caring for children whether this be under the formula or by Part 6A Change of Assessment process.
b) Child support payments in excess of the cap should be regarded as discretionary child support.
c) The child support formula should be re-calculated and structured upon the BSU cost of children tables.
d) The cost of children should reflect the BSU study as a replacement for the Lee study.
e) Part 6A Change of Assessment determinations should be subject to review under the ADJR Act.
f) The child support formula should apply to after tax income rather than gross income.
g) CSA Change of Assessment determinations should recognise the BSU study ahead of the Lee study;
h) CSA Change of Assessment determinations should be regarded as advisory rather than binding.
i) CSA should not harass or coerce clients for child support without a court order.
j) CSA should monitor and report rates of suicide and unemployment of their clients.
k) Appeals (full review) against Change of Assessment determinations should be heard under s.110 of the CSAAct and damages awarded against CSA where negligence is proved under accrued jurisdiction.

2 Best Interests of the Child

Terms of Reference: *(a) given that the best interests of the child are the paramount consideration:*

There is no doubt that "the best interests of the child" is a worthy paramount consideration of family law disputes.

However, it is also the most oft abused principle in family law by the very professionals charged with responsibility to implement this goal.

The paramount consideration should not become the only consideration by family law professionals. It cannot become an all encompassing excuse to abuse the principles or rights of the child's parents. It is not in the child's best interests to cause injustice to the child's parents to the extent that one or both parents feel unjustly treated. Injustice to parents may result in child abandonment, resentment or cause other barriers in the parent / child relationship.

To understand how the paramount principle is abused by family law professionals, it is necessary to understand the driving forces behind everyday abuses of law in Family Courts in Australia.

2.1 Positive Sex Discrimination

A fundamental problem of Family Law is a culture of positive sexual discrimination that emerged under successive Labor Governments and epitomized by PM Hawke's statement that by the year 2000 no Australian child would be living in poverty.

Unfortunately, this well intentioned policy objective became the crux for the Family Court and Child Support Agency to fraudulently transfer vast amounts of wealth from the father to the children, who usually

reside with the mother. Thus mothers benefited from this transfer of wealth as a form of positive sex discrimination. More unfortunately, this policy became the tool to impoverish divorced fathers.

The Family Court effected this transfer of wealth through property settlement and spousal maintenance orders whilst the Child Support Agency dealt with child support.

The Family Court became the focal point of many female lawyers and social workers with an axe to grind against males. In this Court of Law they are able to effect hidden social agendas with no accountability for their agenda, to lift the standard of living of women, is concurrent with the Court's political objective to lift the standard of living of children.

2.2 Adversarial Legal System

The adversarial basis of Australia's legal system is a fundamental problem in family law. This was acknowledged by the Chief Justice of the FCA as follows:

> US journal - the FAMILY COURT REVIEW - page 287 Vol 40. No 3, July 2002
> At the 25th conference of the family court in Sydney in July 2001, Chief Justice Nicholson stated:
>
> *"The original architects of the [Family Law] act recognised that the adversarial system was an inappropriate vehicle for the resolution of family disputes in the vast majority of cases, particularly where the continued parenting of children was an issue."*

All too often lawyers approach family law in the best interests of themselves and their clients and neglect the best interests of the children. Albeit, there is some residual recognition that what is best for the mother will indirectly benefit the children as the mother usually becomes the resident parent.

Unfortunately, this approach to law leads to unscrupulous behaviour in solicitors and legal professionals designed to grind the fathers into submission rather than achieve a fair and equitable result.

A fundamental abuse of this process occurs when Legal Aid is involved. They have a professional process of grinding fathers into submission in the best interests of their budget and their client. There is growing suspicion that Legal Aid in each state has close liaisons with Family Court Registrars to the extent that judicial outcomes may be pre-determined before any hearing occurs.

The Family Court is usually happy with any result that saves them time, settles by Consent Orders and gives mum and the kids a fair result. Fathers are left to rot in poverty with no funds left to ensure contact is meaningful or enforced.

2.2.1 Inquisitorial Judges

I note that Chief Justice Nicholson is using this inquiry as an opportunity to request more powers for Family Court Judges through advocating an Inquisitorial Model rather than an Adversarial Model to family law.

What the Chief Justice fails to mention is that the Inquisitorial Model is already in practice in family law through the extensive use of Judicial Registrars who are unaccountable for their application of justice. The JRs are able to abuse the process of law due to the high proportion of self represented litigants before the Court.

The Judicial Registrar system in use in family law is a primary source of injustice and should not be adopted by Judges.

The solution to poor judicial standards is accountability - not additional powers. Abuse of legal process should be eliminated – not encouraged or extended.

2.2.2 An Alternative?

With the failure of the traditional adversarial system and the unsuitability of an inquisitorial system, the only alternative has to be a move away from a judicial process. Children should have more say in where they reside and there should be less focus on the financial outcome of residence. In the current system, the primary problem is that the spoils of divorce go to the resident parent. Removal of financial incentives will allow for more freedom in residence and contact arrangements for children with the outcome the children will spend more time with the parent that cares about them most (Solomon's wisdom).

In order to achieve this outcome:

- property settlements need to be more reflective of a 50:50 outcome or assets being held in a family trust until the children cease being dependent upon the family assets.
- Child support needs to be capped at a fair and equitable share (50%) of the cost of caring for children.
- Discretionary child support needs to be encouraged (not coerced or de-frauded) above a share of the basic cost level. This will occur easier when both parents share the upbringing of the children.

2.3 Judicial Registrars & De Novo Appeals

Judicial Registrars operating within family law have become known as head bangers. That is, they operate to bang the heads of litigants together to make them see sense (usually the cheapest solution for the Government or legal aid).

Unfortunately, this excessive use of force provides an excellent opportunity for JRs to implement any hidden agenda they possess with no accountability.

The right of appeal from a FCA judicial registrar is de-novo. That is, a-new. Whilst the High Court ruled that de-novo appeals may have regard to the process of law used by the JR, the Family Court Rules make no mention of this right of review.

From personal experience, a Judge, in reviewing orders made by a judicial Registrar, stated: "This hearing is de-novo, that means I now redo the original hearing and everything else is irrelevant".

The de-novo appeal has become a tool to hide abuse of process from review and accountability.

2.3.1 Rules of Evidence

One of the fundamental flaws within family law has been the lowering of standards regarding rules of evidence. Too often anything and everything said by the mother is believed verbatim:

- Hearsay evidence is allowed.
- Un-sworn or un-proved statements are believed.

Whereas anything proved or sworn by the father is ignored.

Anything that supports the mother's claim for sole residence becomes evidence and presented by Child Representatives and Family Report Writers as fact.

2.4 Federal Magistrates Service

The most recent attempt to reform family law may be seen as the introduction of the Federal Magistrates Service in recent years. Unfortunately, this initiative does not appear to have had any significant improvement in the lot of fathers or their children. The FMS would appear to have become corrupted by the FCA rather than provide a means of reforming the FCA.

2.5 Hidden Agenda of Judges

Does the problem of low judicial standards stop at the Judicial Registrar level? No. Once a Registrar has made a poor decision, it is practically impossible for a father to get that decision reviewed or overturned. Particularly, if the father is a Self Represented Litigant (SRL), which most are after initial experiences and losses in family law. The standard *modus operandi* of Judges appears to be to support and cover up abuse of power by Registrars rather than overturn, correct or apply principles of law and justice.

2.5.1 Abuse of Consent in legal proceedings

A key goal of FCA Judges and Registrars has become Consent Orders. There would appear to be some macabre competition between the FCA and the FMS to see which institution can obtain the highest percentage of settlements by consent. Both Courts pursue an outcome by Consent Orders through fraud or coercion.

Why? Consent Orders are practically impossible to appeal and enable the Chief Justice to tell Parliament that more than 90% of family disputes are settled by consent (implied geniality). But in reality the vast majority of father have simply been ground into submission with no other alternative but to consent to whatever pathetic outcome they are offered.

Paradoxically, it would appear Registrars are more inclined to make Orders by judgement but which suffer from lack of knowledge or analysis, thus failing to meet the paramount principle. On the other hand, Judges are prone to not making Orders by judgement. They prefer to force the parties back to Registrars or Conciliation processes for outcomes through Consent Orders.

At the end of the process, Father are usually so disillusioned with family law, they resign themselves to life without a family or children. There is a substantial risk that fathers will become self-alienated through despondency due to lack of equity in the legal process.

2.5.2 Abuse of Violence Allegations

All too often Father hear the following legal principles and concepts being relied upon by the Family Court Judges and Registrars to alienate them from their children: "status quo", "unacceptable risk", "primary parent" and "lingering doubt". These platitudes of feminist sympathizers are routinely used to extricate fathers out of the lives of children because it is just too hard or risky to make a fair judgement.

The consequences of Father alienation are that single parent households account for some 70% of delinquent youth, whilst family violence statistics show that mothers and their boyfriends murder children by a ratio of 4:1, over biological fathers. Similarly, biological fathers account for less than 1% of child sex abuse cases. Stepfathers, de factos and other family and friends make up well over 60% of the balance.

Father alienation increases the risk of child abuse. It does not prevent it.

2.6 Child Representatives

The Child Representative (CR) is the foundation of protecting the child's best interests in family law. But there is a substantial risk that CRs lack true independence. CRs are appointed by Legal Aid in most States and usually Legal Aid is also representing the mother. Naturally, there is a fundamental conflict of interest in this arrangement.

Legal Aid will clearly appoint CRs that have a successful track record in resolving matters in a manner satisfactory to Legal Aid. This will usually include gaining reimbursement for the cost of the CR from the father, either directly or through legal processes.

CRs have become known to harass and defraud Fathers for costs incurred by the CR and Family Report Writer.

There is reasonable suspicion that CRs will act in their own (and Legal Aid) interests ahead of the children's best interests.

CRs should carry a legal onus to demonstrate diligent behaviour to eliminate PAS (Parent Alienation Syndrome) in situations where it arises.

2.7 Family Report Writers

Family Report Writers (FRW) are an integral part of the family law process. Judges have become reluctant to make decisions on residence or contact orders without a Family Report. Unfortunately, these professionals have dubious political persuasions and are in a strong position to carry a hidden agenda into the Court room.

Again, the lack of review and accountability of FRW's is an inherent problem in family law.

2.8 Ombudsman Office

One would expect the Commonwealth Ombudsman to exercise a position of strength in the review of conduct of legal professionals and statutory authorities in family law. Unfortunately, this is not the case. The Commonwealth Ombudsman has become little more than an excuse maker for any abuse of process by a statutory authority (for example CSA).

The lack of effective review of CSA by the Commonwealth Ombudsman has become scandalous.

2.9 Solicitors

Solicitors generally act in their client's best interests and pay insufficient regard to the children's best interests or their client's interests. Again, lack of effective accountability appears to be the chief problem. State based Legal Ombudsmen or Law Societies appear to be more interested in covering up breaches of professional standards than upholding these standards.

I have almost lost count of the number of times I have read statements along the lines: "we almost had shared residence arrangements worked out amicably until she went to see a solicitor." Unfortunately, the adversarial system brings out the worst in solicitors. They seem to adopt the attitude that because they work in the legal system, they can use and abuse the rules. Unfortunately, many Judges, being ex-solicitors appear to condone or accept such unprofessional behaviour.

In my personal experience I have made complaint against solicitors representing the other party over unprofessional behaviour to Judges and the Queensland Law Society. These complaints were made late 2002.

The Family Court Judges have ignored all complaints made to date. They seem to have that attitude that complaints will go away if ignored long enough. The Queensland Law Society failed to provide a diligent investigation into the complaints and the Legal Ombudsman in Queensland has failed to address the issues to date.

While those in charge of the complaint process continue to stick their heads in the sand, the system will continue to degenerate.

2.10 Legal Aid

Legal Aid has gained a reputation for sexual discrimination in family law. Mothers are seen to have access to legal aid 'at will' but fathers are excluded under any pretext.

Fathers have become reluctant to even apply for legal aid due to the inherent discrimination. Who would want a discriminatory body involved in funding their case?

Sexual discrimination within legal aid cannot be regarded as being in the child's best interest.

2.11 High Court

It would be reasonable to expect the High Court to provide the ultimate source of independent and impartial justice or right of appeal to family law litigants. Unfortunately, the abuse of judicial process appears to extend to the high Court itself.

The appeal route to the High Court contains a number of Barriers to Justice:
- Appeal application costs;
- Appeals limited to points of law rather than conduct of Judges;
- Appeals to HCA require Leave to Appeal;
- Costs awarded against the litigant in lost cases;
- Costs of transcripts are onerous or prohibitive (also inaccurate or falsified);

It is in the public interest (including child's best interest) that Australia's legal system lift its game above Malaysian standards and demonstrate natural justice is accessible to all parties, including male Self Represented Litigants.

Currently, there is reasonable apprehension that Australia's High Court is overly conservative in favour of Government policy. The recent scandal surrounding secret interviews and public speeches by Dyson J prior to his appointment to the High Court bring the independence of the High Court into question and the role of the judiciary into disrepute.

3 Shared Parenting

Terms of Reference:
(i) what other factors should be taken into account in deciding the respective time each parent should spend with their children post separation, in particular whether there should be a presumption that children will spend equal time with each parent and, if so, in what circumstances such a presumption could be rebutted; and

A primary goal of rebuttal shared parenting should be to accord both parents an equal opportunity to be effective parents to their children. Naturally, there will be instances where one of the parents is not able, interested or suitable to be an equal parent. However, the children deserve an opportunity to have both parents in their life and this outcome deserves positive reinforcement. Currently it is actively discouraged by a hostile family law industry.

The current system should be viewed as a social experiment that has failed the children and fathers:

- mothers were given every opportunity, through sole residence, to demonstrate good faith to act in the children's best interest, and they failed insofar as they resorted to Parent Alienation (PA) when it suited them. Why? Because it was too easy to implement PA, financially rewarding and there was no comeback on the Mother.

- PA should be regarded as a crime against the children and should be regarded as grounds for change in residence. Unfortunately, the current family court is not sympathetic to such outcomes.

- Contact for Fathers has been minimal and unenforceable. This has made it inevitable that fathers give up and retire from fatherhood. It is easier for fathers to become a stepfather to another man's children than it is to be a real father to their own children.

3.1 Parent Alienation Syndrome (PAS)

One of the greatest failures in the current (mother takes all) approach to family law is PAS. Officially, this syndrome does not exist. Unofficially, or anecdotally, it occurs every day in many, many ex-families. Despite the official denials, much has been written on the subject, for the syndrome is well known in all western societies.

In my own Personal experience, I suffered two years of PAS. Or should I say, my children suffered 2 years of PAS from me and 4 years PAS from their extended family. My sons have yet to see their grandparents since July 1999 due to their mother's implementation of PAS, which includes:
- returned mail;
- defaced photographs;
- relocation without advice to me;
- blocked phone calls;
- threatened DVOs without justification.

Why did the Mother implement PAS?
- Because I committed the heinous crime of getting remarried and moving on with my life after she left.
- Because she can commit PAS without any accountability;
- Because she can commit PAS with full legal funding from LAQ;
- Because she can commit PAS under the blind eye of the legal profession;
- Because excessive child support assessments by CSA provide a powerful financial incentive to alienate the father. That is, the Mother continues to receive child support in excess of the cost of caring for the children (de-facto spouse maintenance) whilst the Mother controls the children. If the children reside with the Father for more than 30% of the nights of a year then the mother loses child support (her income).
- Because she has come to perceive child support as her income rather than financial support for the children.
- Because she is vindictive and is willing to use her children to inflict pain upon others.

What did the Family Court do to stop PAS? Nothing.
- The FCA dismissed my Form 49 Contravention Notice with costs against me. It became clear the FCA plainly did not want to hear this sort of action.
- The FCA granted the mother interim residence of the children so she could receive child support.
- The FCA appointed a child representative who harassed me for costs and failed to represent the children.

The FCA failed to act in my children's best interests through their slack and incompetent processes.

Will shared parenting stop PAS? It can if it is implemented in a manner to penalize PAS. That is, should either the Father or Mother engage in unacceptable parenting, the Family Court could adjust the shared parenting ratio so as penalize the offensive behaviour. The PAS parent would lose time with their children and suffer a financial penalty through adjustments to child support.

Bad parenting should be penalized and good parenting should be rewarded. This can occur under shared parenting easier than under the current system biased towards feminist ideology.

4 Contact with Other Persons

Terms of Reference:
(ii) in what circumstances a court should order that children of separated parents have contact with other persons, including their grandparents.

Grandparent contact is one of the hardest issues facing the family law. Of course children deserve and require contact with grandparents, but how do you make effective contact orders for grand parents when serious Parent Alienation and Denigration is occurring.

From my own experience my children have not had face to face contact with their grand parents for 4 years and it is unlikely to occur for some time to come.

This situation has arisen due to lack of meaningful contact orders, lack of adequate representation by the child's representative and lack of interest by Judges in the Family Court to make effective orders.

There appears to be a hidden agenda to deny contact orders until the father agrees to residence orders and child support orders acceptable to the Judge – by consent, of course. That is, the father is coerced into agreeing to the mother's demands through systemic denial of contact. Grandparents and children become mere pawns in the Judicial strategy.

Children should have a default level of contact with their Grand Parents and it is should be the responsibility of the Child Representative to ensure the contact is enforced.

5 Child Support Formula

Terms of Reference: *(b) whether the existing child support formula works fairly for both parents in relation to their care of, and contact with, their children.*

Unfortunately the child support formula is not the only problem in regards CSA. Other problems include:
- Formula errors;
- Part 6A Change of Assessment process;
- Lack of accountability of CSA;
- Fraud, coercion and harassment;
- Illegal activities.

5.1 Formula Errors

The current CSA formula contains a number of problems:
a) it can result in assessments that exceed the total gross cost of caring for children (acknowledged publicly by CSA);
b) it can impoverish the father (not acknowledged by CSA);
c) it fails to provide funds for meaningful contact;
d) it makes insufficient provision or allowance for second families;
e) it provides financial incentive for the mother to alienate or reduce contact of children from the father;
f) it can result in violence or suicide (not appropriate to record these deaths according to CSA).

5.2 Change of Assessment Process

Most of the problems associated with the CS formula could be overcome through **proper** use of the Change of Assessment provisions under Part 6A of the CSAAct. However, the Deputy Child Support Registrar invariably abuses this process to increase child support rather than impart natural justice.

The abuses of law surrounding the Change of Assessment Team (COATs) operating under delegated powers of the Deputy Child Support Registrar go the core of legal corruption. There is reasonable apprehension that the Federal Attorney General's Department has deliberately established CSA within a protected zone insofar as it is allowed to breach legislation, precedent and natural justice with immunity.

The abuses of legal process of CSA include:

- ignore the latest study into the real cost of caring for children (the BSU study);
- continued reliance on outdated Lee study into cost of caring for children;
- excessive determinations of child support that exceed the total gross cost of kids;
- ignoring Government intent to cap child support at lower levels in accordance with new research;
- coercion to collect arrears;
- fraudulently obtaining child support payers consent to excessive determinations;
- fraudulently portraying an advisory determination as a binding decision;
- registering a Change of Assessment determination without a Court Order;
- collecting arrears without court orders;

The Attorney General and the Family Court have provided CSA effective immunity from accountability by:

- excluding CSA from accountability under the ADJR Act;
- ignoring applications to review CSA determinations under s.110 of the CSAAct;
- allowing Federal Court Judges to obstruct justice (s.110 appeals);
- ignoring applications to hear negligence actions against CSA under accrued jurisdiction;
- ignoring the Attorney General's own recommendation to the Joint Select Committee 1994 that the Family Court have responsibility to review the actions of CSA.

Whilst the objectives of CSA may be sound – it is not in the child's best interests to allow a Government Authority to harass, coerce or de-fraud the child's parent to such an extent that socially unacceptable rates of suicide, unemployment and violence are tolerated, if not ignored by that authority?

CSA boldly, and publicly, state that it is inappropriate for them to monitor the suicide rate of their clients. Yet they are able to state the number of reported suicide threats within 24 hours of being accused of deceiving Minister Anthony on such issue.

One would naturally regard the Family Court as the logical Court of Law to review and control CSA excesses. However, there is reasonable apprehension of lack of independence between a Federal Chapter III Court and a Federal Statutory Authority.