

## 0.1. Is New Formula Fair to Carer and Taxpayer?


0.1.1. This article follows on as a summary of the article below, using the second Example from Matrix McElspeth, per:

*"Kate has two pre-schoolers and is not working. Former husband Phil earns \$50,000 a year and rarely sees the children. Under the old system he paid \$240 a month, but that will drop to \$127 a month from July."*


However we vary Phil's income from \$20,000 pa to \$160,000 pa to see the effect on the Carer [the esteemed Buttercup] and J Doe.

0.1.2. Here are just 3 of the results in detail, for \$20,000, \$90,000 and \$160,000, but we have in fact performed the exercise in \$10,000 increments [15 in total]

**1989 Formula**



**2008 Formula**




	Child Support assessed	FTB + Youth Allowance	Carer IN Blue + Yellow	Carer OUT BSU figures + CPI	Ratio Payer / FTB
1989 Formula	\$20,799	+\$145,736	= \$166,535	\$181,498	12 / 88
2008 Formula	\$11,349	+\$150,496	= \$161,845	\$181,498	7 / 93


	Carer IN	Carer OUT	Percentage Provision over Needs
1989 Formula	\$166,535	\$181,498	92%
2008 Formula	\$161,845	\$181,498	89%

This is the result for \$20,000

**1989 Formula**



**2008 Formula**




	Child Support assessed	FTB + Youth Allowance	Carer IN Blue + Yellow	Carer OUT BSU figures + CPI	Ratio Payer / FTB
1989 Formula	\$335,799	+\$60,676	= \$396,475	\$181,498	85 / 15
2008 Formula	\$292,146	+\$60,676	= \$352,821	\$181,498	83 / 17


	Carer IN	Carer OUT	Percentage Provision over Needs
1989 Formula	\$396,475	\$181,498	218%
2008 Formula	\$352,821	\$181,498	194%

This is the result for \$90,000

**1989 Formula**




**2008 Formula**



	Child Support assessed	FTB + Youth Allowance	Carer IN Blue + Yellow	Carer OUT BSU figures + CPI	Ratio Payer / FTB
1989 Formula	\$442,733	+\$60,676	= \$503,408	\$181,498	88 / 12
2008 Formula	\$438,975	+\$60,676	= \$499,651	\$181,498	88 / 12

	Carer IN	Carer OUT	Percentage Provision over Needs
1989 Formula	\$503,408	\$181,498	277%
2008 Formula	\$499,651	\$181,498	275%

This is the result for \$160,000



0.1.3. This is the combined graph, which takes the four indicators from the 15 individual graphs.

0.1.4. Firstly the Y Axis on the Left operates on the 2 sets of columns, which indicate the percentage of FTB in the Total Provision of Buttercup, eg at \$20,000 the FTB is about 90%

[meaning the Child Support is only 10%]. Then at \$160,000 it is almost the reverse where the FTB is only 12% and the Child Support 88%.

0.1.5. Secondly the Y Axis on the Right operates on the RED and GREEN lines [as well as the solid BLACK line at 100%, or equity]. As seen both RED & GREEN start and end together, but with some decrease for the new formula "in the middle", and I will return to both these issues.

0.1.6. To then combine the lines and columns, it will be seen that Buttercup is only [slightly] below Equity at \$20,000, and rises quickly above Equity from \$30,000. She has "twice Equity" by \$100,000 and ends up at \$150,000 getting 2.7 times her outgoings [88% of which is from the Payer and 12% from FTB].

0.1.7. In my view these results indicate a "Social Security System" and a "Child Support System" that are fighting each other harder than separated parents "experiencing joint parenting delusions", and which no amount of counselling is about to fix. It will be obvious from those two chapters in the book why this is so.

0.1.8. So to return to the questions posed, it beggars belief [and is Intellectually Dishonest?] that Buttercups [or their minders] might keep a straight face, given the results hereabove [of which of course they are totally aware] in claiming they are "hard done by" with the new formula. For example at \$100,000, to complain that dropping from 240% **too much** to 210% **too much** is hardly a complaint, but more an **admission** of overpayment in the first place.

0.1.9. But before going to J Doe it may be worth making a quick mention of the Payer [the so called Deadbeat Dad]. **Of course** he is the bunny in all this, always **has** been and always **will** be, and although we are not "allowed" to talk of any discrimination against men, these figures say that once all the

nasty Parkinson/Howard devices are out in the open then any savings to dad from the new formula will amount to the famous Amanda Vanstone "Sandwich and a Milkshake".


0.1.10. But I will explain [although you may have worked it out yourself] the nasty device here regarding "the cap". Remember there were 3 Stages to the Parkinson Plan, that is the Parkinson Child Support Plan rather than his equally devious Towards Healing Plan to save Catholic Pedophiles from their victims. Stage 1 was to reduce that "nasty cap" from about \$130,000 to about \$100,000 [2005 figures, which have now crept up again via the Hestia Uplift]. Essentially Stage 1 was the good old Latham Congoline of Suckholes to suck in the blokes, only to spit 'em out later, **including** the cap.

0.1.11. Stage 2 was the Brough/Tillmans "chase deadbeats to the grave initiative", and thankfully both got "pasturised" in November 2007. Stage 3 was the new formula on the Never-Never plan. And so it is that you will see above the Stage 1 cap stops the 1989 formula dead in its tracks before \$120,000, but the 2008 result is still creeping up until \$150,000



0.1.12. But the Cash for Comment freaks are parroting from their minders that the cap now applies to both incomes, so \$150,000 divided by two is \$75,000 each. Well nice try but I for one did not come down the Thames in the last Kipper Tin. The truth is that this Matrix McElspeth Example is typical of maybe 80% of cases and \$75,000 each is typical of about 0.001%. So Bingo, dad wears the whole \$150,000.

0.1.13. So back to J Doe. In my view there are two ways to look at this, to get some semblance of equity. The first scenario says that if dad is already assessed to fund 100% of Buttercup's outgoings, then why should J Doe be asked to pay anything at all? That situation occurs at \$60,000 [for 2008 formula] as shown below

**1989 Formula**



**2008 Formula**



	Child Support assessed	FTB + Youth Allowance	Carer IN Blue + Yellow	Carer OUT BSU figures + CPI	Ratio Payer / FTB
1989 Formula	\$200,799	+\$66,177	= \$266,976	\$181,498	75 / 25
2008 Formula	\$180,326	+\$77,005	= \$257,331	\$181,498	70 / 30

	Carer IN	Carer OUT	Percentage Provision over Needs
1989 Formula	\$266,976	\$181,498	147%
2008 Formula	\$257,331	\$181,498	142%

0.1.14. But J Doe is still putting in some \$77,000, or about 30% of the total. How could that possibly be justified? It does not take a Rocket Scientist to conclude that the Equitable Solution is to

use the new **or** old formula [it really matters not] but set the cap at some \$60,000 [ie 1 times "average wage" and not 2.5 times "average wage"]. Then cut out J Doe completely at that point. Then do a linear "ramping" of FTB to the \$20,000 type scenario.

0.1.15. After all that is how the Scheme was first envisaged back in the 1980s, but before the Secret Wimmins Business interests "dun deals" with Barry Williams, like the 2.5 cap, in return for flying Bazza around Australia. And as we see in 2006, Bazza was even flown to London to see the Queen in order to get "Peak Body" sign off on the 2008 abuses to Bloke.

0.1.16. Alternatively if the Government **wants** to have J Doe feel all Warm & Cuddly by "doing it right for the little kiddies", then why not give the commensurate relief to dad?

0.1.17. But to return to the original questions, no Matrix McElspeth, Buttercup is doing **very well indeed** in this mix, and if her spoils be reduced by some minimal amount, a lurk is still a lurk, a rort is still a rort, inequality is still abhorrent.