

0.1. Parkinson's Curse - The New Formula

0.1.1. There is a purple weed called Patterson's Curse that creates havoc in rural areas of Australia, named after a Bushranger whose family planted the weed on his grave after he was hung for theft. And so it is, as the Purple Haze surrounding the "devices" of the Howard/Parkinson Formula clears, that we see more and more instances where there is no change to payments [see, eg, "The New Formula is a Sham"].

0.1.2. So you may be thinking it is just business as normal via **Parkinson's Curse**, it was just a vote catcher that didn't work, but who cares as nothing changed. Well **please think again** as from the Purple Haze there emerges two more scenarios, firstly with 27% **increase** and secondly with 107% **increase**.

0.1.3. The first scenario is for a typical case of PAS/Relocation where kid [say 13 years old] gets to see dad less than 14% of nights. Dad is on \$50,000 and mum on \$60,000, having gone from "welfare to work" and easily getting one of the highly paid "secret wimmins business" [SWB] jobs subsidised by the \$2.3 billion pa taxpayer funding of SWB.

0.1.4. The Results on the next page show the 27% [\$7,000] increase to dad's bill over 5 years. So how could this possibly be? The sneaky/squeaky professor has been hitting the media [and even going to London to tell the Queen] to say his new formula now "takes both incomes into account **equally**" [inferring the old formula didn't].

0.1.5. So you scratch your head and say OK, that's not quite true but under the old formula mum's income above some \$45,000 [disregarded] **was** "considered" [or since 1999, **half** of it was] while dad's income over some \$15,000 [exempted] was considered. So why is there an **increase** and not a **decrease**?

CHILD SUPPORT INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY SYSTEM

© Child Support Solutions

Assessment

These initial payment particulars should agree with your Notice of Assessment from the CSA

These are the payments under the proposed new formula

| | |
|------------------|------------------|
| Initial payment: | \$94.76 / week |
| | \$410.61 / month |
| | \$4,927 / annum |

| |
|------------------|
| \$120.51 / week |
| \$523.98 / month |
| \$6,288 / annum |

2005 is 127% of 1989 formula



Income of payer: \$50,000 Income of payee: \$60,000

Projection

| | |
|--------------------------------|------------------------------|
| Total payment, 1989 formula: | \$24,637 |
| Average payment, 1989 formula: | \$105.29 per wk for 4.50 yrs |

| | |
|--------------------------------|------------------------------|
| Total payment, 2005 formula: | \$31,439 |
| Average payment, 2005 formula: | \$134.36 per wk for 4.50 yrs |

2005 is 128% of 1989 formula



0.1.6. As long as you have an IQ above Tony Abbott you have probably already worked out this part of Parkinson's Curse. But if not, the deception is in the word "consider". For the old formula the assessment was **pegged** by dad's income [in this case 18% of \$50,000 minus \$15,000]. All mum's income could do was to **decrease** the assessment [in this case 18% (of **one half** after 1999) of \$60,000 minus \$45,000]. So \$6,300 minus \$1,350, or about \$95 per week [\$94.76 to be exact - see above].

0.1.7. But there is no pegging at all [until mum gets to some \$130,000] under new formula. And what is worse is the assessment itself simply keeps **going up** the more mum earns. "But the professor said" Well the professor went on to say it was fair because mum will be paying the lion's share of dad's costs because she is on big money. But remember that mum's blood sucking lawyers PASified/Relocated the kid and dad don't make the threshold of the Parkinson Curse of 14% of nights, so a lion's share of zip **is still** zip.

0.1.8. So while this new method of basing the actual formula percentage on **both** incomes [ie not just a fixed 18% of dad's income] might at least result in no change where dad actually **gets** "Normal Order", this result above is just one more incentive for mum's lawyers to ensure dad does not **continue** to get to see kids.

0.1.9. And if you have got your new assessment already you will see that as another aspect of Parkinson's Curse, the CSA basically ignores the "contact regime" that you ground out so laboriously with the HLLs at the Family Relationship Centre.

0.1.10. So to move on to worse matters we now give dad a new offspring to a new partner and do the sums again.

CHILD SUPPORT INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY SYSTEM

© Child Support Solutions

Assessment

These initial payment particulars should agree with your Notice of Assessment from the CSA

These are the payments under the proposed new formula

| | |
|------------------|------------------|
| Initial payment: | \$50.17 / week |
| | \$217.40 / month |
| | \$2,609 / annum |

| |
|------------------|
| \$103.44 / week |
| \$449.80 / month |
| \$5,398 / annum |

2005 is 206% of 1989 formula



Income of payer: \$50,000 Income of payee: \$60,000

Projection

| | |
|--------------------------------|-----------------------------|
| Total payment, 1989 formula: | \$13,044 |
| Average payment, 1989 formula: | \$55.75 per wk for 4.50 yrs |

| | |
|--------------------------------|------------------------------|
| Total payment, 2005 formula: | \$26,988 |
| Average payment, 2005 formula: | \$115.34 per wk for 4.50 yrs |

2005 is 207% of 1989 formula



0.1.11. So now dad's assessment has **doubled**, about \$13,000 more over the same 5 years. So how did the Parkinson Curse arrange **that** one? Once again it is all in the way the maths "works" covered up by window dressing of "all children are treated equally". I won't even start to try to actually explain the tricks, but simply repeat the warning of never forget that Parkinson was hand picked by Howard after his work in "bending" the Towards Healing Protocol, effectively to save Catholic pedophile priests **from** their victims.

0.1.12. So there we have it, two more scenarios to explain why the new formula, once used/abused by blood sucking lawyers, can truly be called Parkinson's Curse.

0.1.13. But before departing [no pun intended] this aspect of the formulas, it would be recalcitrant of me not to share my disgust at seeing Belinda Neal raising her ugly head [as it were] at the Cash for Comment web sites, and praising the new formula.

0.1.14. Those of you with long memories will remember that in 1994 the Joint Select Committee [JSC] into the CSScheme was unanimous [save for "Senator Belinda Neal dissenting"] that the issue of exempted vs disregarded incomes was a total farce and **had** to be changed. In her dissenting Report she said:

28. The excluded [sic] income component provided to the non custodial parent is in essence a living allowance which is deducted from their taxable income before the percentage payable for child support is calculated.

29. By contrast the disregarded income amount applied to the custodial parent is an amount which recognises the contribution of the custodial parent to the financial support of their children. This disregarded income amount takes into account the cost of the parenting to the parent with whom the child lives, including


child care costs, and at the lost opportunities in employment which the parents with the day to day care of children often suffer.

0.1.15. Well once the BSU had done its job it was obvious that even adding in child care costs [ie the mba level] resulted in a cost of children **well below** the formula level, once dad earned more than "a basic wage".

0.1.16. In any case the ALP did not get time to amend anything at all as a result of the JSC Recommendations [either way] and it was not until 1999 that Howard got around to it. But for this issue he showed his initial hand at "three card tricks" [even without Parkinson's help] and **slightly** reduced the disregarded income figure, albeit because it has always been upgraded by the Hestia Factor [double the CPI], the figure very quickly rose **back** to about \$45,000 before being zapped by Parkinson.

0.1.17. However, "on the other side of face", Howard pulled a con trick by amending the "retraction rate" from dollar for dollar to 50 cents in the dollar.

0.1.18. So having related this bit of history, let's return to the first scenario above [ie dad on \$50,000 and no new kids], but vary mum's income from zero to \$160,000 pa. Please look at the graph below.



0.1.19. The first result to observe is that at the chosen start point for mum of \$60,000 the pre & post 1999 results [RED & GREEN] just happen to cross over, but once mum gets to \$80,000 she is way better off under the Belinda/Rodent bipartisan "reform" of 1999. As I keep saying in the book, "never ever ask for reform, as you just might get it". And that is particularly so when Parkinson is Chair of the "Law Reform Mob", as he was at the time he planted Parkinson's Curse [essentially **on** the graves of the Deadbeat Dads].

0.1.20. By \$100,000 in both pre & post 1999 cases the "25% rule" [or rather "the other 25% rule" to s 128 which Parkinson just zapped] cuts in to give mum a "minimum cap" of 25% [ie \$30 pw] of the "maximum" assessment.

0.1.21. So now forget RED and compare GREEN & BLUE. You will see that the 27% or so **increase** for the new formula we found above with mum on \$60,000 is fairly much the norm as her income decreases to zero. But even if she takes a job as a COAT or SSAT at \$140,000 pa the assessment "bottoms out" at \$80 pw [266% of old formula at \$30 pw]. Sort of like an unofficial 60% Rule, huh Professor P?

0.1.22. And the **worst** result? Simply by inspection it seems for mum on \$100,000 the new formula gets her some **300%** of the old formula.

0.1.23. Two final observations. Firstly Google reveals:

*"Patterson's Curse is known to many as a purple weed which has taken over railway sidings in Australia. What people don't know is that Patterson was one of the fiercest bushrangers and train robbers. Frank Patterson tried everything he could to escape the hangman's noose once he got caught, much of it with threats, or even maledictions. Hence, when he was hung, he cursed the town of Ironbark and the Australian Government. His family planted the **beautiful English purple flower**, as a memorial tribute on his grave, which spread through the town, the State, and then the country. **Australia now spends 23 million dollars a year** eradicating Patterson's Curse. Patterson was hung for the theft of 4 pounds."*

0.1.24. Obviously Kevin '07 is way too busy just now eradicating WorkChoices etc and fixing far greater sins of Howard than the Rape of Rights by Parkinson's Curse. One would hope that remedial work will start to happen automatically once Howard's Cash for Comment freaks put out their hands for more cash come October 2008 and getting none [one must assume].

0.1.25. But what of those supposedly "on his side" like Belinda Neal, but in reality simply pushing the feminist agenda like Pru Goward on steroids? Only time will tell.

0.1.26. Remember that Kevin '07 still has the dead simple option I detail in the book of simply zapping the **whole** of the Assessment Act as was done in the UK. And of course just as the deposed Mal Brough [pronounced Bruff as in Gruff] is still putting in his 2 cents worth to try to explain away his "Rape of the Aboriginal Rights Initiative" [and maybe "Chase deadbeat dads to their graves Initiative"], it is no surprise that Parkinson took off for London to try to defend his own Parkinson's Curse, once the poo hit the fan.

0.1.27. Because even though, as we know, the Professor's poos are pearly white and without any smell, they can still do a lot of damage once dispersed by the fan, circling overhead and coming down as egg [white] on face [both sides]. And hey, I have not even started to eradicate the Towards Healing Curse.