**Summary of major changes to the Family Law Act and Shared Parental Responsibility**

1. Removes the relationship to be considered primary between the biological child and biological parent. Anyone can now be considered as a carer (which has refined parent) with the same primacy as the biological child/parent relationship currently has. Incumbent government refers to Case Law.
2. Removes the right of a child to have meaningful relationship with both parents.
	1. Additionally removes the right of the child to have this relationship to the maximum extent possible.
3. *Repeals and substitutes 60B*.
4. Removes current pathway that Judicial officers have available, ie weighing up "Best Interests", with a list of relevant items, then Parental Responsibility, then Shared Care Time, then if not practical or in the best interests, then substantial and significant time, which there are definitions for. Now, nothing.
5. Removes FDR's obligations to discuss and push shared care time and if not shared then significant and/or substantial time.

*Repeals section 63.*

1. Removes considerations for shared, significant and substantial time.

*Repeals 65DAA and replaced it with nothing.*

1. Codifies the application for a parenting matter. Insertion of s 65DAAA "If a parenting order is in force in relation to a child, court mush not reconsider the final parenting order".

This is possibly the meanest, anti-father measure within the bill (not that the number of examples are lacking). Many fathers and/or secondary parent's consent or gain orders where the child/ren do not spend a lot of time with them, for a range of reason, age of children, cost of litigation, entrenchment of the mother's view, etc.

So they take a view that they will "get time on", and work on themselves being the best father and co-parent they can be and take their matter back if required to get more time on for the children.

And this cruel measure is retrospective. "The amendment made by this Part applies in relation to final parenting 6 orders whether the orders came into force before, or come into force on 7 or after, the day this item commences."

1. Places greater emphasis on a reasonable excuse for not following court orders, based on a fear felt.

This proposed legislation places a standard of proof of beyond reasonable doubt for the party making the application and a standard of proof of balance of probabilities for the respondent who also has "out: to say, I felt fear.

This is undoubtably to address fathers trying to see their children, even after they get orders. Mum still refuses. So when they make a contravention application, the bar for them to reach is high, bar for an abusive mother to reach is very low. Outcome. The children stay in conflict.

And if the applicant is not wholly successful, then the judicial officer must consider a fine or imprisonment up to one year.

1. Removal of any evidence from post parenting programs. This is so refuse/resist mothers can reveal in these programs they have no real objection other than they don't like the other party. This effects programs like New Ways for Families and Certified Parenting Coordination, where in real time, the parents' friendliness and absent or present nature of violence and/abuse and/or good or bad co-parenting is recording and available for the court.