

From: Brisbane Lesbian Gay Bisexual Transgender Intersex and Queer Action Group (BLAG)
To: [SPSC SPSC](#)
Subject: Submission: Adoption of Children Legislation Amendment (Equality) Bill 2017
Date: Thursday, 28 December 2017 8:31:38 AM
Attachments: [Review of 77 studies.pdf](#)
[Monash University investigation.pdf](#)

The Secretary
Social Policy Scrutiny Committee,
GPO Box 3721
DARWIN NT 0801
email - SPSC@nt.gov.au

Dear Secretary,

Please accept this submission regarding the **Adoption of Children Legislation Amendment (Equality) Bill 2017**.

Our organisation is a Brisbane-based Lesbian Gay Bisexual Transgender and Intersex (LGBTI) lobby group. In 2016 our organisation lodged a submission for a similar bill to this NT bill, when the Queensland Parliament considered the *Adoption and Other Legislation Amendment Bill 2016* - a bill which was passed, legalising adoption for same-sex couples in Queensland.

This submission consists of:

1. Some new information as listed below.
2. The submission our organisation previously lodged for the Queensland Parliamentary Committee Inquiry into the Adoption and Other Legislation Amendment Bill 2016. The contents of this submission - including the attached research findings - are very applicable to the NT Adoption of Children Legislation Amendment (Equality) Bill 2017.

Primary Message:

It's paramount that the interests of the child must remain the top priority of adoption law. By opening adoption to defacto couples, including same-sex couples, this increases the pool of potential homes for the child up for adoption. The broader the pool of potential parents, then the best choice can be made to find each child the most appropriate home environment. Allowing same sex couples to adopt is in the child's best interests.

The implications of recent changes to the federal Marriage Act:

In early December 2017 legislation was passed to allow "two people" to marry. This allows LGBTI couples to now legally marry under Australian law.

Thousands of Australian LGBTI couples who previously entered legal same-sex

marriages in other countries, had their marriages legally recognised under Australia law as of 9 December 2017. The number of legal Australian same-sex marriages is set to rapidly increase from early 2018 and continue into the future.

As adoption is available to all married couples, it makes sense that adoption will be available to same-sex married couples too. It also makes sense to broaden the pool of potential adoptive parents by opening adoption to defacto couples, including same-sex defacto couples.

All other Australian jurisdictions allow same sex couples to adopt children.

Every other Australian state and territory allows same sex couples to adopt. Adoption by same-sex defacto couples is legal in New South Wales, Victoria, Western Australia, Tasmania, ACT, South Australia and Queensland. The move by all other jurisdictions to open the adoption process to same sex couples, is a reflection on the evolution the community as a whole has undergone. It is fair, just and appropriate that legislation has followed community expectations. Most important, this has always been in the best interests of the children awaiting adoption.

Below is our organisation's previously submission to the Queensland Parliament, regarding the (Queensland) Adoption and Other Legislation Amendment Bill 2016. This content, plus the attached documents, are to form part of this submission regarding the Adoption of Children Legislation Amendment (Equality) Bill 2017.

Research Director
Health, Communities, Disability Services and Domestic and Family Violence
Prevention Committee
Parliament House
George Street
Brisbane Qld 4000

Dear Research Director,

Please accept this submission into the **Adoption and Other Legislation Amendment Bill 2016**

This submission is not confidential and may be published on the Parliamentary website. Note the attached documents and weblink form part of this submission and as such, please include them if publishing this submission.

Recommendation - that the Queensland Adoption and Other Legislation Amendment Bill 2016 be passed into law, allowing same sex couples to legally adopt children in Queensland.

Society's expectations of Adoption law has evolved, and our Adoption Act must reflect these contemporary societal changes. Same-sex couples are now visible in society and known by their friends, family, workmates, neighbours and acquaintances. Once people know same-sex couples, they realise they hold the same values and principles as everyone else. This makes it hard to defend lesser legal rights for same-sex couples, especially rights which benefit the children impacted by adoption. This reform is supported by same sex couples and their family and friends, as well as an ever increasing number in mainstream society.

It is paramount that the interests of the child must remain a priority, and allowing same sex couples to adopt is in accordance with the principle of maintaining the child's best interests.

Non-birth parents in same-sex couples, must be allowed to adopt their partner's child.

While children are legal minors, a parent must give authorisation for an array of situations. This can include simple things like enrolling a child at a new school and providing consent for childhood vaccinations, through to consenting to emergency medical treatment or emergency surgery if the child is unexpectedly taken to the Emergency Department in a serious or critical condition.

Though there are not many children put up for adoption now - there are a many same sex couples living together in committed life-long loving relationships. Many of these couples, perhaps some thousands of Queenslanders, are raising children, often raising the child together as a couple from the time of the child's birth. In situations where the birth parent is not present, and if the non-birth parent was able to legally adopt the child, this would then allow the non-birth parent to act in the best interests of the child in the scenarios mentioned above. As the Qld Adoption Act does not currently allow for adoption by same sex couples, there are many children currently being excluded from these important protections.

This is better for the child and in accordance with maintaining the best interests of the child, if the child has two legal parents in the home where they live, who can both provide these important protections which only a parent can legally provide. The number of children being raised by same sex parented families is continuing to grow. This evolutionary change requires legislative reform to ensure these children have equal legal protections to the children of opposite-sex couples.

Multiple members of our organisation are in same sex relationships raising a child together since the child's birth. One such member, Robert, provides the following comment:

"There were also many times I wish I could have said confidently to our daughter that she will never be apart from us, but only adoption could have made that possible. Adoption also affords our daughter legal status in relation to making decisions in our best interest, should we become unable to do so ourselves. Furthermore, adoption protects her legal claim on what should rightfully be hers if and when something happens to us, her parents"

Same sex couples are allowed to foster some the most psychologically damaged children, but yet not to adopt these same children.

There are many same sex couples in Queensland who are long term foster parents, sometimes fostering the same child for some years. Sadly, many of these children have an unhappy past and have moved through many temporary homes and may carry severe psychological harm from their past experiences and/or suffering abuse.

While it's great that same sex couples are given the opportunity to provide a stable loving home environment to these children, questions must be asked as to why the same children can not be legally adopted by the same sex couple who has provide foster care to the child in some cases for many years prior to the child be able to be adopted. This sends conflicting messages - you are able to foster the children that may be hard to place in foster care, and though you do a great job as parents, you are not good enough to become the child's legal parents by adoption (in cases where the foster child is put up for adoption). Foster parents and adoptive parents both provide identical nurturing, stability and love to a child, so why is there this distinction regarding the ability of only some couples to legally adopt?

It fails to serve the best interests of the child by denying them the stability that comes from being legally adopted by parents who love them, just because the parents are of the same sex.

Multiple organisations who provide foster care for children, specifically target LGBTI people to become foster parents, by repeatedly advertising in LGBTI publications calling for same sex couples to apply to become foster parents. This would suggest that these agencies have total trust in the ability of same sex couples to be parents.

One of our members, Michael, and his same sex partner have fostered a child for some years. Michael spoke of his situation:

"Being able to adopt our child is something we dream of and something our child has expressed as a genuine wish for our family. It would mean completion, bringing us together as a family unit that recognizes the love that not only the 3 of us share but our wider family as well. It would mean security, stability and the knowledge that our family will forever be inseparable. As our child is in the long term care of the state without the option to legally adopt them it means constant intrusions and complications that make them feel anxious and restless. There is not that stability and certainty they need, adoption will remove these shackles and allow them to thrive in the family they love so much. Each case for adoption is unique and should be treated as such, every family whether they are same sex parents or not should be afforded that opportunity. Until that happens we remain second class citizens and second class families, existing under one rule for them and one for us."

Other Australian jurisdictions allow same sex couples to adopt children.

Five other Australian states/territories allow same sex couples to adopt. They are New South Wales, Victoria, Western Australia, Tasmania and ACT. Additionally, in South Australia a government bill - the Adoption (Review) Amendment bill - was recently introduced to Parliament, which if passed, will allow South Australian same-sex couples to also adopt. The move by multiple jurisdictions to open the adoption process to same sex couples, is a reflection on the evolution the community as a whole has undergone. It is fair and just that legislation has followed community expectations.

Research shows that children raised by same sex parented families experience good health and wellbeing.

Multiple University studies have demonstrated there is no harm, and perhaps even benefits, to children being raised by a same sex parented family. Some of the research findings are attached and form part of this submission.

- The Australian Institute of Family Studies (AIFS) is the Australian Government's key research body in the area of family wellbeing. AIFS has released publications relating to their research on same-sex parented families, including:

- Same Sex Couple Families in Australia. Published September 2016 <https://aifs.gov.au/publications/same-sex-couple-families-australia>

Key Messages from the study (extract):

"Children raised in same-sex parented families progress emotionally, socially and educationally at the same rate as other children."

- Same Sex Parented Families in Australia. Published 2013, Dr Deborah Dempsey, Swinburne University of Technology <https://aifs.gov.au/cfca/publications/same-sex-parented-families-australia>

Key Messages from the study (extract):

"Overall, research to date considerably challenges the point of view that same-sex parented families are harmful to children. Children in such families do as well emotionally, socially and educationally as their peers from heterosexual couple families.

Some researchers have concluded there are benefits for children raised by lesbian couples in that they experience higher quality parenting, sons display greater gender flexibility, and sons and daughters display more open-mindedness towards sexual, gender and family diversity."

- The Columbia Law School investigated 77 scholarly studies on the wellbeing of children with gay or lesbian parents.

In their report, which is attached, they state:

"... this research forms an overwhelming scholarly consensus, based on over three decades of peer-reviewed research, that having a gay or lesbian parent does not harm children."

- University of Melbourne research, the Australian Study of Child Health in Same-Sex Families, found that children of same-sex parented families demonstrate above average health and wellbeing. Lead researcher, Dr Simon Crouch, comments regarding adoption by same sex couples:

“Australian politicians and others still object to marriage equality and same-sex adoption based on arguments that children need to be raised by a married biological mother and biological father to do well.”

“This study shows that children can thrive in a range of family contexts and the ways that these families are constructed can bring their own particular benefits to child health and wellbeing,”

A report on the University website is here <http://newsroom.melbourne.edu/news/children-same-sex-attracted-parents-doing-well-face-stigma-%E2%80%93-latest-results>

There must be no exemptions to Adoption law.

The law must apply equally and without favour or disadvantage to any person or group. All Queenslanders must be given the same rights and responsibilities under Adoption law, in accordance with the principle of equity as equal citizens. No person or group of people should be exempt from adhering to the law. The Adoption Act must not be allowed to legally endorse discrimination, including discrimination by allowing certain people or organisations to exclude same sex couples from the adoption process. As some welfare/community service agencies may be run by religious or other non-government organisations, it is imperative that any religious organisation or any other organisation facilitating Queensland adoptions, is not allowed to legally exclude same sex couples from consideration.

Sincerely

Phil Browne

Convenor,

Brisbane Lesbian Gay Bisexual Transgender Intersex and Queer Action Group (BLAG)

Phone: 0428 140 359

e-Mail: bnelag@gmail.com

Twitter: [@BneLAG](https://twitter.com/BneLAG)

Facebook: Brisbane LGBTIQ Action Group

SIGN UP to our mailing list here <http://facebook.us12.list-manage.com/subscribe?u=8fb44bf8101d02337c73a89a3&id=b71e47a693>

Our Terms of Reference and Achievements List <https://drive.google.com/file/d/0ByUHzRTDFvIFbGliejhyUEExSkE/view?usp=sharing>





Contact us or peruse the research at www.whatweknow.info

Updated February 2016

What does the scholarly research say about the wellbeing of children with gay or lesbian parents?

Overview: We identified 77 scholarly studies that met our criteria for adding to knowledge about the wellbeing of children with gay or lesbian parents. Of those studies, 73 concluded that children of gay or lesbian parents fare no worse than other children. While many of the sample sizes were small, and some studies lacked a control group, researchers regard such studies as providing the best available knowledge about child adjustment, and do not view large, representative samples as essential. We identified four studies concluding that children of gay or lesbian parents face added disadvantages. Since all four took their samples from children who endured family break-ups, a cohort known to face added risks, these studies have been criticized by many scholars as unreliable assessments of the wellbeing of LGB-headed households. Taken together, this research forms an overwhelming scholarly consensus, based on over three decades of peer-reviewed research, that having a gay or lesbian parent does not harm children.

Evaluating Studies that Conclude Gay Parenting Raises Risks: With regard to the four outlier studies, all share the same flaw. At most a handful of the children who were studied were actually raised by same-sex parents; the rest came from families in which opposite-sex parents raised their children for a period of time, but in which, often, one or more parent(s) subsequently came out as gay or lesbian and left the family or had a same-sex relationship. The result was a family that endured added stress and often disruption or family breakup. Including such children among those labeled as having been “raised by same-sex parents” is so misleading as to be inaccurate, since these children were generally raised by opposite-sex families and only later, after a family disruption, did they live in households with one or more gay parent(s), and only rarely did two parents of the same sex, in a stable, long-term relationship, actually raise the children together. Authors of these outlier studies argue that, nevertheless, such configurations often represent families with gay or lesbian parents, and hence it is reasonable to count them as indicators of what happens when children live with one or more gay parent(s).

Evaluating Studies that Find No Differences Resulting from Having a Gay Parent: Some critics of the LGB parenting research object to the small, non-random sampling methods known as “convenience sampling” that researchers in the field often use to gather their data. Yet within the field, convenience sampling is not considered a methodological flaw, but simply a limitation to generalizability. Within sociology and especially psychology, small, qualitative and longitudinal studies are considered to have certain advantages over probability studies: Such data can allow investigators to notice and analyze subtleties and texture in child development over time that large, statistical studies often miss. It is important to note, moreover, that some of the research that finds no differences among children with

same-sex parents does use large, representative data. A 2010 study by Stanford researcher Michael Rosenfeld used census data to examine the school advancement of 3,500 children with same-sex parents, finding no significant differences between households headed by same-sex and opposite-sex parents when controlling for family background. Another study drew on nationally representative, longitudinal data using a sampling pool of over 20,000 children, of which 158 lived in a same-sex parent household. Controlling for family disruptions, those children showed no significant differences from their peers in school outcomes.

Scholarly sources finding that children of gay or lesbian parents fare no worse than others:

1. Adams, J., & Light, R. (2015). Scientific consensus, the law, and same sex parenting outcomes. *Social Science Research*, 53, 300-310.
2. Allen, M., & Burrell, N. (1996). Comparing the impact of homosexual and heterosexual parents on children: meta-analysis of existing research. *Journal of Homosexuality*, 32(2), 19-35.
3. Anderssen, N., Amlie, C., & Ytteroy, E. A. (2002). Outcomes for children with lesbian or gay parents. A review of studies from 1978 to 2000. *Scandinavian Journal of Psychology*, 43(4), 335-351.
4. Baiocco, R., Santamaria, F., Ioverno, S., Fontanesi, L., Baumgartner, E., Laghi, F., Lingiardi V. (2015). Lesbian mother families and gay father families in Italy: family functioning, dyadic satisfaction, and child well-being. *Sexuality Research and Social Policy*, 12(3), 202-212.
5. Bailey, J., Bobrow, D., Wolfe, M., & Mikach, S. (1995). Sexual orientation of adult sons of gay fathers. *Developmental Psychology*, 31(1), 124-129.
6. Biblarz, T. J., & Stacey, J. (2010). How does the gender of parents matter? *Jrnl of Marriage and Family*, 72(1), 3-22.
7. Bos, H. M. W. (2010). Planned gay father families in kinship arrangements. *The Australian and New Zealand Journal of Family Therapy*, 31(4), 356-371.
8. Bos, H. M. W., & Sandfort, T. G. M. (2010). Children's gender identity in lesbian and heterosexual two-parent families. *Sex Roles*, 62(1-2), 114-126
9. Bos, H. M. W., van Balen F., & van den Boom, D. C. (2005). Lesbian families and family functioning: an overview. *Patient Education and Counseling*, 59(3), 263-275.
10. Bos, H. M. W., van Balen, F., & van den Boom, D. C. (2007). Child adjustment and parenting in planned lesbian-parent families. *American Journal of Orthopsychiatry*, 77(1), 38-48.
11. Bos, H., Gartrell, N., & van Gelderen, L. (2013). Adolescents in lesbian families: DSM-oriented scale scores and stigmatization. *Journal of Gay & Lesbian Social Services*, 25(2), 121 – 140.
12. Bos, H., van Gelderen, L., & Gartrell, N. (2014). Lesbian and heterosexual two-parent families: adolescent-parent relationship quality and adolescent well-being. *Journal of Child and Family Studies*, 23(2), 1-16.
13. Bos, H. M. W., Gartrell, N. K., Peyser, H., & van Balen, F. (2008). The USA national longitudinal lesbian family study (NLLFS): homophobia, psychological adjustment, and protective factors. *Journal of Lesbian Studies*, 12(4), 455-471.
14. Bos, H. M. W., Goldberg, N. K., van Gelderen, L., & Gartrell, N. (2012). Adolescents of the U.S. National longitudinal lesbian family study: male role models, gender role traits and psychological adjustment. *Gend. & Soc.*, 26(4), 603-638.
15. Brewaeyns, A., Ponjaert, I., van Hall, E. V., & Golombok, S. (1997). Donor insemination: child development and family functioning in lesbian mother families. *Human Reproduction*, 12(6), 1349-1359.
16. Brewaeyns, A., & van Hall, E. V. (1997). Lesbian motherhood: the impact on child development and family functioning. *Journal of Psychosomatic Obstetrics & Gynecology*, 18(1), 1-16.
17. Chan, R. W., Raboy, B., & Patterson, C. J. (1998). Psychosocial adjustment among children conceived via donor insemination by lesbian and heterosexual mothers. *Child Development*, 69(2), 443-457.
18. Crouch, S. R., Waters, E., McNair, R., Power, J., & Davis, E. (2014). Parent-reported measures of child health and wellbeing in same-sex parent families: a cross-sectional survey. *BMC Public Health*, 14 (635), 1-12.
19. Crowl, A. L., Ahn, S., & Baker, J. (2008). A meta-analysis of developmental outcomes for children of same-sex and heterosexual parents. *Journal of GLBT Family Studies*, 4(3), 385-407.
20. Erich, S., Leung, P., & Kindle, P. (2005). A comparative analysis of adoptive family functioning with gay, lesbian, and heterosexual parents and their children. *Journal of GLBT Family Studies*, 1 (4), 43-60.
21. Erich, S., Kanenberg, H., Case, K., Allen, T., & Bogdanos, T. (2009). An empirical analysis of factors affecting adolescent attachment in adoptive families with homosexual and straight parents. *Children and Youth Services Review*, 31(3), 398-404.
22. Falk, P. J. (1989). Lesbian mothers: Psychosocial assumptions in family law. *American Psychologist*, 44(6), 941-947.
23. Farr, R. H., Forssell, S. L., & Patterson, C. J. (2010). Parenting and child development in adoptive families: does parental sexual orientation matter? *Applied Developmental Science*, 14(3), 164-178.

24. Farr, R. H., & Patterson, C. J. (2013). Coparenting among lesbian, gay, and heterosexual couples: associations with adopted children's outcomes. *Child Development, 84*(4), 1226-1240.
25. Fedewa, A. L., & Clark, T. P. (2009). Parent practices and home-school partnerships: a differential effect for children with same-sex coupled parents? *Journal of GLBT Family Studies, 5*(4), 312-339.
26. Flaks, D. K., Ficher, I., Masterpasqua, F., & Joseph, G. (1995) Lesbians choosing motherhood: a comparative study of lesbian and heterosexual parents and their children. *Developmental Psychology, 31*(1), 105-114.
27. Fulcher, M., Chan, R. W., Raboy, B., & Patterson, C. J. (2002). Contact with grandparents among children conceived via donor insemination by lesbian and heterosexual mothers. *Parenting, 2*(1), 61-76.
28. Fulcher, M., Sutfin, E. L., & Patterson, C. J. (2008) Individual differences in gender development: associations with parental sexual orientation, attitudes, and division of labor. *Sex Roles, 58*(5/6), 330-341.
29. Gartrell, N. K., Bos, H. M. W., & Goldberg, N. G. (2011). Adolescents of the U.S. National longitudinal lesbian family study: sexual orientation, sexual behavior, and sexual risk exposure. *Archives of Sexual Behavior, 40*(6), 1199-1209.
30. Gartrell, N. K., & Bos, H. M. W. (2010). Us national longitudinal lesbian family study: psychological adjustment of 17-year-old adolescents. *Pediatrics, 126*(1), 28-36.
31. Gartrell, N. K., Bos, H. M. W., Peyser, H., Deck, A., & Rodas, C. (2012). Adolescents with lesbian mothers describe their own lives. *Journal of Homosexuality, 59*(9), 1211-1229.
32. Gartrell, N. K., Deck, A., Rodas, C., Peyser, H., & Banks, A. (2005). The national lesbian family study: 4. Interviews with the 10-year-old children. *American Journal of Orthopsychiatry, 75*(4), 518-524.
33. Goldberg, A. E. (2007). (How) does it make a difference? Perspectives of adults with lesbian, gay, and bisexual parents. *American Journal of Orthopsychiatry, 77*(4), 550-562.
34. Goldberg, A., & Smith, J. (2013). Predictors of psychological adjustment in early placed adopted children with lesbian, gay, and heterosexual parents. *Journal of Family Psychology, 27*(3), 431-42.
35. Goldberg, N. G., Bos, H. M. W., & Gartrell, N. K. (2011). Substance use by adolescents of the USA National Longitudinal Lesbian Family Study. *Journal of Health Psychology, 16*(8), 1231-1240.
36. Golombok, S., Perry, B., Burston, A., Murray, C., Mooney-Somers, J., Stevens, M., Golding, J. (2003). Children with lesbian parents: A community study. *Developmental Psychology, 39*(1), 20-33.
37. Golombok, S., Spencer, A., & Rutter, M. (1983). Children in lesbian and single-parent households: psychosexual and psychiatric appraisal. *Journal of Child Psychology and Psychiatry, 24*(4), 551-572.
38. Golombok, S. & Tasker, F. (1996) Do parents influence the sexual orientation of their children? Findings from a longitudinal study of lesbian families. *Developmental Psychology, 32* (1), 3-11.
39. Golombok, S., Tasker, F., & Murray, C. (1997). Children raised in fatherless families from infancy: family relationships and the socioemotional development of children of lesbian and single heterosexual mothers. *Journal of Child Psychology and Psychiatry, 38*(7), 783-791.
40. Gottman, J. S. (1989). Children of gay and lesbian parents. *Marriage & Family Review, 14*(3-4), 177-196.
41. Green, R., Mandel, J. B., Hotvedt, M. E., Gray, J., & Smith, L. (1986). Lesbian mothers and their children: a comparison with solo parent heterosexual mothers and their children. *Archives of Sexual Behavior, 15*(2), 167-184.
42. Harris, M., & Turner, P. (1986). Gay and lesbian parents. *Journal of Homosexuality, 12*(2), 101-13.
43. Hoeffler, B. (1981). Children's acquisition of sex-role behavior in lesbian-mother families. *American Journal of Orthopsychiatry, 51* (3), 536-544.
44. Huggins, S. (1989). A comparative study of self-esteem of adolescent children of divorced lesbian mothers and divorced heterosexual mothers. *Journal of Homosexuality, 18*(1-2), 123-135.
45. Kirkpatrick, M., Smith, C., & Roy, R. (1981). Lesbian mothers and their children: a comparative survey. *American Journal of Orthopsychiatry, 51*(3), 545-551.
46. Lamb, M. E. (2012). Mothers, fathers, families, and circumstances: factors affecting children's adjustment. *Applied Developmental Science, 16*(2), 98-111.
47. Lavner, J. A., Waterman, J., & Peplau, L. A. (2012). Can gay and lesbian parents promote healthy development in high-risk children adopted from foster care? *American Journal of Orthopsychiatry, 82*(4), 465-472.
48. Leddy, A., Gartrell, N., & Bos, H. (2012). Growing up in a lesbian family: the life experiences of the adult daughters and sons of lesbian mothers. *Journal of GLBT Family Studies, 8*(3), 243-257.
49. Lewis, K. G. (1980). Children of lesbians: Their point of view. *Social Work, 25*(3), 198-203.
50. Lick, D. J., Patterson, C. J., & Schmidt, K. M. (2013). Recalled social experiences and current psychological adjustment among adults reared by gay and lesbian parents. *Journal of GLBT Family Studies, 9*(3), 230-253.
51. MacCallum, F., & Golombok, S. (2004). Children raised in fatherless families from infancy: a follow-up of children of lesbian and single heterosexual mothers at early adolescence. *Journal of Child Psychology and Psychiatry, 45*(8), 1407-1419.
52. Miller, J. A., Jacobsen, R. B., & Bigner, J. J. (1981). The child's home environment for lesbian vs. heterosexual mothers: a neglected area of research. *Journal of Homosexuality, 7*(1), 49-56.

53. Patterson, C. J. (1995). Families of the lesbian baby boom: parents' division of labor and children's adjustment. *Developmental Psychology, 31*(1), 115-123.
54. Patterson, C. J. (2001). Families of the Lesbian baby boom: Maternal mental health and child adjustment. *Journal of Gay & Lesbian Mental Health, 4*(3), 91-107.
55. Patterson, C. J., Hurt, S., & Mason, C. D. (1998). Families of the lesbian baby boom: Children's contact with grandparents and other adults. *American Journal of Orthopsychiatry, 68*(3), 390-399.
56. Pawelski, J. G. et al (2006). The effects of marriage, civil union, and domestic partnerships laws on the health and well-being of children. *Pediatrics, 118*(1), 349 -364.
57. Perrin, E. C. (2002). Technical report: coparent or second-parent adoption by same-sex parents. *Pediatrics, 109*(2), 341-344.
58. Perry, B., Burston, A., Stevens, M., Golding, J., Steele, H., & Golombok, S. (2004). Children's play narratives: what they tell us about lesbian-mother families. *American Journal of Orthopsychiatry, 74*(4), 467-479.
59. Potter, D. (2012). Same-sex parent families and children's academic achievement. *Journal of Marriage and Family, 74*(3), 556-571.
60. Rosenfeld, M. J. (2010). Nontraditional families and childhood progress through school. *Demography, 47*(3), 755-775.
61. Ryan, S. (2007). Parent-child interaction styles between gay and lesbian parents and their adopted children. *Journal of GLBT Family Studies, 3*(2), 105-132.
62. Shechner, T., Slone, M., Lobel, T., & Schechter, R. (2013). Children's adjustment in non-traditional families in Israel: the effect of parental sexual orientation and the number of parents on children's development. *Child: Care, Health, & Development, 39*(2), 178-184.
63. Stacey, J., & Biblarz, T. J. (2001). (How) does the sexual orientation of parents matter? *American Sociological Review, 66*(2), 159-183.
64. Tasker, F. (2005). Lesbian mothers, gay fathers, and their children: a review. *Journal of Developmental & Behavioral Pediatrics, 26*(3), 224-40.
65. Tasker, F., & Golombok, S. (1995). Adults raised as children in lesbian families. *American Journal of Orthopsychiatry, 65*(2), 203-215.
66. van Gelderen, L., Bos, H. M. W., Gartrell, N., & Hermanns, J., Perrin, E. C. (2012). Quality of life of adolescents raised from birth by lesbian mothers: the us national longitudinal family study. *Journal of Developmental & Behavioral Pediatrics, 33*(1), 17-23.
67. van Gelderen, L., Gartrell, N. N., Bos, H. M. W., & Hermanns, J. M. A. (2013). Stigmatization and promotive factors in relation to psychological health and life satisfaction of adolescents in planned lesbian families. *Journal of Family Issues, 34*(6), 809-827.
68. van Rijn-van Gelderen, L., Bos, H. M. W., & Gartrell, N. (2015) Dutch adolescents from lesbian-parent families: how do they compare to peers with heterosexual parents and what is the impact of homophobic stigmatization? *Journal of Adolescence, 40*, 65-73.
69. Vanfraussen, K., Ponjaert-Kristoffersen, I., & Brewaeys, A. (2002). What does it mean for youngsters to grow up in a lesbian family created by means of donor insemination? *Journal of Reproductive and Infant Psychology, 20*(4), 237-252.
70. Vanfraussen, K., Ponjaert-Kristoffersen, I., & Brewaeys, A. (2003). Family functioning in lesbian families created by donor insemination. *American Journal of Orthopsychiatry, 73*(1), 78-90.
71. Wainright, J. L., & Patterson, C. J. (2006). Delinquency, victimization, and substance use among adolescents with female same-sex parents. *Journal of Family Psychology, 20*(3), 526-530.
72. Wainright, J. L., & Patterson, C. J. (2008). Peer relations among adolescents with female same-sex parents. *Developmental Psychology, 44*(1), 117-126.
73. Wainright, J. L., Russell, S. T., & Patterson, C. J. (2004). Psychosocial adjustment, school outcomes, and romantic relationships of adolescents with same-sex parents. *Child Development, 75*(6), 1886-1898.

Scholarly sources concluding that children of gay or lesbian parents face added disadvantages:

1. Allen, D. W. (2013). High school graduation rates among children of same-sex households. *Review of Economics of the Household, 11*(4), 635-658.
2. Regnerus, M. (2012). How different are the adult children of parents who have same-sex relationships? Findings from the New Family Structures Study. *Social Science Research, 41*(4), 752-770.
3. Sarantakos, S. (1996). Children in three contexts: Family, education and social development. *Children Australia, 21*(3), 23-31.
4. Sullins, D. P. (2015). Emotional problems among children with same-sex parents: difference by definition. *British Journal of Education, Society and Behavioural Science*, (forthcoming).



**Castan Centre for Human Rights Law
Monash University
Melbourne**

**Submission to the Parliament of New South Wales
Legislative Council Standing Committee on Law and
Justice**

Inquiry into Adoption by Same Sex Couples

**Prepared by Dr Adiva Sifris, Dr Paula Gerber
Research Assistant Ms Alyse Richmond**

Table of Contents

1.	Introduction	3
2.	The Current Law in NSW – <i>Adoption Act 2000</i> (NSW)	4
3.	Australia’s International Obligations	5
3.1	The Implications of Adoption by Same-sex Couples for Children: The Interests of the Child	7
3.2	The Empirical Evidence	8
4.	The Experience in other Australian and Overseas Jurisdictions that Allow the Adoption of Children by Same-sex Couples	10
5.	The Recognition of Same-sex Families in Australia	12
6.	Conclusion	14
	Table 1: Australia - Eligibility for Adoption	16

1. Introduction

Over the past decade a number of social, legal, political and economic forces have converged, creating a climate in which same-sex couples are raising children in ever increasing numbers. Same-sex couples may become parents through a number of pathways including heterosexual intercourse, donor insemination or other reproductive procedures, surrogacy arrangements and adoption. For same-sex couples, adoption, either in the form of non-relative adoption or step parent/second parent adoption, represents a crucial and significant avenue for family formation. As with heterosexual couples, same-sex couples may elect to adopt children for numerous reasons including medical infertility, social infertility, and most importantly, the desire to provide a child with a loving, nurturing and wholesome environment. For male same-sex couples, who have limited alternatives for achieving parentage, the adoption process presents a particularly attractive pathway to parenting. Again as with heterosexual couples, same-sex couples may jointly raise a child biologically related to one of the parties and in the interests of the child may seek to attain legal recognition of their relationship with the child.

The fact that most Australian jurisdictions, including NSW, allow same-sex couples to access to fertility treatment, is evidence that same-sex couples are considered to be suitable parents. Furthermore, there is now a significant volume of research indicating that same-sex couples are just as good parents as heterosexual couples.¹ Once it is accepted that same-sex couples are suitable parents, there is no logical reason to discriminate against the means of achieving parentage. Thus, this submission argues that same sex couples should be entitled to become parents by the same means that are available to heterosexual couples, including adoption.

¹ See Ruth McNair, 'Outcomes for Children Born of A.R.T. in a Diverse Range of Families', (Occasional Paper Victorian Law Reform Commission 2004)

2. The Current Law in NSW – *Adoption Act 2000* (NSW)

Where parties are in a heterosexual relationship s 30 of the *Adoption Act 2000* (NSW) (the *Adoption Act*) allows a step-parent under stringent circumstances to apply to adopt a biological child of their partner. As the law stands the non-biological parent in a same-sex couple will not be considered a step-parent and thus is not eligible to apply to adopt his or her partner's biological child. Step-parent adoption will extinguish the legal relationship between the child and one of his or her birth parents, and for this reason is not encouraged.²

In the case of non-relative adoptions which are often of an infant child, adoption is 'the process whereby a court irrevocably extinguishes the legal ties between a child and the natural parents or guardians and creates analogous ties between the child and his adopters.'³ The legal consequences of adoption are thus to deny a biological parent any legal status, rights or responsibilities regarding the child. It is therefore of considerable significance for the relinquishing parents, the adopters and most importantly the child. The *Adoption Act* stipulates a number of threshold requirements that a couple must cross in order to be eligible to apply to adopt a child. For the purposes of this submission, the most important of these threshold requirements are, that in accordance with the *Adoption Act*, only married couples or heterosexual couples living in a de facto relationship may apply to adopt a child.⁴ There is also provision for one person to apply to adopt a child.⁵ Thus, while one member of a same-sex couple may make application to adopt a child on their own, they cannot do so with their partner as a same-sex *couple*.

² In some overseas jurisdictions such as some of the States in United States of America and Provinces in Canada where a child is conceived during the same-sex relationship the non-biological parent may adopt the child without severing the legal relationship with the birth mother. This is referred to as second parent adoption.

³ Stephen Cretney, Judith. Masson and Rebecca Bailey Harris, *Principles of Family Law* 7th ed, Sweet and Maxwell, London, 2003) 791.

⁴ *Adoption Act 2000* (NSW) ss 23, 26 and 28.

⁵ *Adoption Act 2000* (NSW) ss 23, 26 and 27.

Adoption is primarily a service to children and its major purpose ‘is to provide a stable family for a child in need, rather than to meet the need or desire of an adult for a child’.⁶ In accordance with the *Adoption Act*, the basic requirement which applies to all prospective persons who wish to make application to adopt a child is that they must be ‘of good repute and are fit and proper persons to fulfil the responsibilities of parents’.⁷ The Castan Centre for Human Right Law agrees that in the interests of prospective adopted children, eligibility criteria are both necessary and desirable. However, it contends that the *Adoption Act* in its present form arbitrarily discriminates against same-sex couples purely on the basis of their sexuality, rather than their ability to provide a stable and loving home for a child. The existing eligibility criteria should be amended so that the only factors taken into account, are what is in best the interests of the child (consistent with the UN Convention on the Rights of the Child), and not the sexual orientation of the prospective parents.

3. Australia’s International Obligations

Section 7(f) of the *Adoption Act* states that one of the objects of the legislation ‘is to ensure that adoption law and practice complies with Australia’s obligations under treaties and other international agreements’. Allowing same-sex couples to adopt is consistent with Australia’s obligations under international law. No specific article of the Convention on the Rights of the Child (‘CROC’) deals directly with the issue of parentage or for that matter, the number of parents which a child may or may not have. Article 7(1) emphasises the right of the child to know and be cared for by his or her parents as far as possible.⁸ ‘Parent’ is not defined in CROC, but there is no reason to assume that it is limited to heterosexual parents or, for that matter, to a two-parent model;

⁶ Victorian Law Reform Commission, ‘Assisted Reproductive Technology and Adoption: Final Report’ (2007) 104.

⁷ *Adoption Act 2000* (NSW) ss 27 and 28.

⁸ Article 7.1 CROC: ‘The child shall be registered immediately after birth and shall have the right from birth to a name, the right to acquire a nationality and as far as possible, the right to know and be cared for by his or her parents.’

sexuality appears to be an irrelevant consideration.⁹ Nothing in the wording of Article 7 refers to heterosexual parents and the preamble recognises that a child ‘should grow up in a family environment in an atmosphere of happiness and understanding’.¹⁰ Discussions of the Committee on the Rights of the Child appear to contemplate a flexible, dynamic, evolving model of parentage, and reports of this committee specifically state that ‘the Convention refers to the extended family and the community and applies in situations of nuclear family, separated parents, single parent family, common law family and adoptive family’.¹¹ Children are born and raised in diverse family forms and there is no reason to suggest that some of these children have the rights and protections set out in CROC, while others do not.

Australia’s international obligations concerning the rights of a child to have two heterosexual parents came under the judicial microscope in *McBain’s* case.¹² The Catholic Church asserted that, CROC, the International Convention on Economic Social and Cultural Rights and the International Convention on Civil and Political Rights (ICCPR), recognised the right of the child to be born into a family consisting of a male and a female parent, with the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and the ICCPR specifically linking family with marriage.¹³ On that basis, it was argued that according to the ICCPR, marriage is a necessary precursor to founding a family. Justice Sundberg of the Federal Court rejected this argument, noting that when read as a whole, these

⁹ John Tobin, ‘*The Convention of the Rights of the Child: The Rights and Best Interests of Children*’, (Occasional Paper Victorian Law Reform Commission, 2004) 7-11. Tobin is writing in connection with same-sex parents adopting children, but no distinction can be made, in principle, between adoption and a child conceived in any other way. CROC does not distinguish between the mode of achieving parentage.

¹⁰ Article 7(1) CROC: ‘... the right to know and be cared for by his or her parents’.

¹¹ See Committee on the Rights of the Child, Reports of General Discussion Days CRC/C/DOD/1 [2.1].

¹² *McBain* [2000] 99 FCR 116, 120. The Catholic Church attempted to argue that the word ‘service’ in the Commonwealth *Sex Discrimination Act 1984* should be read so as to accord with Australia’s international obligations.

¹³ *Universal Declaration of Human Rights*, adopted and proclaimed by General Assembly Resolution 217 A III of 10 December 1948 Article 16: ‘the right to marry and found a family’ *International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights*, opened for signature 16 December 1966, 999 UNTS 171, Article 23(2) (entered into force 23 March 1976) – ‘the right to marry and found a family’. The Human Rights Committee have interpreted these articles to include non discrimination on the basis of sex and sexual orientation.

obligations ‘tell against the existence of an untrammelled right of the kind for which the Catholic Church contends’.¹⁴ The General Comments issued by the Human Rights Committee in relation to Article 23 have gone some way to resolving some of these ambiguities.¹⁵ The Committee recognises that the notion of ‘family’ might be construed differently according to the norms of various societies and the content of domestic law. The Committee explicitly refers to diverse family forms such as ‘unmarried couples and their children and or single parents and their children’. It would appear, therefore, that the definition of family is not confined by marriage and may include a wide variety of living arrangements.¹⁶ The recognition of family forms other than the nuclear family makes possible the inclusion of same-sex families with children within the concept of ‘family’.¹⁷ Opening up adoption to same-sex couples in no way impair Australia’s compliance with its international obligations.

3.1 The Implications of Adoption by Same-sex Couples for Children: The Interests of the Child

On an international level, CROC ensures that the best interests of the child are ‘a primary consideration’.¹⁸ Domestically, Australian legislation is entrenched in the ‘interests of the child’. Section 7(a) of the *Adoption Act* establishes the best interest of the child as the paramount consideration in the adoption process.¹⁹ There is no evidence to support assertions that children raised in same-sex families are worse off than those raised in heterosexual units.

¹⁴ *McBain* [2000] 99 FCR 116, 120.

¹⁵ See Human Rights Committee, General Comment 19 (39) ‘Protection of the Family, the Right to Marriage and the Equality of Family’ adopted at the 102nd meeting 27 July 1990.

¹⁶ See Sarah Joseph, Jenny Schultz and Melissa Castan, *The International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights: Cases, Materials and Commentary* (2nd ed., Oxford University Press, Oxford, 2004) 588.

¹⁷ *International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights*, opened for signature 16 December 1966, 993 UNTS 3, art 10 (entered into force 3 January 1976) does not expressly link marriage and procreation and thus may be interpreted as expressly recognising all forms of family.

¹⁸ See Article 3(1) CROC.

¹⁹ See *Adoption Act 2000* (NSW) s 7(a)

3.2 The Empirical Evidence

The increase in the number of same-sex families has given rise to an upsurge in social science and legal research presenting arguments for and against same-sex parenting. The centrality of children's interests has prompted those in favour of lesbian parenting to rely upon empirical research proving that children raised in lesbian-led families are 'no different' to those raised in heterosexual families. To do so requires researchers to prove a negative; namely, that lesbian parenting is 'not harmful' to children. This has been referred to as a 'deficit model', as it commences with the assumption that lesbian parents lack the attributes essential for effective parenting.²⁰

In Australia a number of law reform commissions have examined the empirical data relating to same-sex couples. As early as 1997, the NSW Law Reform Commission commented that '[t]here is no established connection, positive or negative, between people's sexual orientation and their suitability as adoptive parents.'²¹ The Victorian and Tasmanian law reform bodies have provided the most extensive responses to the question of whether same-sex parenting is in the interests of the child. In 2003, the Tasmanian Law Reform Institute ('the Institute') submitted a report on adoption by same-sex couples. The Report recommended that the *Adoption Act 1988* (Tas) 'be amended to permit a couple to apply for adoption regardless of the gender or marital status of the partners making up the couple'.²² This conclusion was reached after a painstaking analysis of the empirical data available. While the Institute acknowledged that much of the research was controversial and flawed, they found that it was no less reliable than equivalent research into other areas of child development and psychology, and stated that:

²⁰ Ruth McNair, 'From GP to Political Activist for the New Family' in Heather Grace Jones and Maggie Kirkman (eds), *Sperm Wars: The Rights and Wrongs of Reproduction* (ABC Books, Sydney, 2005) 227, 229.

²¹ New South Wales Law Reform Commission, 'Review of the Adoption of Children Act 1965 (NSW)', Report 81 (1997) [6.120].

²² Tasmania Law Reform Institute, *Adoption by Same Sex Couples*, Final Report No 4 (2003) Recommendation 1. See also Recommendation 3(a) which recommended that 'both step-parent and relative adoptions should be available to the same-sex partner of a parent or a relative of a child.'

The problem appears to be that anti-gay scholars either have a tendency to view any evidence of difference as evidence of harm or alternatively they employ double standards by attacking the studies, not so much because their research methods are inferior to most studies of family relationships, but because these critics oppose equal family rights for lesbians and gays.²³

The Institute concluded that the best interests of children required that same-sex couples be eligible to adopt children. The Institute openly criticised arguments regarding sexual identity on the basis that they reflected prejudices about homosexuality as an undesirable, wrong or a pathological condition.²⁴

The Victorian Law Reform Commission (VLRC) approached the question of the children's interests from a much broader perspective. Its reference included not only adoption which is assessed on a case by case basis, but also eligibility criteria for assisted reproduction and consequential amendments such as recognition of parentage.²⁵ As part of its investigation the VLRC commissioned Dr Ruth McNair to prepare an occasional paper into the 'Outcomes for Children Born of A.R.T.' A good portion of this paper is dedicated directly to the outcomes for children with same-sex parents. In this publication the author carefully summarised, analysed and examined the outcomes of these studies from the perspectives of the outcomes for the children themselves, their family functioning and the wider social environment. Dr McNair concluded that **'family functioning (processes) rather than family structure is the critical factor in determining children's outcomes'**.²⁶ These conclusions echoed earlier findings that family structure is only important where it is associated with secondary effects such as poverty.²⁷ The VLRC responded positively to these findings, stating that 'there is sound

²³ Tasmania Law Reform Institute, *Adoption by Same Sex Couples*, Final Report No 4 (2003) 5.

²⁴ See Tasmania Law Reform Institute, *Adoption by Same Sex Couples*, Final Report No 4 (2003) 6.

²⁵ See Victorian Law Reform Commission Assisted Reproductive Technology & Adoption: Should the Current Eligibility Criteria in Victoria be Changed?' Consultation Paper(2003).

²⁶ Ruth McNair, 'Outcomes for Children Born of A.R.T. in a Diverse Range of Families', (Occasional Paper Victorian Law Reform Commission 2004) 2.

²⁷ Elizabeth A Vandewater and Jennifer E Lansford, 'Influences of Family Structure and Parental Conflict on Children's Well-Being' (1998) 47 *Family Relations* 323. See also the New Zealand Law Commission, *New Issues in Legal Parenthood*, Report 88, (2005) [2.10].

evidence that children born into families with non-biological parents or same-sex parents do *at least as well* as other children²⁸ (emphasis added). This conclusion, phrased in the positive, replaces the deficit model of ‘just as good’ with a positive pronouncement of ‘at least as well’.

Nancy Polikoff, a renowned academic from the United States of America, summed up the results of the empirical data as follows:

By now there have been more than fifty peer reviewed studies with small samples published. While these studies have often included samples of convenience, many of them utilized control groups. All of them concluded that there is no relationship between the sexual orientation of a parent and the well being of a child. To summarize, gay and lesbian parents have equal parenting abilities to heterosexuals, and raise children as happy, healthy and well adjusted as children raised by heterosexual parents. The studies show no difference in the rate of psychiatric, emotional or behavioural difficulties and no differences in the quality of peer relationships, self esteem or popularity of children raised by lesbian and gay parents.²⁹

It is thus clear, that the same-sex family structure is not in itself a cause of negative outcomes for children and should not in itself determine whether a couple is eligible to adopt children. The criteria for determining a suitable family environment for a child should be according to a person’s/couples individual merits as parents, rather than their sexuality.

4. The Experience in other Australian and Overseas Jurisdictions that Allow the Adoption of Children by Same-sex Couples

All adoption legislation in Australia includes eligibility criteria. This means that a particular person or categories of persons are included in the adoption process while others are excluded. In the context of non-relative adoption, the legislation provides for individuals to be assessed on their particular characteristics in order to determine whether or not they are suitable candidates. Western Australia, the Australian Capital Territory

²⁸ See Victorian Law Reform Commission, *Assisted Reproductive Technology & Adoption*, Position Paper One: Access (2005) [2.66].

²⁹ Nancy Polikoff, 'Lesbian and Gay Parenting: The Last Thirty Years' (2005) 66 *Montana Law Review* 51, 55.

and Tasmania have been at the forefront in amending their legislation to allow same-sex couples to adopt.³⁰ (discussed in detail in the next section). In the remaining jurisdictions, while individually lesbian women are eligible to apply to adopt, two women as a couple will not be regarded as the child's legal parents, eligibility to adopt is limited to heterosexual couples. In some of these states the couples must be married, while in others it is sufficient if they are living together on a genuine domestic basis. Furthermore, adoption by single applicants is limited to 'exceptional' or 'special' circumstances, which is a euphemism for 'special needs' children. Table 1 below, 'Australia – Eligibility for Adoption' contains the up-to-date eligibility criteria and other relevant information pertaining to adoption legislation in each Australian State and Territory.

Most recently, The VLRC, as part of its enquiry into *Assisted Reproductive Technology & Adoption* recommended that the Victorian adoption legislation be amended to allow the courts to make adoption orders in favour of same-sex couples.³¹ They also recommended that the same-sex partner of a parent of a child should be allowed to adopt the child.³² The Victorian reforms were introduced after a painstaking and exhausting five year process during which every aspect relating to the legal recognition of same-sex families, including the eligibility of same-sex couples to adopt children, was investigated. The VLRC emphasised the interests of the child as the paramount consideration and concluded that as result of same-sex couples being excluded from the adoption process 'a child in need may potentially be deprived of the opportunity to be placed with the most suitable carers.'³³ The Commission thus recommended that *the Adoption Act 1984* (Vic) be reformed to allow same-sex couples to be eligible to adopt and that same-sex couples be assessed on the same criteria as opposite-sex partners.

³⁰ *Adoption Act 1994* (WA) s 39, *Adoption Act 1993* (ACT) s18 and *Adoption Act 1988* (Tas) s 20 (2A).

³¹ See Victorian Law Reform Commission, *Assisted Reproductive Technology & Adoption*, Final Report (2007) Recommendation 67.

³² Victorian Law Reform Commission, *Assisted Reproductive Technology & Adoption*, Final Report (2007) Recommendations 67 and 68.

³³ Victorian Law Reform Commission, 'Assisted Reproductive Technology and Adoption: Final Report' (2007) 106

A number of overseas jurisdictions have extended their adoption legislation to include same-sex couples. In the United States, a number of states allow second parent adoption which enables the partner of the legally recognised parent to adopt the latter's child. These include California, Connecticut, Delaware, District of Columbia, New Jersey, New York, Indiana and Massachusetts.³⁴ In addition a number of states for example California, New Jersey, Illinois, Connecticut, District of Columbia and Oregon allow same-sex couples to apply to adopt a child as a couple. In Canada, there is almost uniform recognition of adoption by same-sex parents who live together in a genuine domestic relationship.³⁵ In both the United States and Canada, the judiciary has been active in extending the laws of adoption to same-sex couples.³⁶ In the United Kingdom, the *Adoption of Children Act 2002* (UK) c 38 provides that same-sex couples are eligible to adopt children. This has been achieved through changing the definition of couple which reads as 'two people (whether of different sexes or the same sex) living as partners in an enduring family relationship.'³⁷ The increasing number of same-sex families thus represents a worldwide phenomenon, evoking a global response, with many overseas jurisdictions extending their adoption legislation to include same-sex couples.

5. The Recognition of Same-sex Families in Australia

In 2002, Western Australia introduced a package of reforms allowing same-sex couples to adopt children, all women to access clinical donor insemination (irrespective of their marital status) and recognising the consenting non-birth mother as a parent.³⁸ Shortly

³⁴ See See John Seymour and Sonia Magri 'A..R.T. Surrogacy and Legal Parentage: A Comparative Legislative Review', (Occasional Paper Victorian Law Reform Commission 2004) 56.

³⁵ See for example *Civil Code of Quebec* LQ 1991, c64 art 546 and 578, *Adoption Act* SNL 1999, c A21,s 20(1) and *Adoption Act SS 1998* c A 5.2, ss 16(2) and 23(1).

³⁶ See for example *Jacob and Dana*, 660 NE 2d 397 (NY App, 1995) and *In the Matter of the Adoption of two children by H.N.R.*, 666 A 2d 535 (NJ Super AD, 1995). In these cases it was decided that it is in the interests of the child for the non-biological parent to be eligible to apply to adopt the biological child of their partner. For Canadian examples *Re K* (1995) 15 RFL (4th) 129 and *Re M (C.S.)* 2001 NSSF 24

³⁷ *Adoption of Children Act 2002* (UK) c 38, s 49(1)(a) and s 144.

³⁸ The *Acts Amendment (Gay and Lesbian Law Reform) Act 2002* (WA) s 26 introduced s 6A into the *Artificial Conception Act 1985* (WA). This section came into force on 21 September 2002.

afterwards the Australian Capital Territory and the Northern Territory also passed legislation recognising the consenting non-birth mother as a parent.³⁹

New South Wales was the next Australian jurisdiction to pass progressive legislation presuming, the consenting non-birth mother of a child conceived through assisted conception procedures to be the mother of the child where parties are living in a de facto relationship.⁴⁰ Following the recommendations of the VLRC, Victoria has passed a package of reforms allowing all women to access donor insemination.⁴¹ Furthermore if two women are living on a genuine domestic basis the consenting non-biological mother is presumed to be the legal parent of a child conceived during a lesbian relationship.⁴²

The Federal Government has responded to a recent report of the Human Rights and Equal Opportunity Commission identifying 58 Federal Acts as discriminating against same-sex couples.⁴³ In November 2008, the *Family Law Amendment (De Facto Financial Matters and Other Measures) Act 2008* (Cth) was passed. In accordance with this legislation s 60H of the *Family Law Act 1975* (Cth) was amended to recognise the consenting non-birth mother as a parent or if such recognition is operative on a State or Territory level.⁴⁴

Thus, in Australia, all levels of government have recognised the same-sex family unit and made a determined effort to eradicate discrimination against same-sex couples and their

³⁹ *The Law Reform (Gender, Sexuality And De Facto Relationships) Act 2003* (NT) s 41 inserted s 5DA(1) into the *Status of Children Act 1978* (NT) This section commenced on 17 March 2004. The *Parentage Act 2004* (ACT) repealed *The Artificial Conception Act 1985* (ACT) and came into effect on 22 March 2004 see *The Parentage Act 2004* (ACT) ss 8(1) and 11(4).

⁴⁰ Schedule 2 of the *Miscellaneous Acts Amendment (Same Sex Relationships) Act 2008* (NSW) introduces s 14(1A) into the *Status of Children Act 1996*(NSW) and commenced on the 19 September 2008..

⁴¹ *Assisted Reproductive Treatment Act 2008* (Vic) s 10

⁴² *Assisted Reproductive Treatment Act 2008* (Vic). Section 147 amends Part III of the *Status of Children Act 1974* (Vic) and introduces ss 13 and 14. These amendments will come into operation on the 1 January 2010 unless they are proclaimed earlier.

⁴³ Research Paper, Same-Sex: Same Entitlements: National Inquiry into Discrimination against People in Same-Sex Relationships: Financial and Work-Related Entitlements and Benefits. Areas of Federal law that Exclude Same-Sex Couples and their Children (Human Rights and Equal Opportunity Commission, 2006).

⁴⁴ *Family Law Act 1975* (Cth) ss 4AA and 60EA 60H(1).

children.⁴⁵ The NSW legislature has been an active participant and a driving force in this recognition process. The amending of the NSW *Status of Children Act 1996* and the granting of legal recognition to the consenting non-birth mother of child conceived during the course of genuine same-sex relationship is confirmation of the belief that the sexuality of parents is of little consequence to the interests of the children they raise. In passing this legislation NSW has already validated same-sex parenting and with it the suitability of same-sex couples to parent. In light of these developments, it would be illogical for NSW to make a decision to exclude same-sex couples from the adoption process.

6. Conclusion

The *Adoption Act 2000* (NSW), in its existing form, arbitrarily discriminates against same-sex couples. Whilst, heterosexual couples are eligible to adopt children if they are ‘of good repute and are fit and proper persons to fulfil the responsibilities of parents’, same-sex couples are ineligible, even if they are ‘of good repute and are fit and proper persons to fulfil the responsibilities of parents’.

No evidence exists that children raised in same-sex families are disadvantaged. Not *all* same-sex couples make good parents, just as not *all* heterosexual couples make good parents. The *Adoption Act* must be amended so that same-sex couples are eligible to adopt, subject to the same eligibility criteria as opposite sex couples. Prospective parents should be evaluated individually and by reference to their ability to parent, rather than their sexual orientation.

To achieve parity between same-sex couples and heterosexual couples, and remove discrimination from the legislation, only minor amendments are required to the existing legislation. In particular, the existing definition of ‘de facto relationship’ which reads as

⁴⁵ See also the *Same-sex Relationships (Equal Treatment in Commonwealth Laws – General Law Reform) Act (Cth) 2008* and the *Same-sex Relationships (Equal Treatment Commonwealth Laws – Superannuation) Act (Cth) 2008* which remove discrimination against same-sex couples from a raft of Commonwealth legislation in relation to superannuation, social security, taxation, veterans affairs and workers compensation.

‘the relationship between a man and a woman who live together as husband and wife on a bona fide domestic basis although not married to one another’ should be amended to read: **‘the relationship between two persons, irrespective of sex, who live together on a bona fide domestic basis’**.

Table 1: Australia - Eligibility for Adoption

State	Legislation	Who can adopt? (excluding step-parent)	Definitions of Couple	When can a Step-parent/second parent Adopt?
Australian Capital Territory	<i>Adoption Act 1993</i> s 18	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • s 18 (1)(b): A couple 'who, whether married or not, have lived together in a domestic partnership for a period of not less than 3 years'. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ❖ Heterosexual married and de facto couples. ❖ Same-sex couples. ❖ s 18(3): Single person. 	'domestic partnership' is the relationship between two people whether of a different or the same sex , living together as a couple on a genuine domestic basis.' s 169 <i>Legislation Act 2001</i> (ACT)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • s 18(2): Only in circumstances where the Court considers it 'not preferable' to make an order for custody or guardianship.
New South Wales	<i>Adoption Act 2000</i> Sections 23, 26, 27, 28 and 30	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • ss 26 and 28(4): A couple who have been living together for a continuous period of at least 2 years. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ❖ s 28(4): Heterosexual married and de facto couples. ❖ s 27: One person 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • s 23(1): 'Couple' means a man and a woman who: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> (a) Are married; or (b) Have a de facto relationship. 'De facto couple' applies to a man and woman living together on a genuine domestic basis without being married.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • s 30(a)-(d): the child is at least 5 years old; the step parent has lived with the child for a continuous period of not less than 2 years; there is consent in accordance with the <i>Adoption Act 2000</i>, and 'clearly preferable in the best interests of the child to any other action that could be taken by law in relation to the child'.
Northern Territory	<i>Adoption of Children Act 1994</i> ss 13, 14 and 15	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • s 13(1)(a): Man and woman married to each for not less than two years'. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ❖ s 13(1) married couple. ❖ s 14(1)(b): Single person under exceptional circumstances. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • s 13(1) 'where the man and woman... are married to each other'. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • s 15(3)(a)-(c): guardianship or custody of the child under <i>Family Law Act</i> does not make adequate provision for the welfare and interests of the child; 'exceptional circumstances'; 'better provision'.
Queensland	<i>Adoption Children Act 1964</i> (Qld) s 12(1)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • s 12(1) 'husband and wife jointly'. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ❖ s 12(1)and (2): Husband and wife. ❖ s 12(3)(c): One person under special circumstances. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • s 12(1) 'husband and wife jointly'. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • s 12(5): 'Welfare and interests of the child 'better served' than under an order for guardianship and custody.
South Australia	<i>Adoption Act 1988</i> (SA) ss 10 and 12	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • s 12(1): Two persons cohabiting together in a marriage relationship for a continuous period of at least five years(unless special circumstances). <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ❖ Heterosexual married and de facto couples. ❖ s 12(3)(b): One person in special circumstances. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • s 4(1): 'Marriage relationship' means the relationship between two persons cohabiting as husband and wife or de facto husband and wife. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • s 10(1)(a): is clearly preferable, in the interests of the child, to any alternative order. • s 10(2): The Family Court of Australia has given that person leave to proceed with the application for adoption.

Table 1: Australia - Eligibility for Adoption

State	Legislation	Who Can Adopt? (excluding step-parents)	Definitions of Couple	When can a Step-parent /Second Parent Adopt?
Tasmania	<i>Adoption Act 1988</i> (Tas) s.20	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● s 20(1) two persons who, for a period of not less than 3 years are married or in a registered deed of relationship. ❖ s 20(1): Married couple ❖ s 20 (2A): Parties in a 'significant relationship' But only where the partner is the natural or adopted parent of the child or a relative of the child. ❖ s 20(4): One person under exceptional circumstances. 	<i>Relationships Act 2003</i> (Tas) s 4: Significant relationships – (1) Is a relationship between two adult persons (a) Who have a relationship as a couple; and (b) Who are not married to one another or related by family.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● s 20(7)(a)-(c): Court shall not make an adoption order unless: an order for custody or guardian would not make adequate provision to serve the welfare and interests of the child; and serves the welfare and interests of the child; and special circumstances exist.
Victoria	<i>Adoption Act 1984</i> ss 11-12	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● s 11(1)(a) and (c): A man and a woman who are married to each other or living in a de facto relationship for not less than two years. ❖ Heterosexual married and de facto couples ❖ s 11(3) Single person under special circumstances. 	s 4(1): 'De facto relationship' means the relationship of a man and a woman who are living together as husband and wife on a genuine domestic basis, although not married to each other.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● s 11(6)(a)-(d): Conditions to be satisfied. Order under <i>Family Law Act</i> not adequate; exceptional circumstances; better provision for welfare of child and in the case of an order in favour of a de facto spouse neither that spouse nor his or her de facto spouse is married to another person at the time that the order is made.
Western Australia	<i>Adoption Act 1994</i> s 39	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● s 39(1)(d) and (e) (joint): Married couple or living together in de facto relationship for at least three years. ❖ Married couples. ❖ Heterosexual de facto couples. ❖ Same-sex de facto couples. ❖ s39(1): single person. 	<i>Interpretation Act 1984</i> s 13A(1): 'De facto relationship' as a relationship other than marriage between two people who live together is a ' marriage like ' relationship. s 13A(3): 'It does not matter whether the persons are different sexes or the same sex. '	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● s 68(1)(fa): Child's adoption by step-parent preferable to order under FLA. ● s 4(1)(b): definition of 'step-parent'.