

From: [Sharan Hall](#)
To: [HCDSDFVPC](#)
Subject: SUBMISSION ON CURRENT ADOPTION BILL
Date: Tuesday, 4 October 2016 1:19:51 PM

Inquiry Secretary

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

4TH October 2016

Mrs Sharan Hall

[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]

Dear Secretary,

My name is Mrs Sharan Hall from [REDACTED], and I am writing to you to state my opposition to the proposed Adoption Bill.

Adoption by singles and same sex couples is not in the best interests of a child.

It is not as heinous as Same Sex Marriage would be for the child, as presumably the birth parents would still be allowed to be known within certain guidelines, and hence at some stage of the child's life may be able

to be sought out and communicated with, as opposed to the ludicrous proposition that the biological parents of a child no longer be the two names of parents on the birth certificate.

In more detail, I make respectfully make my submission to the committee, as follows –

To allow adoption of a child by a single parent or a same sex couple is to allow less than ideal situations for a child to grow up in.

While not denying marriage is flawed and has not been respected as it should have been, and that many children sadly, already grow up in less than ideal situations; to allow adoption by singles or same sex couples is to allow (and encourage) the exact situation that opposition to Same Sex Marriage has as its main tenant - That we should not be *legislating* for a child to not have a mother or a father.

This bill is intended no doubt to grant permission to singles and same sex couples that is currently denied them in the absence of Same Sex Marriage legislation, as Same Sex Marriage will automatically allow adoption rights, and more.

This bill deserves to be defeated on the same grounds that Same Sex Marriage is to be opposed.. for the sake of the children. Social science has proven, (though by the mainstream media and commentators the public would probably not be aware), that children of same sex couples suffer no more or less DISADVANTAGE as other children from other disrupted families ie. Step families. But suffer disadvantage they do. To state the situation in this way is to legislate for disadvantage. Why would we legislate for disadvantage?

Is it not the governments job, inasmuch as they are called to legislate marriage and adoption, meant to be for the express purpose of supporting and encouraging the best possible situation for the child? Is not the best situation for the children the sole reason for legislating in favour of a mum and a dad, or indeed having anything to do with any sort of sexual relationship between two consenting adults? The only time the government ought to have anything to say or do about sexual relationships between consenting adults is in the case where there is the potential for children, ie

the relationship between a male and a female, the only relationship which is able to produce children. Whilst same sex couples and singles ought to be respected and treated with great civility and equality in all regards, a rightful exclusion should be in the case where we seek to enact legislation which puts their needs as adults ahead of the needs of the child to have a mother and a father.

As a secondary comment, I have comments for the consideration of the committee regarding Adoption vs Same Sex Marriage.

No doubt adoption where the child's birth mother or father is able to be known and potentially present in the child's life would be better than the proposed same sex legislation which as I understand it would deny even the knowledge of the parent to the child. An absurdity and a severe denial of a child's rights.

Scientifically speaking, every human being has a mother and a father, and to deny that is, I repeat, absurd.

However, because the adoption scenario is marginally better than the proposed extinction of biological ties which is proposed in the Same Sex Marriage legislation, there is no cause to pursue it. Any legislation which directly legislates for a less than ideal scenarios to be automatically encountered by a child is not good legislation, and indeed is stealing from the child/ren the right to a mother or father. Adoption of a child has always historically been to a new ideal scenario, a mum and a dad. Let's not change that.

I do hope the committee has full access to stories of children who have grown up in motherless or fatherless households who very often indicate that they suffer emotionally, often deeply. Whilst they love their caregivers (often very deeply) no matter what combination they are, they often yearn for the other parent. It would appear that when they are no longer in the care of those parties that they often say that they suffered from not having the other parent, and had previously refrained from saying so at the risk of hurting their carers (whom they love and appreciate most often), and in fact, often, also, have remained silent in order to escape being ostracized from their community because of not "towing the party line" and singing the praises of their situation in the case of same sex couples and their communities ..

The facts are also clear that a large proportion of the homosexual community, whilst wanting to exercise their own rights to engage sexually with whom they please, also recognise that this is not good for children.

I am familiar with a “longterm” liaison that called itself marriage between two adult men that lasted 16.5 years. It has just recently broken up. Amicably, thankfully for them. They remain the best of friends and now live in separate states of Australia, but in the closely paraphrased words of the elder partner “they just are not going to keep playing at this relationship in order to make it work in regard to a marriage.” I am very glad they were not allowed to adopt children that would be the legal responsibility of the two of them past when their relationship changed its character to very good and very supportive friends. (the older man does “adopt” children, as adults, and calls them “children of choice” and he exists and enjoys a “family of choice.” While this may be ok for adults, this is not in the best interests of a child in their formative years.

For the record, in regard to this particular relationship, I was under the impression (until this recent change) that this relationship was forever, and in fact, by their own admission, was even monogamous. I did not expect it to fail. I believed I was privileged to know a couple whom were the exception rather than the rule, as homosexual men in particular statistically speaking, choose not to be monogamous.

Hence, even in the best of scenarios in Same Sex couples, longevity and stability is not assured. A child adopted to a same sex couple or a single person would suffer.

I trust the committee is privileged to have a copy of “Stealing from a Child” by David Van Gend. I believe it is a well researched and presented book, worthy of note. I ask the committee to give it detailed and careful consideration.

I do hope you will give due weight to the voices of concern raised on behalf of the potential adopted children whom will be automatically disadvantaged by virtue of their adoption.

Thank you for your concern for children.

I trust that your recommendation to Parliament will reflect true hearts that recognise when harm will be caused, and call it as such. I would ask that you recommend that this bill not be voted on.

Yours faithfully,

Sharan Joy Hall