# And then... the brides changed nappies

**Lesbian mothers, gay fathers and the legal recognition of our relationships with the children we raise**

**A Community Law Reform Document**

**1st edition**
**October 2002**

**Gay & Lesbian Rights Lobby**

For further copies of this paper:

Visit the GLRL Website at: www.glrl.org.au to download the pdf file
or for a paper copy, contact:
The Gay and Lesbian Rights Lobby of NSW Inc
PO Box 9, Darlinghurst, NSW, 1300
Fax: 02 9331 7963
Email: info@glrl.org.au

Published by the GLRL (NSW) Inc, Sydney, 2002

Authored by Jenni Millbank.

This project is supported by a grant from the Law and Justice Foundation of NSW. For their comments on an earlier draft, big thanks to Reg Graycar, Tim Leach, Wayne Morgan, Anthony Powell, Danny Sandor.

# Nappies is for consultation

In 1993 the GLRL developed relationship recognition options in *The Bride Wore Pink*. After a process of community consultation, a second edition of the *Bride* was developed in 1994. *Bride* became the basis for lobbying for law reform over 5 years until laws recognising gay and lesbian relationships were passed in NSW in 1999. This second stage, *Nappies* is to take the law reform process further, from partnerships to parenting.

This discussion paper outlines some of the issues in the laws that regulate and (mostly do not) recognise our families. We suggest a series of possibilities for change and recommend those we think are the best.

We are informed in this paper by existing social science research on gay and lesbian family forms[1] as well as by the GLRL 2001 consultation on parenting issues.[2] Our starting point is that parenting issues are more of an issue generally for women than men, as lesbians are more likely to be parents than gay men are, and more likely to be the full time caregivers to children when they are parents. Acknowledging women's primacy in parenting issues does not mean we devalue men's parenting relationships.

**Our purpose is to find models that assist all our families as they exist now, it is not to express any preference for one kind of family – one parent or two, gay dads involved or not involved - over any other.**

**We expect that our suggestions will generate a range of views. This document is only a draft, it is not final. We need to hear from you about whether you think what we propose is helpful. You can respond in writing, by email, or at one of the community consultations through 2002/3 – see the details for submissions and consultations at the end of this paper**.

We hope to develop a broad consensus from listening to lesbian and gay families about what law reform is needed. If there is a consensus we will write a final report and use it as a base for our future lobbying efforts, as we did with *Bride*. If there is no real agreement within our communities, we will issue a final report acknowledging where those divisions lie.

[1] Summarised in *Meet the Parents* (2002), available on the GLRL website at www.glrl.org.au
[2] The report on these consultations is available at www.glrl.org.au

# Who is parenting and how

Parenting is a big issue in our communities. As more of us choose to have children outside of traditional two parent heterosexual relationships, new family forms are appearing without the social or legal categories to recognise them. We use the following terms to try to be clear about who is undertaking what roles.

| | |
|---|---|
| **Mothers** | Biological mothers |
| **Co-mothers** | Non-biological mothers who have jointly planned, conceived and raised a child with a female partner |
| **Step-mothers, Step-fathers** | Parenting a child who was born to their partner in a previous relationship |
| **Co-fathers** | Non-biological fathers who are co-parenting a child from birth with a male partner who is the biological or adoptive father |

Co-parents is the gender neutral term to cover both co-mother and co-fathers who are parenting equally with a partner who is the biological or adoptive parent of the child.

Biological fathers who have chosen to have children with lesbian mothers through donor insemination (DI) may undertake any number of roles, from meeting the child on a single or limited number of occasions, to an involved and active parent figure. We use the following terms to make these roles clear.

| | |
|---|---|
| **Known donors** | Biological fathers through donor insemination who know, but have little involvement with, a child they have helped create |
| **Donor-dads** | Biological fathers who have some involvement, and regular contact, with their children |
| **Co-parenting donor-dads** | Biological fathers who are very involved with their children, and some sharing of responsibility |

Yes, we know, it is confusing.

# And baby makes three (or four, or five, or two)

While we cannot say with any certainty exactly how many lesbian and gay parents exist, how many co-parenting couples have separated, what proportion of lesbian mothers are sharing residence or parental responsibility of children with gay fathers, or how much contact gay fathers are having with children born through donor insemination, there are some clear trends that emerge from available information.

Unless otherwise noted, all statements about family forms and the division of labour are drawn from *Meet the Parents* (GLRL, 2002)[3] which draws together available research on lesbian and gay family forms from the UK, USA and Australia through the 1980s and 1990s. The studies relied upon can be examined there in much more detail.

- Up to 10% of gay men and 20% of lesbians are parents
- Up to half of these parents have had children in the context of a previous heterosexual relationship, but this proportion is gradually declining
- The vast majority of lesbian mothers now having babies are doing so through donor insemination
- Most, but not all, lesbian parents are having children in a lesbian couple (about 85%)
- Lesbian couples who have more than one child together often exchange roles as biological mother and co-mother
- Lesbian co-mothers share a large amount (but not quite half) of the child care and home responsibilities with mothers, and both co-mothers and mothers see themselves as "equal parents"
- Most lesbian mothers having children through donor insemination do so with known donors (around 50-70%)
- Most, but not all, known donors are gay men
- Of the gay men who are known donors, between half to two thirds of them have some contact with the child
- Of the donor-dads who have contact with the child, around half of them had regular contact (so up to 20-25% of children born to lesbian mothers have regular contact with their biological father)
- A small but significant portion of donor-dads acted as co-parents with regular contact and some degree of responsibility in the child's life (up to 10% of known donors)
- In virtually all families the lesbian mothers were the "primary parents", having residence of the child, giving primary care and exercising parental responsibility by making all important decisions about the child (where they lived, went to school, medical care etc)
- Contact with children appears to be a major issue facing gay fathers[4]

[3] Available at www.glrl.org.au

[4] Contact was the major issue raised by gay fathers in the 2001 GLRL parenting consultations, predominantly concerning children from previous heterosexual relationships. This was also true of gay fathers in the data drawn from the non-identified files of gay and lesbian clients who obtained free legal advice from the Lesbian and Gay Legal Rights Service over a 5 year period from 1995-2000.

- Disputes between separating mothers and co-mothers over issues of residence, contact and child support appear to be more common than disputes between mothers and donor-dads over contact[5]
- Lesbian parents who have been surveyed are almost universally in favour of equal legal recognition being afforded to co-mothers and mothers
- Lesbian parents who have been surveyed are equally divided on whether there should be some limited legal recognition of known donors, or none at all
- The views of donor-dads on recognising their relationships with children are not yet known

[5] Mother and co-mother disputes outnumbered mother and donor dad disputes 3:1 in the advice files noted above.

# How the laws affect our lives

The laws governing parent-child relationships may be state or federal, or a combination of the two.[6] Because our starting point is what our families need and what our communities want, this discussion paper will cover both NSW and federal laws when they impact on us.

Currently, NSW law deems the consenting husband or male de-facto partner of a woman who has a child by donor insemination (DI) to be the child's father for all legal purposes. The donor is deemed not to be a legal parent for any legal purpose. Where there is no male de-facto partner, children born through donor insemination have only one legal parent, their mother. So in heterosexual families where children are born through DI the child has two legal parents, while in lesbian families they have only one. In neither case is a donor or donor-dad recognised as a legal parent.

With very few exceptions, a co-mother does not have a legally recognised relationship with her child under NSW or federal law.

Legal recognition of our relationships with the children we love and raise will matter at different times and for different purposes. It may, for example, affect who is entitled to receive child support from whom if the parents' relationships break down, or whether a child will automatically inherit property or superannuation from a parent at their death. Areas we have identified as important are:

- Inheritance
- Child support
- Contact and residence
- Parental authority – eg over schools, medical care etc

So, for example, if a co-father dies, his child will not automatically inherit from his estate if he has not left a will. If a lesbian couple separate, there are only very limited and expensive options for the mother to pursue the co-mother for child support. A co-parent may not be accepted by schools or doctors as authorised to make decisions about their child. Some laws only cover (and are only relevant to) children up to the age of 18, such as laws about contact and residence or child support. Other laws cover parent-child relationships with no age limit, such as inheritance law.

It is important to remember that issues such as *contact* with children, *responsibility* for children (including financial responsibility) and *authority* over children can all be distinct, and some may be more relevant to certain relationships than others.

Being legally recognised as a parent gives rise to the presumption that parents are *jointly responsible* for a child under the *Family Law Act* (Cth). But it is important to note that legal recognition is only a baseline and does **not necessarily** determine residence and contact disputes about children under the *Family Law Act*. Also note that the *Family Law Act* **can be used by any person** who has an interest in a child's well-being; they do not need to have a biological or legal relationship with the child.

[6] For instance the definition of a parent under the federal Family Law Act relies in part upon definitions from state law.

# Current recognition avenues

Adoption transfers all of the legal rights and responsibilities of a parent onto a person who is not the biological parent of a child. Adoption is not currently available to lesbian and gay couples in NSW. While a lesbian or gay man can adopt a child as a "single" person, a same sex couple cannot jointly adopt an unrelated child. Same sex couples where one partner has a biological child are also excluded from using adoption to extend recognition to the other partner.

Existing recognition options are very limited. They are confined to parenting orders under federal law, and a few limited instances of functional parent presumptions under state law. They are explained below.

## Parenting orders

Under the *Family Law Act* (Cth) parenting orders can made regardless of the biological or legal relationship between the parties or between the parties and the child. A mother and co-mother can jointly apply *for parenting orders by consent* covering issues such as residence and contact as well as other specific issues. If there is no legal father, or he consents, this is a fairly simple process and it has been used on numerous occasions to confirm that the child legally resides with the co-mother as well as confirming her authority to make medical and educational decisions about the child.

Consent orders can also cover donor-dads. Such orders could set out what contact the donor-dad is to have with the child, or establish that residence is to be shared between the donor-dad and the mothers.

### Pros

- a relatively simple process
- flexible coverage of issues so can be tailored to each family's needs
- can cover more than two adults, so covers multi-parent families
- can be used by co-parents as well as step-parents

### Cons

- it is not adoption. It only covers some areas and does not necessarily affect the definition of "parent" and "child" under other laws – eg does not affect inheritance
- only covers children up to the age of 18
- waiting time – it can't really be used until the child is a few years old and a 'status quo' has been established
- requires proving to the court that your family form is in 'the child's best interests' – for heterosexual families this is assumed
- like all *opt-in* mechanisms, it does not help families where parents have not successfully completed this process. Even at its simplest it requires money, access to lawyers and a lot of effort, including coming out to a court.

## Limited functional parent presumption

In a few areas of NSW law, such as worker's compensation, a person who is living with a child and acts "in loco parentis" (or "in the place of a parent") even though they are not a biological parent, has that relationship recognised for a specific purpose. So if a 'functional parent' were to die in a work-related injury, the child would be entitled to compensation even though they were not biologically or legally related.

### Pros

- is *presumptive*, so can simply be used when needed, no need for *opt-in* process
- is flexible, can cover co-parents or step-parents
- can change over time
- can cover multi-parent families

### Cons

- very limited coverage, as only applies to a small number of laws
- mostly only covers relationships where the parent and child live together
- may lead to difficult problems of proof if opposed

**Clearly these two current avenues do not offer adequate coverage to the range of lesbian and gay families in our community.**

**In the following section we raise general issues for recognition (who? how?) and then outline all of the available possibilities before listing which ones we support and why.**

# Recognition options for the future

Two important issues running through reform possibilities are:

1. **Who should be covered?** Should we assume that the law will only cover two legal parents, or try to extend legal recognition to multi-parent families?
2. **How should that coverage occur?** Should it be based upon *presumption* based or opt-in?

Presumption based laws, such as our current relationship recognition laws, apply automatically after you have met certain criteria and you do not need to do anything to formalise your relationship. With many of these laws, you can *opt-out* if you wish. *Opt-in* recognition works on the basis that you must take steps to register a relationship or formalise it.

**Who**. Our general approach is that wherever possible the broadest range of our parenting relationships should be recognised.

Co-parents who raise a child with whom they have no biological relationship from birth are in the position of most immediate need, as they have no legal relationship with their child in almost every area. Co-parents should be recognised as the equal parents they really are, and we support the full legal recognition of co-parents as an urgent priority. It follows that co-parents should be liable for child support obligations.

Other people whose roles are more varied and are more likely to evolve with time, such as step-parents and donor-dads, should also have their relationships recognised. These relationships are more varied and need a greater variety of recognition options.

**How**. Where possible, we suggest extending existing legal regimes. We do this for simplicity and based on what we think is achievable. So, for example, we do not start by completely rewriting family law, but where current laws do not "fit" our families, we suggest new models.

Co-mothers are parenting from birth in partnership with mothers. We believe that legal recognition, like that for heterosexual couples who have children through donor insemination, should be *presumptive* from birth. This is a formal equality approach; simply extending existing laws to equally cover co-mothers who are similarly situated to male partners.

Co-fathers are not in the same situation as co-mothers because they are not having children with their partners through donor insemination – so current presumptive laws cannot be extended to co-fathers. We support recognition of co-fathers to the fullest extent possible, depending upon how the relationship has come about. For example, where the child is adopted, co-fathers should be recognised through the availability of joint adoption.

The range of other parent figures who come into children's lives later and whose roles may evolve with time require a more flexible range of options that can reflect the differences in their relationships. Recognition of these varied relationships therefore needs to be *opt-in*.

**There are many different legal avenues that could be pursued to obtain parenting recognition. Below we list a series of different options, and note their advantages and disadvantages. At the conclusion of this menu, we explain which avenues we support and why.**

## 1. A deeming provision from birth

As noted earlier, NSW law deems the consenting male de-facto partner of a woman who has a baby by donor insemination to be a legal father for all legal purposes. Currently, this does not cover same sex couples, so babies born through DI in lesbian couples have only one parent. If this law were made gender-neutral, a consenting lesbian co-mother would be a full parent from birth across a wide range of laws. Western Australia introduced such a provision in 2002.

### Pros

- covers all NSW laws at once
- may cover some federal law also (where the meaning of "parent" is anchored in NSW law)
- extremely simple
- presumptive rather than opt-in, it applies automatically from birth, so does not require money, lawyers etc
- a female partner can refuse consent and so opt-out –if she does not want to be a legal parent she can refuse to be listed on the birth certificate
- uses a simple "formal equality" approach, placing female partners in the same position as male partners in couples where children are born through DI
- is life-long, does not cease when the child turns 18
- if Western Australia can do it, so can we!

### Cons

- currently such a law only covers children born **after** it has been introduced, so may not help all families with children already
- also does not cover children born through other means than DI
- does not cover most federal law (eg child support)

The major disadvantage of this reform option is that it does not cover everyone. This could be remedied by introducing other changes in combination with it – e.g. if children born before the law was introduced could be adopted by their co-parent.

Alternately, there could be an additional provision under this law for parents whose children were born before the changes came into effect to opt-in to coverage under the Act through a simple administrative process – such as changing the details on the birth certificate. This would have the same effect as adoption for co-mothers, but would be cheaper and easier to use.

# 2. Adoption

NSW adoption law prevents a lesbian or gay co-parent or step-parent formalising their relationship with a child they are raising with the biological parent.

## Step-parent adoption

Step-parent adoption creates a legal relationship between the child and the step-parent. Step-parent adoption provisions assume that there are two biological/legal parents to start with. An order of adoption severs the relationship of one biological parent and awards it to the step-parent. Because of the effect on the parent whose relationship is severed, there is a presumption in the law **against** such an order.

These provisions do not currently cover same sex relationships. If extended to same sex couples, they could be used by lesbian and gay step-parents.

## Pros

- covers all NSW laws
- may cover federal law also (where the meaning of parent is anchored in NSW law)
- can reflect changing family forms, after relationship breakdown
- has symbolic importance as family recognition
- uses a formal equality approach treating homosexual and heterosexual parent figures in the same way
- is life-long, does not cease when the child turns 18

## Cons

- not a simple process
- is *opt-in*, so requires money, lawyers, effort. Will not cover the many people who do not use it
- is not flexible in that it only recognises two parents, and involves severing the relationship of the other biological parent (eg a former husband or wife)
- is unlikely to be approved where the other biological parent opposes it
- is really not appropriate when homosexual parent figures are not in the same situation as heterosexuals, i.e. they are in fact co-parents rather than step-parents (discussed below)
- may not cover all federal law (eg child support)

## Co-parent adoption

Step-parent provisions are not adequate to deal with co-parent relationships. These two situations need to be dealt with differently as they very reflect different relationships and needs.

Where there is only one legal parent to begin with – e.g. two lesbian mothers who have had a child together through donor insemination – and the co-parent has been present in the child's life since birth as an equal parent, they should not be treated as a step-parent because they are not, in fact a step-parent. Heterosexual co-parents from birth are already deemed to be parents for all legal purposes.

We support an additional adoption provision for co-parent adoption where there is either only one legal parent (or where there are two legal parents if there is consent from the parent who will have their relationship severed). This provision would have a presumption **in favour** of such an order.

### Pros

- covers all NSW laws
- may cover federal law also (where the meaning of parent is anchored in NSW law)
- if there is a presumption in favour, it would be relatively simple to use
- has symbolic importance as family recognition
- is life-long, does not cease when the child turns 18
- could be used to extend recognition to children who had been born before reforms deeming co-mothers from birth came into force

### Cons

- is *opt-in*, so it requires money, lawyers, effort and will not cover the many people who do not use it
- is not flexible in that it only recognises two parents and assumes that known donors will stay unrecognised (or will consent)
- may not cover all federal laws (eg child support)

## 3. Extended functional parent presumption

Such a change would presume that a “functional parent” was a legal parent for some or many areas of law. The definition of “functional parent” could be based upon living with the child and acting in place of a parent, or use definitions from existing NSW legislation, or another legal categories such as “dependency”. So, if a functional parent died, the child could use the specific laws that included this definition to claim inheritance or compensation.

### Pros

- flexible – can be used to respond to some areas of law and not others if that is desired
- flexible – can cover co-parents or step-parents as and when needed
- *presumption*-based, so does not require money and lawyers to *opt-in*
- uses and extends legal categories that already exist

### Cons

- may be slow and piecemeal with some laws being changed and others not, based on the government’s view of what is expedient rather than our needs
- may lead to inconsistency and uncertainty about who is covered and when
- would only cover NSW law and would not be reflected in any federal law
- depending upon definition, may be limited to children up to 18, or only to those who live with a parent figure may be hard to prove a relationship if there is opposition to a claim

# 4. Registrable Parenting Plans

Disputes about children may arise between mothers and co-mothers if their relationship breaks down; such disputes typically cover residence, contact, and child support. Disputes may also arise between mothers and donor-dads – these disputes are typically about contact.

As many lesbians are having children with gay donors, all members of these families are starting with some idea of how all the parties should occupy different parenting roles. Agreements may be spoken or written down. They may cover emotional issues as well as practical ones – eg what the parties will call each other and themselves to the child, who will have residence and primary care of the child, who will bear the costs of child-raising and so on. As neither co-mothers nor donor-dads have a legal relationship with the child, these agreements are very important in structuring everyone's understanding of how the family will function, but they are not legally binding. They have no legal effect if a residence or contact dispute develops.

We do not propose that parenting plans between mothers or between mothers and donors be made binding for two important reasons.

The first reason is that research on lesbian and gay families suggests that as children grow up, agreements are often varied as relationships change – frequently a donor-dad's contact with the child increases over time. A binding agreement is unable to accommodate future developments. So, for example, if a donor-dad had agreed to little or no contact, but over the next few years saw the child weekly, a dispute over contact could not be resolved by a parenting agreement which recorded the original view that he would not see the child.

Secondly, no parenting agreement of any kind can be binding on the Family Court. The Court must always make orders in the child's best interests, and any agreement or prior order can always be overturned on this basis. It would be impossible to argue for binding agreements when they fly in the face of the Family Law system's emphasis on the child's best interests.

However, the *Family Law Act* does provide that the parents of a child can register a written agreement, known as a *parenting plan*, with the Family Court. A parenting plan can cover residence, contact, child support, or any other issue of parental responsibility. A registered plan has the same effect as an order of the Court, so it binds the parties unless it is revoked by consent or is varied by a later order of the Court.

Currently, this option is not available to lesbian and gay families because it covers plans 'between the parents of a child' (although it can also include other people) and neither co-mothers nor donor-dads are 'parents' under the Act.

We support changes to the Act to broaden the range of people who can register plans. Such plans provide some certainty to lesbian and gay families as they set a baseline to start from if there is later dispute.

## Pros

- flexible, can be used to reflect whatever arrangement families come up with
- can accommodate multi-parent families
- can cover mother-co-mother agreements as well as mother-donor-dad agreements
- provide increased certainty on issues of contact and residence
- can cover child support agreements
- relatively simple process
- uses an existing legal avenue
- many families are drawing up agreements anyway
- the process of drawing up agreements helps to clarify expectations and may assist in avoiding disputes later

## Cons

- requires *opt-in*, if registering requires money, lawyers, a process of drawing up
- does not automatically flow on to other areas of law – eg inheritance
- assumes that people know in advance what their family form will be registered plans cannot be varied by consent, only revoked, so can't be varied to accommodate changes as time goes on

# What we favour and why

None of the options we have outlined are perfect, and none of them covers everyone. **We support a mixed use of several of them, in conjunction, to provide coverage that it as broad and simple as possible, while still permitting choice.**

In *The Bride Wore Pink* we identified two major issues, the recognition of partner relationships and the recognition of a broader range of interdependent relationship outside of couples. We decided to pursue both of those goals as distinct but related issues, and recommended widespread immediate recognition of partner "de-facto" relationships with a more limited and slower recognition of a broader range of other "domestic" relationships. This was on the basis that there was a clear need for, and clear community support for, partner recognition, in addition to clear inequality with heterosexual partner relationships, and a relatively simple series of reforms that could be pursued. The need for wide recognition of non-partner relationships was less clear, as was the impact of any proposed changes, so we recommended some immediate reforms (many of which have happened) accompanied by an inquiry into what else was needed (currently under way).

Then, as now, we are conscious of a desire not to reinforce traditional hetero-nuclear (or homo-nuclear!) family structures and to respect our community's extended family networks. We again recommend a two-pronged approach to parenting reform, separating out issues that require clear and immediate change from those that require more complex inquiry.

**Issues relating to co-parent and step-parent recognition are clear, have widespread support, represent a large proportion of families, and can be argued on the basis of formal equality with heterosexual families. We urge immediate reforms in these areas. These reforms proceed on the basis of the current legal framework of two legal parents.**

Issues relating to the recognition of donor-dads as legal parents in addition to mothers, or the full legal recognition of multi-parent families – two mothers and two fathers - are more complex and uncertain. Multi-parent recognition cannot be assimilated into the current legal framework which uses a two-parent model. Multi-parent recognition would also have uncertain legal effects. So, for instance, removing the provision that deems donors not to be parents would have effects on all families where children are born through DI, not just on lesbian and gay families (even assuming it only covered known and not anonymous donors). It would also create three legal parents (assuming that the co-mother was already recognised) in a legal framework that until now has only ever accommodated a maximum of two.

It is clear that contact with children is a major issue for donor-dads, and that there is a need to provide certainty in relation to contact and residence issues. We support immediate changes to provide certainty in this area. However it is very unclear what other areas need change. For example, if two primary parents are able to obtain child support from one another, is there really a need to extend liability to include third or fourth parents?

**We therefore support a further process of detailed consideration on how multi-family recognition could occur if it is needed across a broad range of laws.**

# We recommend:

## Immediate reforms to

1. Change the *Status of Children Act* to make the definition of de-facto partner gender neutral. This will deem consenting co-mothers of DI babies born to lesbian couples parents across all NSW laws.

2. Include an administrative provision so co-mothers of DI children born before the changes above came into effect can opt-in as parents across all NSW laws.

3. Change the *Adoption Act* to make the definition of de-facto partner gender neutral. This will allow gay and lesbian parents to use the current step-parent adoption provisions.

4. Change the *Adoption Act* to include a new provision for co-parent adoption where there is only one legal parent. This will allow gay and lesbian co-parents to adopt with a presumption in favour of adoption.

5. Change the *Child Support (Assessment) Act* (Cth) to include a definition of "parent" from changes 1-4 above. Alternately, introduce *child support legislation in NSW* using a definition of "parent" from changes 1-4 above. A NSW version would mirror the payment provisions of the federal *Child Support Act*, and would apply until federal law changed to include the new definitions.

6. Change the *Family Law Act* (Cth) to enable registration of parenting plans for lesbian and gay families. This would establish a legal status quo for residence and contact based on the agreement.

## More detailed consideration of

1. Including functional parent recognition in certain laws, especially ones that concern times of crisis or a major impact upon the people concerned, eg inheritance.

2. Considering the viability of adoption law allowing more than two legal parents.

Considering what the impact would be of allowing some or all parental rights to flow to known (but not unknown) donors. This would require particular consideration of multi-parent families where (by virtue of the changes outlines above) there were already two legal parents. Would the donor have an equal set of parental rights and responsibilities?

**To make a written submission explaining what legal changes you support and why, please write or fax to:**

The Gay and Lesbian Rights Lobby of NSW Inc
PO Box 9, Darlinghurst, NSW, 1300
Fax: 9331 7963
or email nappies@glrl.org.au

All submissions will be treated as confidential.
If you would like to take part in a face-to-face consultation, please detach and return the following page to the GLRL:
By Fax: **02 9331 7963**
or email your details and availability to nappies@glrl.org.au

# Nappies consultation: expression of interest

Yes, I would like to come to a discussion and give my views on the recommendationsfor law reform in *Nappies*.

Please tick and fax to **02 9331 7963** or email **nappies@glrl.org.au:**

**I am**

- ☐ a lesbian mum
- ☐ a gay dad
- ☐ a lesbian co-mother
- ☐ a gay co-father
- ☐ planning to be any of the above

Or interested because _____

**Where**

I can/cannot travel to an inner city Sydney location.
If not, _____is a good location for me.

I would like to take part in a regional consultation if there is one in:

- ☐ Orange
- ☐ Wollongong
- ☐ Newcastle
- ☐ Lismore

**When**

I would prefer a consultation to be:

- ☐ On a weekday
- ☐ On a weekend
- ☐ In the daytime
- ☐ In the evening

Please contact me by phone, or email or post at: _____

_____

_____

**Contact name** _____

Gay & Lesbian
Rights Lobby

The Gay and Lesbian Rights Lobby of NSW Inc
PO Box 9, Darlinghurst, NSW, 1300

www.glrl.org.au