

Inquiry into past forced adoptive policies and practices circa 1939 –1983

Submission of Elizabeth Brew on behalf of Origins SPSA Inc

Environment and Public Affairs Committee



September 2023

Context for this submission

The following submission is a critique and rebuttal of institutional statements to the current Inquiry of the West Australian State Government into past adoptive practices, including by *Relationships Australia* and the *Australian Association of Social Workers (AASW)*. These organisations contributed significantly to the implementation of past forced adoption policies and practices, and each have historic religious affiliations. Service providers are meant to divulge religious affiliation according to their own principles of the *Forced Adoption Support Services (FASS)*, named in the AASW submission. To the contrary, these organisations defend forced adoption as a product of the societal views of the day. Significantly, this defence was rebutted by the *Community Affairs References Committee (CARC)*, detailed ahead, because it undermines the spirit of true apology as defined by the *Five Criteria of the Canadian Law Commission*. These criteria were recommended by the CARC and employed as guideposts by the *Forced Adoptions Apology Reference Group* – the Committee that penned the national apology. Transparency around past provision of ‘illegitimate’ babies to childless married couples is essential for avoiding conflicts of interest that may cause ‘the second injury to victims of violent crimes.’

In 2013, Origins SPSA Inc wrote a successful proposal to the federal government for a committee to oversee the implementation of funds to forced adoption victims by the Gillard Government, and the *Forced Adoptions Implementation Committee* was formed. This proposal underscored the importance of avoiding conflicts of interests associated with ‘the second injury to victims of violent crimes.’ The authors cited a paper that is considered to be ‘a significant contribution to the study of psychological trauma and its treatment; particularly countertransference aspects of that treatment,’ in which Symonds presents three related major concepts, including:

- (1) self-hate and shame are the key dynamics in post traumatic distress;
- (2) ordinary professional attitudes of those who are supposed to help often intensify the traumatized person's self-hate and shame. Martin Symonds called this is the second injury;
- (3) and to counteract the self-hate and the shame, the professional must adopt a much more active attitude and behavior-in contrast to the previous experience the traumatized individual has had with the world of helpers (including family and friends).ⁱ

Attached is an additional source concerning 'the second wound.'ⁱⁱ

The *Forced Adoptions Implementation Working Group Committee* recommended a trauma-based model of counselling, and ‘Forced Adoption National Practice Principles’ (FANPP) were formulated, incorporating recommendations suggested in the abovementioned proposal. According to the Australian Government, the FANPP were predominantly gleaned from service providers during consultations and capacity-building workshops, and from a practice roundtable that the *Department of Social Services* convened for funded *Forced Adoption Support Services* providers in March 2016.ⁱⁱⁱ In 2013, Director of Origins SPSA Inc, Ms Lily Arthur was invited by DSS to attend a workshop for social workers since employed to provide forced adoption counselling services. Ms Arthur provided information on the history and impacts of forced adoption as researched by Origins SPSA Inc. The meeting consisted of approximately 15-16 attendees. Ms Arthur inquired how many attendees had read the Senate Report, and only one social worker, [REDACTED], replied in the affirmative.

Argument of the defence

Legislation of the closed adoptions era sealed records in perpetuity, taking the post adoption sector by surprise when the former policy reversed. The veil of secrecy at this time allowed illegal actions to flourish unnoticed. The argument of the defence was evident in a paper by Kraus dated 1976, titled, 'Historical context of the adoption crisis in NSW,' which postulated that a purported greater acceptance by the community of unmarried mothers was inconsistent with the sudden, exponential decline in NSW adoptions from 1971 given the concurrent dramatic fall in births by the targeted cohort.^{iv} The argument of the defence or changing societal attitudes reemerged in 2010, reiterated in the WA apology for forced adoptions.^v The argument of the defence would not hold up in a court of law.

The defence on the grounds of social mores was criticised by the by the *Community Affairs References Committee (CARC)* in its final report into the *Role of the Commonwealth, if any, its practices and policies in contributing to forced adoptions* and during the latter's tabling in the Senate. The CARC recommended that future apologies should be worded with emphasis on institutional responsibility rather than be qualified by reference to values or professional practices of the times.^{vi} In tabling speeches, Senator Rachel Siewert stated, 'We have heard it said that what happened reflected the standards and the views of the time. We believe that is in fact not true.'^{vii} This statement was greeted by an outbreak of applause from the gallery. A previous submission by Origins SPSA Inc to this current Committee provides a number of examples of this primary argument by the defence.^{viii} Organisations involved in past forced adoptions continue to argue that forced adoptions were indicative of the societal views of the period, suggesting that they have either failed to read the Final Senate Report or rejected its recommendations.

Argument of the offence

It is the position of *Origins SPSA Inc Committee* that historic forced adoptions were not only unethical but discriminatory and unlawful. First and foremost, forced adoption consisted in criminal assault to unlawfully remove the baby, and thereby usurped the legally binding responsibilities of parents under pain of punishment to ensure the safety and wellbeing of their children, ie, technically kidnapping.

By removing the baby, the bond between the baby and those closest to the parents, such as the grandparents, had no opportunity to form and, even had grandparents wanted or preferred that the baby be adopted, authorities were not thereby justified in approaching unsuspecting mothers to take history case notes, and secretly prearrange adoptions prior to the birth and then take signatures from the maternal legal guardians under duress. Our organisation has seen the evidence of many cases where social workers took consent from mothers despite knowing that familial pressure was being applied to them, which was also contrary to the adoption Acts.

Terminology employed by AASW Submission authors

The authors of the AASW submission employ the terms 'parenting rights.' In Australia, there are no such things as 'parenting rights.' There are parental obligations, and penalties for

various offences against children, including imprisonment of persons who ill-treat or abuse them. Under the *Australian Capital Territory Crimes Act*, for example, “Parental responsibility,” for a child, means all the duties, powers, responsibilities and authority parents ordinarily have by law in relation to their children.’^{ix} ‘Forced adoption’ according to examples provided by the AASW was not the act of violating ‘parenting rights’ but usurping parental responsibilities. Parents irrespective of age could not abandon their responsibilities without criminal penalty during their lifetimes.^x In 1926, an article in the *Sydney Morning Herald* unequivocally forewarned unmarried mothers of the risk of criminal prosecution should they refuse to ‘...[take] advantage of the hostels which [offered] comfort and consideration.’^{xi}

Mothers subject to forced adoption practices have been described as ‘underaged;’^{xii} the targeted cohort were minors then under 21, prior to 1974.^{xiii} There is no such legal concept in Australia as an underage mother. Even the youngest of mothers were and continue to be, presumed competent. Up until 1963, in NSW, QLD, and VIC, 12-year-old females and 14-year-old males could marry with parental consent, and these marriages typically followed pregnancy.^{xiv} The newborn infants of these marriages were untouchable by adoption Acts. In addition, consent could not be dispensed on the grounds of age irrespective of marital status. Under the uniform Acts and ordinances, authorities could not remove a child for parental neglect until a year had elapsed since its birth. For example, Section 32 (d) of the NSW Adoption of Children Act stated that an adoption consent could be dispensed where the court was satisfied:

that person has, for a period of not less than one year, failed, without reasonable cause, to discharge, or to make suitable arrangements to discharge, the obligations of a parent or guardian, as the case may be, of the child.

Australian Association of Social Workers

The AASW defines historic forced adoption as ‘all closed adoptions where there was a failure to obtain fully informed and freely given consent from the mother (and in some cases the father) before the adoption proceeded.’^{xv} The AASW submission provides ‘examples of traumatising and illegal perinatal practices associated with forced adoption,’ as if they were isolated events rather than systemic practices associated with policy, including:

- administration of high levels of drugs;
- differential treatment of married and unmarried mothers;
- preventing contact between mother and baby;
- withholding or giving incorrect information about the baby; and
- bullying behaviour and failure of procedure by consent-takers.^{xvi}

The AASW submission states: These [forced] adoptions and the accompanying practices were a result of the commonly accepted views of the period.^{xvii} To the contrary, society was not responsible for the illegal perinatal practices committed in labour wards throughout the decades of forced adoptions. The AASW submission leans towards the defence of forced adoption in employing watered-down and misleading descriptors in the opening paragraphs of its executive summary, including, ‘pressure to adopt’ and lack of ‘support and information.’^{xviii} Lack of ‘support and information’ implies that the uninformed decision of the mother was the proximate cause of the material consent. To the contrary, the unlawful removal of her baby meant that the consent was taken under duress and, in addition, would

readily have been interpreted as fraud upon the court had the validity of the adoption been contested.^{xix} The unauthorized removal of the 'illegitimate' newborn was the proximate cause of the material parental consent, not the pursuing omissions of information consistent with such a premeditated act. Inversely, to offer support and information would have been entirely inconsistent with the premeditated, unauthorized removal of a baby. To the contrary, consider the unlikely scenario of a mother who in rightful possession of her beautiful newborn baby, surrenders for want of mere knowledge of available assistance. The removals were premeditated – the files of mothers were coded, earmarking their unborn babies for adoption. This argument from lack of knowledge by the mother clearly distorts the forced adoptions phenomena and waters down the crime. The emphasis on pressure to adopt is a moot point, given the main thrust behind forced adoption was the now incontrovertible, illegal removalist practices and policies by maternity homes and labour wards during the decades of forced adoptions. The consent extracted for such adoptions to proceed was taken as an ostensible permission to make arrangements for the adoption of a child – a child who was already removed. Such a consent was the ostensible relinquishment of parental responsibility (not parental rights) – parental responsibilities that had already been usurped. Therefore, the signatories' parental responsibility could not be signed away because it had already been seized. This is a clear case of fraud.

AASW – Relevant history

In addition, the AASW submission makes no mention of its own historic role in contributing to forced adoptions despite citing the first of the 'three overarching principles' of FASS services:

Services are transparent about their historical involvement in past practices relating to forced adoption and forced family separation. This includes disclosure protocols to be delivered by staff when first engaging with service users.^{xx}

The AASW also explains that as:

...a result of the commonly accepted views of the period, [these forced adoptions] featured a combination of inadequate financial support for families headed by a single woman, and the moral censure against women who were pregnant without a husband.^{xxi}

The AASW itself was entrusted with the discretionary oversight and distribution of social security by the Chifley Labour Government, founded under the auspices of the *Commonwealth Department of Social Services (CSS)* in 1946.^{xxii} High profile members of the *Australian Association of Social Workers* promoted and helped to establish the British-affiliated Marriage Guidance Councils in Australia, following WWII. Science lecturers at the University of Adelaide and University of Sydney, respectively [REDACTED] and [REDACTED], endorsed the British affiliated marriage guidance during conferences of the AASW. Marriage guidance became a branch of social work, requiring specialised training and 'the [personalised services of the] churches, voluntary societies and individuals [about whom was said had] a greater chance of success than any State institution would.'^{xxiii}

In 1947, an article in the *Adelaide News* titled 'Marriage guidance plan debated' reported that [REDACTED], lecturer in charge of social studies at Adelaide University, had learned of a national marriage guidance plan as a delegate to an AASW conference in Sydney she had recently attended. The AASW had announced that they were to recommend marriage guidance centres be established in every State. And social workers had decided that, 'as the preservation of successful marriages was of such importance to the community, the work needed financial support from the States.' Conference delegates had learned from the casework tutor at Melbourne University how the councils worked in London. Difficult cases of marriage breakdown would be referred to 'consultants-specialists such as doctors, lawyers, and psychiatrists.'^{xxiv}

The ten British principles adopted by the British affiliated, Australian state marriage guidance councils envisioned a society in which married parenthood would 'no longer labour under social and economic disabilities.'^{xxv} The ten British principles were actioned moral imperatives that underpinned measures to prevent marriages prone to divorce, including, deterring pregnant minors from marriage and promoting and facilitating the provision of illegitimate babies for adoption into the families of married childless couples – the founding mission of the first marriage guidance council in Britain.^{xxvi} The British marriage ideology framed the teenage bridal pregnancy trend as undesirable and harmful to the very foundations of society.

In 1952, the *Melbourne Marriage Guidance Council* published a booklet about its activities as an affiliate of the *British National Marriage Guidance Council*. The ten principles explicitly opposed exnuptial conception, birth and child raising outside of monogamous marriage:

- i. Safeguarding the family unit as basis of community life and welfare of the nation.
- ii. Permanent monogamous marriage is the right foundation alone providing satisfactory conditions for the birth and upbringing of children; for the expression and function of sex, and for a secure relationship between a man and a woman.
- iii. A disciplined and sustained effort if required to build marriage.
- iv. Instruction to the rising generations as to the right approach to marriage and choice of partner is a duty.
- v. Adequate premarital courses should be provided.
- vi. Sexual intercourse should not take place outside of marriage.
- vii. It is a public duty to prevent the broken home by expert treatment of marital disharmony.
- viii. Parenthood is normally the fulfilment of the racial ends and deepest satisfaction of marriage; therefore, everything should therefore be done to promote fertile unions.
- ix. Scientific contraception is only to assist spacing of children but not to enable selfish and irresponsible people to escape duties and disciplines of marriage and parenthood;
- x. To bring about a state of society in which the welfare of the family [thus defined] shall receive primary consideration, and where parenthood shall no longer labour under social and economic disabilities.^{xxvii}

In addition, the AASW actively promoted the censure of exnuptial conception in a 1954 report, titled, *Unwed Mothers and their Children*. The report opened: 'due to the increasing popularity of adoptions,' there was a new interest in the unwed mother as 'the major source of [newborn infants],'^{xxviii} and 'Social and moral disapproval of the unwed motherhood is inherent in our culture. Wed motherhood, on the other hand, is highly revered.'^{xxix} The related

study based on more than 336 interviews of unmarried mothers under institutional and community surveillance across nine months,^{xxx} arranged by the AASW 'Welfare of Mothers & Babies Study Group,' expressed overt moral condemnation intermingled with questions about how maternal age might impact on child welfare. The report described the high incidence of pregnancy among adolescent girls as 'formidable,' noting this cohort accounted for 42 per cent of births mostly of 'Australian' females aged 16 to 20 years.^{xxxi} The AASW publicly aligned itself with and received instruction and advice from, ██████████ ██████████ in conducting this surveillance of unwed mothers. When ██████████ returned to the US from Australia in 1955, she advised a conference on the briefing of hospital administrators, nurses and doctors concerning adoption procedures to be followed, providing insight into her influence on the Australian scene.^{xxxii} For example, ██████████ emphasised the importance of appraising nursing staff of plans to avoid contrary advice being offered to [unmarried mothers] who did not 'qualify' for a relationship with their child.^{xxxiii} Further detailed analysis is provided by Brew.^{xxxiv}

Contrary to the defence of forced adoption on the grounds of the alleged, prevalent societal views, the practise of bridal pregnancy by the cohort targeted for adoption (minors, then under 21)^{xxxv} was a longstanding custom, upheld by common law precedents and legally sanctioned by requisite parental consent to the marriage of the minor. From the mid 1950s, age-based stigmatisation was associated with political campaigns to increase adoptions by raising the age at first marriage.^{xxxvi} In 1959, the federal Attorney General, Garfield Barwick and directors of Sydney marriage guidance councils aired their views during a televised event that was noted in the second biannual Issue of 'News from the field' published in the AASW's *Australian Journal of Social Work* during the first half of 1959. The campaign was underpinned by an age-based discourse which sought to increase numbers of infants for adoption by first raising the marriage ages across the Commonwealth. However, the marriage councils were outspoken critics not only of marriages under the proposed new marriage ages but of any pregnant minor, then under 21, whether planning to marry or not.

Interventionists in fact berated parents sanctioning the bridal pregnancies of minors. This point obviously challenges the defence's argument that grassroots societal views supported adoption as an alternative to early marriage.^{xxxvii} In an article published in 1959, titled: 'Tragedy of Child Marriages: Social workers blame parents,' then director of the *NSW Marriage Guidance Council*, Reverend Coughlan warned that "duty marriages" [entered into because of ex-nuptial pregnancy] could completely ruin the lives of both [bride and groom].^{xxxviii} Director of the *Social Services Department of the Methodist Church*, Reverend W.J. Hobbin declared, "I am utterly opposed to these shotgun marriages, which the statistician's report shows are increasing ... Parents afraid of guilt and shame on the family name, are forcing their young daughters into these marriages."^{xxxix} Further, he questioned, "How are boys and girls of these tender years fitted for the tremendous responsibility of the married life, and how can they give a baby the care and understanding it needs?" Demand exceeded supply of adoptable infants in NSW by 1959, placing mothers under increasing pressure to surrender their infants.^{xl} Then Director of the *Family Welfare Bureau*, May Phillinger declared:

boys and girls are not able to consider marriage on a stable emotional basis until they reach the early twenties. They are not able to face up to the give and take that a successful marriage requires ... The percentage of divorces for people who marry

under 21 is enormous. I believe it is far better for a girl to have her baby in a home and let her own family or someone else adopt it afterwards.^{xli}

The above italicised organisations were among the first to be approved for funding by the Department of the Attorney General under Garfield Barwick's watch. The federal Matrimonial Causes Act 1959, gazetted the marriage guidance councils as follows, from December 1st 1960 – 8th April 1965:

- Marriage Guidance Council of New South Wales
- Marriage Guidance Council of Victoria
- Queensland Marriage Guidance Council
- Marriage Guidance Council of South Australia Inc
- Marriage Guidance Council of Western Australia Inc
- Tasmanian Marriage Guidance Council
- St. Andrew's Cathedral Marriage Guidance Centre (Sydney)
- Church of England Marriage Guidance and Education Council (Melbourne)
- Catholic Welfare Bureau (Marriage Guidance Section) (Sydney)
- Catholic Family Welfare Bureau (Marriage Guidance Centre (Melbourne).
- Catholic Marriage Advisory Council (Brisbane)
- Catholic Welfare Organization (Canberra)
- Father and Son Welfare Movement of Australia (Marriage Counselling Service) (Sydney)^{xlii}

During the 1960s, between 70.5% and 76.8% per cent of brides aged 15 – 19 were pregnant on their wedding day. Age specific annual percentages of 20 – 24-year old brides who gave birth within nine months of marriage were approximately half of the latter.^{xliii} Annual percentages of mothers of ex-nuptial infants who kept their babies were also significant, moreover.^{xliii} The practise of bridal pregnancy would have continued in an upwards trend had the federal government not intervened in favour of forced adoptions.^{xliii}

The argument of the defence maintains not only that adoptions were numerous because they were supported by the social mores of the day but that societal views suddenly changed with the decline in adoptions from their numerical peak in 1972. Significantly, teenage bridal pregnancy emerged as an issue of ongoing concern, underscoring the role of abortion and contraception as means to solve this 'problem.' In 1975, the first consultant to the Commonwealth Department of Health, Dr Stephanie Siedlecky outlined the ideas behind Government plans for three Action Centres, modelled on US and British teen sexual health clinics, to 'target the adolescent.'^{xliii} Siedlecky told conference attendees that the 'costs of welfare payments to unmarried mothers must be considered.'^{xliii} She said that the first 400 of 1000 abortions performed on teenagers at Preterm Foundation in Sydney would be offset by decreased 'welfare payments to unmarried mothers.'^{xliii} In 1983, Siedlecky supported the *World Health Organisation's* advice that welfare provision could incentivize adolescent births that 'might otherwise have been terminated.'^{xliii} Unsurprisingly, welfare payments to teenagers declined from 1973-75.ⁱ In addition, payments over the period from 1974-78 increased by a mere 0.4% – the smallest of all age cohorts.ⁱⁱ Teenage financial and pregnancy support was also significantly hampered by difficulties in accessing the system in addition to a lack of funding.ⁱⁱⁱ This evidence refutes the assertion that adoptions declined from the early 1970s due to the introduction of the Whitlam Sole Mothers Benefit.

In fact, the effects of teen pregnancy, birth, and parenting stigma may not be a past phenomenon but could be witnessed in contemporary times with a dip in teenage births from 55.5 per 1000 in 1971 to an historic low of 11.9 in 2015.^{liii} On 29th June 2023, the *Australian Institute of Health and Welfare* reported that ‘The number of teenage mothers giving birth has more than halved since 2011 (11,016).’^{liv}

Relationships Australia

Relationships Australia is a federation of community-based, not-for-profit organisations that claims to have no religious affiliations.^{lv} The submission of *Relationships Australia*, Western Australian branch, argues that religious organizations as unsuitable providers of forced adoption counselling services because of ‘perceived past involvement in historical forced adoption practices,’ in contrast with itself: ‘RAWA is a community-based, not-for-profit organisation with no religious affiliations.’^{lvi} The former federation of Marriage Guidance Councils, the *Australian National Marriage Guidance Council*, voted to rename to *Relationships Australia* (RA) in 1993 and is presently funded by the Australian Government to provide forced adoption counselling services across Australia.^{lvii}

Recommendations

That the Committee reiterate the recommendation of the CARC that institutions should not qualify apologies and professional empathy by reference to the social mores or views of the day but rather place emphasis on institutional responsibility – including of their own institutions.

The first of the overarching principles of FASS services requires that ‘Services are transparent about their historical involvement in past practices relating to forced adoption and forced family separation. This includes disclosure protocols to be delivered by staff when first engaging with service users.’^{lviii} In the interests of the mental health of victims, *Relationships Australia* and the *Australian Association of Social Workers* should therefore divulge or acknowledge that they are unaware of their respective histories detailing historic forced adoptions.

That the Committee should consult with forensic psychologists to overview the language and audit the application of current FASS guidelines in service provision to forced adoptions clients. Where conflicts of interest are at play, ‘countertransference’ may inflict the second injury to the victims of violent crimes.

Origins has much experience with such accounts by victims and offers itself for a hearing to the current Inquiry.

ENDNOTES

- ⁱ Martin Symonds 1980, 'The "second injury" to victims of violent acts,' *American Journal of Psychoanalysis*, vol. 70, no. 1, p. 34.
- ⁱⁱ The Second Wound, 'What is the second wound,' <https://secondwound.com/> (accessed 25 September 2023).
- ⁱⁱⁱ Australian Government, 'Forced adoption national practise principles,' <https://aifs.gov.au/research/research-reports/forced-adoption-national-practice-principles> (accessed 25 September 2023).
- ^{iv} John Kraus, 'Historical context of the adoption "crisis" in New South Wales,' *Australian Social Work*, vol. 29, no. 4, (1976): 19.
- ^v WA Today, 'Tears and cheers as WA apologises to unwed mothers,' <https://www.watoday.com.au/national/western-australia/tears-and-cheers-as-wa-apologises-to-unwed-mums-20101019-16sf8.html> (accessed 25 September 2023).
- ^{vi} 'Commonwealth contribution to former forced adoption policies and practices,' Parliament of Australia, February 2012, 9.
- ^{vii} YouTube, 'Senator Siewert tables an inquiry report into forced adoptions,' 5 March 2012, <https://youtu.be/U0cqJffQiqs?t=7m42s>, (13 August 2017).
- ^{viii} Committee on Environment and Public Affairs, 'Inquiry into past forced adoptive policies and practices circa 1939 – 1983,' Submission, "*White" stolen generation?: A proposed nomenclature of historic illegal forced adoptions*, 6.
- ^{ix} Australian Capital Territory Current Acts, 'Crimes Act 1900 – Sect 39,' http://www5.austlii.edu.au/au/legis/act/consol_act/ca190082/s39.html (accessed 24 September 2023).
- ^x SM Cretney, Principles of Family Law, 5th edition, Sweet & Maxwell, 1990, 657., In 'Commonwealth contribution to former forced adoption policies and practices,' Parliament of Australia, February 2012, 10.
- ^{xi} 'Child Welfare: Adoption system – 900 children placed,' *Sydney Morning Herald*, 8 November 1926, 10.
- ^{xii} Amelia Oberhardt, Secrets we keep, Listnr podcast, Season 5, 'In the child's best interest,' <https://play.listnr.com/podcast/secrets-we-keep> (accessed 22 September 2023).
- ^{xiii} Former almoner at Crown Street Women's Hospital, Elspeth Brown wrote in 1977 that 'The bulk of babies for adoption are the children of younger age cohorts, while adopting parents come from older cohorts. In other words, the fifteen to nineteen-year-olds of 1971-72, who provided more than 3,000 babies for adoption during that period, were born between 1952 and 1957-boom years for babies in Australia... while the adopting parents of 1971-72 were very likely born prior to our baby boom years.' In Elspeth Browne, 'Adoption and abortion: a comment,' *Australian Social Work*, (1977): p. 38.; Chief social worker at Crown Street Women's Hospital (1964-76), Roberts wrote in 1969 that 'unmarried motherhood' is very much a problem of 'youth,' finding that sixty per cent had been under the age of 21 in 1967, In Pamela Roberts, "Social issues of today: The unmarried mother who keeps her child," In Proceedings of Eleventh National Conference Proceedings: "Social Issues of Today" Hobart: Australian Association of Social Workers, 1969: 49; In addition, former social workers, Marshall and McDonald much later concluded: 'Women who gave up their babies for adoption were mostly young and unmarried,' with the 15-19-year-old cohort predominating across the entire post WWII peak.' In Marshall and McDonald, *The Many-Sided Triangle*, (Melbourne: Melbourne University Press, 2001): 48; Najam et. al.'s longitudinal study found that 'Relinquishing mothers were predominantly 18 years or younger.' In J. Najman, J. Morrison, J.D. Keeping, M.J. Andersen, & G. Williams, 'Social factors associated with the decision to relinquish a baby for adoption,' *Community Health Studies*, vol. XIV (1990): p. 180; A simple statistical analysis by Kraus also suggests that the 15 – 19-year-olds were the cohort most affected by adoption. In John Kraus, "Historical context of the adoption 'crisis' in New South Wales," *Australian Social Work*, 29 (1976): p. 19-25.; Matron Taylor of St. Mary's Church of England Home at Toowong reportedly stated that unmarried mothers were usually 17 to 19, that nearly all of their babies were adopted, and that there was a waiting list of people who could not be supplied. In 'Nation has duty to Unmarried Mothers,' *Courier Mail*, 11th December 1944, 3.; In 1975, former senior social worker at *Crown Street Women's Hospital* in Sydney, which arranged the majority of the State's adoptions stated that the modal age of mothers was 'still the same': 15-20 years (see primary source document: Minutes of a meeting held in Annandale in 1975, Table 2).
- ^{xiv} McDonald, "Age at first marriage," 295.
- ^{xv} Ibid.
- ^{xvi} In Higgins, 2010; Kenny et al., 2012, In Australian Association of Social Workers (AASW), submission to the Committee on Environment and Public Affairs: 'Inquiry into past forced adoptive policies and practices circa 1939 – 1983,' p. 3.

-
- ^{xvii} Australian Association of Social Workers (AASW), submission to the Committee on Environment and Public Affairs: 'Inquiry into past forced adoptive policies and practices circa 1939 – 1983,' p. 6
- ^{xviii} *Ibid.*
- ^{xix} Health Commission of New South Wales, *Policy paper on adoption*, 1982.
- ^{xx} Australian Association of Social Workers (AASW), submission to the Committee on Environment and Public Affairs: 'Inquiry into past forced adoptive policies and practices circa 1939 – 1983,' p. 8.
- ^{xxi} *Ibid.* p.6.
- ^{xxii} 'Women's news: Association formed by Australian Social Workers,' *Sydney Morning Herald*, 12 September 1946, 7.
- ^{xxiii} Rupert Cross, 'Final Report of the Committee on Procedure in Matrimonial Causes (The Denning Committee),' *Modern Law Review*, vol. 10, no. 2 (Apr., 1947): 185.
- ^{xxiv} 'Marriage guidance plan debated,' *Adelaide News* (29 September 1947), 7.
- ^{xxv} The Melbourne Marriage Guidance Council Armadale, Victoria: The Council, 1951, (accessed 3 July 2023): <<http://nla.gov.au/nla.obj-52836655>>, In Elizabeth Brew, unpublished submission to the Committee on Environment and Public Affairs: 'Inquiry into past forced adoptive policies and practices circa 1939 – 1983,' *To have and not to hold: The commonwealth marriage of minors intervention (1959)*, p. 57.
- ^{xxvi} 'Doctor answers eight vital questions on marriage,' *World's News*, 19 February 1944, 2.
- ^{xxvii} The Melbourne Marriage Guidance Council Armadale, Victoria: The Council, 1951, (accessed 3 July 2023): <<http://nla.gov.au/nla.obj-52836655>>
- ^{xxviii} Welfare of Mothers & Babies Study Group, 'Unwed Mothers,' Australian Association of Social Workers AASW), 1.
- ^{xxix} *Ibid.*
- ^{xxx} Welfare of Mothers & Babies Study Group, 'Unwed Mothers,' Australian Association of Social Workers AASW), 1.; 'Surrender her baby,' *Australian Women's Weekly*, 8 September 1954, 26.
- ^{xxxi} Welfare of Mothers & Babies Study Group, 'Unwed Mothers,' Australian Association of Social Workers AASW), 4, 12, 26.
- ^{xxxii} *Ibid.* 27.
- ^{xxxiii} *Ibid.* 28.
- ^{xxxiv} Elizabeth Brew, unpublished submission to the Committee on Environment and Public Affairs: 'Inquiry into past forced adoptive policies and practices circa 1939 – 1983,' *To have and not to hold: The commonwealth marriage of minors intervention (1959)*.
- ^{xxxv} Former almoner at Crown Street Women's Hospital, Elspeth Brown wrote in 1977 that 'The bulk of babies for adoption are the children of younger age cohorts, while adopting parents come from older cohorts. In other words, the fifteen to nineteen-year-olds of 1971-72, who provided more than 3,000 babies for adoption during that period, were born between 1952 and 1957-boom years for babies in Australia... while the adopting parents of 1971-72 were very likely born prior to our baby boom years.' In Elspeth Browne, 'Adoption and abortion: a comment,' *Australian Social Work*, (1977): p. 38.; Chief social worker at Crown Street Women's Hospital (1964-76), Roberts wrote in 1969 that 'unmarried motherhood' is very much a problem of 'youth,' finding that sixty per cent had been under the age of 21 in 1967, In Pamela Roberts, "Social issues of today: The unmarried mother who keeps her child," In Proceedings of Eleventh National Conference Proceedings: "Social Issues of Today" Hobart: Australian Association of Social Workers, 1969: 49; In addition, former social workers, Marshall and McDonald much later concluded: 'Women who gave up their babies for adoption were mostly young and unmarried,' with the 15-19-year-old cohort predominating across the entire post WWII peak.' In Marshall and McDonald, *The Many-Sided Triangle*, (Melbourne: Melbourne University Press, 2001): 48; Najam et. al.'s longitudinal study found that 'Relinquishing mothers were predominantly 18 years or younger.' In J. Najman, J. Morrison, J.D. Keeping, M.J. Andersen, & G. Williams, 'Social factors associated with the decision to relinquish a baby for adoption,' *Community Health Studies*, vol. XIV (1990): p. 180; A simple statistical analysis by Kraus also suggests that the 15 – 19-year-olds were the cohort most affected by adoption. In John Kraus, "Historical context of the adoption 'crisis' in New South Wales," *Australian Social Work*, 29 (1976): p. 19-25.; Matron Taylor of St. Mary's Church of England Home at Toowong reportedly stated that unmarried mothers were usually 17 to 19, that nearly all of their babies were adopted, and that there was a waiting list of people who could not be supplied. In 'Nation has duty to Unmarried Mothers,' *Courier Mail*, 11th December 1944, 3.; In 1975, former senior social worker at *Crown Street Women's Hospital* in Sydney, which arranged the majority of the State's adoptions stated that the modal age of mothers was 'still the same': 15-20 years (see primary source document: Minutes of a meeting held in Annandale in 1975, Table 2).

-
- ^{xxxvi} Elizabeth Brew, unpublished submission to the Committee on Environment and Public Affairs: 'Inquiry into past forced adoptive policies and practices circa 1939 – 1983,' *To have and not to hold: The commonwealth marriage of minors intervention (1959)*.
- ^{xxxvii} Ibid.
- ^{xxxviii} 'Nation-wide legal bar to child marriage urged,' *The Canberra Times*, 8 June 1959, 7; 'Do these confessions express teenage morals,' *Smith's Weekly*, 24 September 1949, 1.
- ^{xxxix} 'Tragedy of Child Marriages: Social workers blame parents,' *Sydney Morning Herald*, 5 March 1959, 25.
- ^{xl} Ibid.
- ^{xli} Ibid.
- ^{xlii} *Commonwealth of Australia Gazettes*: 15 December 1960, (no. 84) 436; 27 April 1961 (No.34), 1574; 1 August 1961 (No.69), 3214; 8 March 1962 (No.14), 806; 8 April 1965 (no.30), 1368.
- ^{xliiii} K.G. Basavarajappa, 'Pre-marital pregnancies and ex-nuptial births in Australia: 1911-66,' *Australian and New Zealand Journal of Sociology*, vol. 4 (1968): p. 144-145.
- ^{xliiv} Commonwealth contribution to former forced adoption policies and practices,' Parliament of Australia, February 2012, 9.
- ^{xliiv} Elizabeth Brew, unpublished submission to the Committee on Environment and Public Affairs: 'Inquiry into past forced adoptive policies and practices circa 1939 – 1983,' *To have and not to hold: The commonwealth marriage of minors intervention (1959)*.
- ^{xlivi} Stephania Siedlecky, "Action Centres – The dilemma of adolescent sexuality," In *Proceedings of a conference on all aspects of women's health*, University of Queensland, vol. 3, 1975, 272.
- ^{xliiii} Stephania Siedlecky, "Action Centres – The dilemma of adolescent sexuality," In *Proceedings of a conference on all aspects of women's health*, University of Queensland, vol. 3, 1975, 274.
- ^{xliiii} Stephania Siedlecky, "Action Centres – The dilemma of adolescent sexuality," In *Proceedings of a conference on all aspects of women's health*, University of Queensland, vol. 3, 1975, 273.
- ^{xlix} 'Trends in Teenage Pregnancy in Australia: 1971-1981.' *The Australian and New Zealand Journal of Obstetrics and Gynaecology*, vol. 23 (1983):133.
- ^l Brotherhood of Saint Lawrence, *Labour force or labour ward: Is this a choice young women are making?*, (1981), viii-ix, M. Montague, 21.
- ^{li} Brotherhood of Saint Lawrence, *Labour force or labour ward: Is this a choice young women are making?*, (1981), viii-ix, M. Montague, 21.
- ^{lii} M. Allen, "Problems of the single pregnant girl." In *Proceedings of a conference on all aspects of women's health*. University of Queensland. 1975. 62.; P. Judge, 'Rape and abortion,' In *Proceedings of a conference on all aspects of women's health*, University of Queensland, vol. 3, 1975, 144.
- ^{liii} Australian Human Rights Commission 2017, *The rights and needs of young parents and their children: A summary of key findings from the Children's Rights Report*, 2017: 93.
- ^{liiv} Australian Government, Australian Institute of Health and Welfare, Australia's mothers and babies, <https://www.aihw.gov.au/reports/mothers-babies/australias-mothers-babies/contents/focus-population-groups/teenage-mothers> (accessed 18th August 2023).
- ^{liv} Relationships Australia, submission, 'Budget 2021-2022 – public consultation – pre-Budget submissions,' (accessed 3 July 2023): <<https://mail.google.com/mail/u/0/#inbox?projector=1>>.
- ^{lvi} Relationships Australia Western Australia (RAWA), submission to the Committee on Environment and Public Affairs: 'Inquiry into past forced adoptive policies and practices circa 1939 – 1983,' pp. 1,3.
- ^{lvii} Relationships Australia, 'Our history,' 2023, <https://relationships.org.au/about/our-history/> (accessed 22 April 2023).
- ^{lviii} Australian Association of Social Workers (ASSW), submission to the Committee on Environment and Public Affairs: 'Inquiry into past forced adoptive policies and practices circa 1939 – 1983,' p.8.