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Summary

As the law stands, where a child is born as the result of a surrogacy arrangement, a couple can apply for a parental order for that child within a period of six months after its birth, providing that the gametes of at least one of them were used to bring about the creation of the embryo. A single person whose gametes were used to create an embryo carried by a surrogate cannot do so. At the heart of this issue is the right to family life and the right of children and their biological parent to have their parental relationship legally recognised following a surrogacy arrangement, whether that parent is in a relationship with another person or not.

In Re Z (A Child) (No. 2)¹ the court found this distinction between single parents and couples was incompatible with the right to private and family life and to non-discrimination under the European Convention on Human Rights 1950 (“Convention”).

On 29 November 2017 a proposal for a draft Human Fertilisation and Embryology Act 2008 (Remedial) Order 2018 was laid before both Houses.² The Joint Committee produced its Report on this proposal, “Proposal for a Draft Human Fertilisation and Embryology Act 2008 (Remedial) Order 2018” on 2 March 2018.³

The Government then laid a revised draft Human Fertilisation and Embryology Act 2008 (Remedial) Order 2018, together with the Government’s Response.⁴ The Committee is now considering this revised draft remedial Order, which seeks to remedy the incompatibility of section 54 of the Human Fertilisation and Embryology Act 2008 (“HFEA”) and also seeks to make the necessary consequential amendments that follow from those changes.

In Chapter 3 of our first Report we raised concerns that the proposed draft remedial Order still discriminated against some people based on family relationship status, in particular due to the requirement to prove that one is not in a relationship (such as an enduring family relationship) and the requirement to prove that a separation was permanent in order to be eligible for a parental order. We are pleased that the revised draft order now enables sole applications from biological parents regardless of relationship status.

We are content that the Government has revised its draft Order and has adequately taken into consideration the drafting points made in Chapter 4 of our first Report. The Government has also helpfully provided explanations and information in their response which respond to the other points made in our first Report.

The Committee considers that the procedural requirements of the Human Rights Act 1998 (“HRA”) for the use of the remedial power have been met in this case and considers that the draft Order remedies the incompatibility identified by the Courts.

¹ Z (A Child) (No. 2) [2016] EWHC 1191 (Fam)
² HC Deb, 29 November 2017, col 282WS and HL Deb, 29 November 2017, col 282WS
The Committee concludes, after taking into account representations made, that the special attention of each House is not required to be drawn to the draft order on any of the relevant grounds, or on any other grounds, and recommends that the draft order should be approved.
Recommendation

Introduction

1. This remedial order concerns the rights of children and their biological parent to have their parental relationship legally recognised following a surrogacy arrangement, whether that parent is in a relationship with another person or not.

2. At present, there are children who live with their biological parent, but where the parental relationship cannot be legally recognised due to the fact that the Human Fertilisation and Embryology Act 2008 (“HFEA”) requires any application for a parental order after a surrogacy arrangement to be made by two people who are married, civil partners or in an “enduring family relationship”. Where a single person wishes to apply for a parental order the child will be in legal limbo. Even though the child may be living in a healthy and happy environment with that parent, the lack of legal recognition can lead to a significant amount of uncertainty for these families.

3. In Re Z (A Child) (No. 2),5 the UK Courts found section 54 of the HFEA to be discriminatory, contrary to Article 14 (prohibition on discrimination) taken in conjunction with Article 8 (right to private and family life) of the European Convention on Human Rights (“Convention”), given that the parent’s relationship status can preclude whether or not a child will be legally recognised as the child of their biological parent.

4. The Human Rights Act 1998 provides that where a court has found legislation to be incompatible with a convention right, Ministers may correct that incompatibility through a “remedial order”, and may use such an order to amend primary legislation.6 There are special provisions to ensure that this power is not misused.7

5. The Government proposed a draft Human Fertilisation and Embryology Act 2008 (Remedial) Order 2018 to remedy the incompatibility of section 54 of the HFEA with the rights under the Convention, and to remove the discrimination found by the Court in Re Z (A Child) (No. 2). This draft Order, together with the required information, was laid before both Houses on 29 November 2017. As is required, the Joint Committee produced its Report on this proposed Order “Proposal for a Draft Human Fertilisation and Embryology Act 2008 (Remedial) Order 2018” on 2 March 2018.8

---

5 Z (A Child) (No. 2) [2016] EWHC 1191 (Fam)
6 See Human Rights Act 1988, section 10 & schedule 2
7 In the non-urgent procedure, a proposal for a draft has to be laid before Parliament for 60 days, during which representations may be made. If the Government decides to proceed, it will then lay a draft Order, accompanied by a statement responding to the representations and explaining what changes, if any, have been made to the draft in consequence. In order to be made, the draft Order must be approved by each House of Parliament, a further 60 days after laying. There is also an urgent procedure, in which the Minister may lay a made-order, but there is a period of 120 days (again, divided in two 60 day periods) during which representations may be made and responded to. In both cases, each House of Parliament must then approve the Order if it is the have effect (or continuing effect in the case of the urgent procedure).
6. A revised draft Human Fertilisation and Embryology Act 2008 (Remedial) Order 2018 was subsequently laid before Parliament on 18 July 2018. This was accompanied by the Government’s Response9 to the Committee’s earlier Report.

7. The Committee’s Standing Orders require us to report to each House—

- Whether the special attention of each House should be drawn to the draft order on any of the grounds on which the Joint Committee on Statutory Instruments may so report in relation to most other statutory instruments; and

- Our recommendation whether the draft order should be approved.10

8. We issued a call for evidence on the Government’s proposal on 19 July 2018 and received seven written submissions, all of which supported this Order being approved without delay. We are grateful to all those who responded to our call for evidence or drew our attention to other relevant information. A list of those who contributed is included at the back of this Report and all written submissions we received can be found on our website.11

**The Government’s response to our first Report on the proposal for a draft Order**

9. In our first Report we considered that the procedural requirements of the HRA had been met—the Government’s reasons for proceeding by way of remedial order were sufficiently compelling reasons and using the non-urgent procedure struck a reasonable balance. However, we recommended that the Government clarify its reasons for proceeding by way of non-urgent procedure as this information was missing from the earlier required information. We are now pleased to see that this has been addressed in the Government’s Response to the Committee’s report.12

10. In Chapter 3 of our first Report we raised concerns that the proposed draft remedial Order still discriminated against some people based on family relationship status, in particular due to the requirement to prove that one is not in a relationship (such as an enduring family relationship) and the requirement to prove that a separation was permanent in order to be eligible for a parental order. We are pleased that the revised draft order now enables sole applications from biological parents regardless of relationship status.

11. We are content that the Government has revised its draft Order and has adequately taken into consideration the drafting points made in Chapter 4 of our first Report. The Government has also helpfully provided explanations and information in their response which respond to the other points made in our first Report.

---


10 House of Commons, Standing Orders, Public Business 2017, HC 4, 152(8), and The Standing Orders of The House of Lords relating to Public Business 2016, HL Paper 3, 72(c)

11 Joint Committee on Human Rights, Publications

12. Finally, we note that the Department has tidied up some of the drafting in the Schedules since it laid the proposal for a draft Order. Whilst much of this is an improvement, we had a further concern that the new drafting in paragraph 7(20) of Schedule 2 to the draft Order could be defective now that the wording has been changed in between the proposal for a draft Order and the draft order being laid. The wording of new Regulation 20A which this sub-paragraph inserts appears to contain a drafting error by the omission of the word ‘substitute’ which gives rise to a lack of clarity as to the modification being made. However, the Department informed us that they do not think that the court could interpret this as anything other than “substitute”.

**Does the draft Order remedy the incompatibility?**

13. The Committee welcomes the Government’s acceptance of our recommendations in our first Report and the amendments it has made to the draft Order to give effect to those recommendations.

14. We consider that the procedural requirements of the Human Rights Act 1998 for the use of the remedial power have been met in this case and consider that the draft Order remedies the incompatibility identified by the Courts.

15. The Committee concludes, after taking into account representations made, that the special attention of each House is not required to be drawn to the draft order on any of the relevant grounds, or on any other grounds.

16. We consider that there are no reasons why this Order should not be agreed to by both Houses of Parliament. We therefore recommend that the draft order should be approved.
Conclusions and recommendations

1. The Committee welcomes the Government’s acceptance of our recommendations in our first Report and the amendments it has made to the draft Order to give effect to those recommendations. (Paragraph 13)

2. We consider that the procedural requirements of the Human Rights Act 1998 for the use of the remedial power have been met in this case and consider that the draft Order remedies the incompatibility identified by the Courts. (Paragraph 14)

3. The Committee concludes, after taking into account representations made, that the special attention of each House is not required to be drawn to the draft order on any of the relevant grounds, or on any other grounds. (Paragraph 15)

4. We consider that there are no reasons why this Order should not be agreed to by both Houses of Parliament. We therefore recommend that the draft order should be approved. (Paragraph 16)
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Formal minutes

Wednesday 14 November 2018

Members present:

Rt Hon Harriet Harman MP, in the Chair
Fiona Bruce MP  Baroness Lawrence of Clarendon
Ms Karen Buck MP  Baroness Nicholson of Winterbourne
Jeremy Lefroy MP  Lord Trimble
Lord Woolf

Draft Report (Draft Human Fertilisation and Embryology Act 2008 (Remedial) Order 2018 – Second Report), proposed by the Chair, brought up and read.

Ordered, That the Chair’s draft Report be read a second time, paragraph by paragraph.

Paragraphs 1 to 16 be read and agreed to.

Summary agreed to.

Resolved, That the Report be the Fourteenth Report of the Committee.

Ordered, That the Chair make the Report to the House of Commons and that the Report be made to the House of Lords.

[Adjourned till 21 November 2018 at 3.00pm]
Published written evidence

The following written evidence was received and can be viewed on the inquiry publications page of the Committee’s website.

DHE numbers are generated by the evidence processing system and so may not be complete.

1. Anonymous 1 (DHE0002)
2. Anonymous 2 (DHE0003)
3. British Association of Social Workers PROGAR group (DHE0001)
4. Jason Brown (DHE0004)
5. Mr David Watkins (DHE0007)
6. Surrogacy UK (DHE0005)
7. Surrogacy UK Working Group on Surrogacy Law Reform (DHE0006)
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