

Submission

on the

Marriage Equality Amendment Bill 2009

to the

Senate Legal and Constitutional Affairs Committee

Department of the Senate

PO Box 6100

Parliament House

Canberra ACT 2600

Telephone: 02 6277 3560

Facsimile: 02 6277 5794

Email: legcon.sen@aph.gov.au

Website: www.aph.gov.au/senate/committee/legcon_ctte

by

FamilyVoice Australia

4th Floor, 68 Grenfell St, Adelaide SA 5000

Telephone: 1300 365 965

Facsimile: 08 8223 5850

Email: office@fava.org.au

Website: www.fava.org.au

30 July 2009

TABLE OF CONTENTS

1. Introduction.....	1
2. Ending discrimination or ending marriage?	1
2.1 Some activists admit same-sex marriage would destroy marriage.....	2
3. Marriage provides the best environment for raising children.....	3
3.1 The child’s need for a mother.....	4
3.2 The child’s need for a father.....	4
3.3 Same-sex couples as parents?	5
3.4 Legalising same-sex marriage may increase cohabitation	7
4. Marriage is the institution which benefits both men and women	7
5. Same-sex relationships are <i>not</i> equal to marriage	8
5.1 For life?	8
5.2 For children?.....	8
5.3 To the exclusion of all others?	9
6. Conclusion and recommendation	9
7. Endnotes.....	9

1. Introduction

On 25 June 2009 the Senate referred the Marriage Equality Amendment Bill 2009 to the Senate Legal and Constitutional Affairs Committee for inquiry and report.

The Committee has called for submissions which are due by 28 August 2009. The Committee is due to report by 26 November 2009.

2. Ending discrimination or ending marriage?

The Bill purports to be aimed at ending discrimination on the basis of sex, sexuality or gender identity by changing the law to allow any two persons to marry rather than preserving the limitation of marriage to 'a man and a woman'.

Marriage, as defined in the Marriage Act 1961 at section 5 means "the union of a man and a woman to the exclusion of all others, voluntarily entered into for life".

This definition was inserted into the Marriage Act 1961 by the Marriage Amendment Act 2004.

The definition reflects the longstanding common law definition of marriage.¹

Its incorporation into the interpretation section of the Marriage Act 1961 was a pre-emptive move to prevent any Australian court from following the revolutionary decisions by some overseas courts (Ontario², Massachusetts³) that redefined marriage as the union of two persons.

Proponents of same-sex marriage claim that this change to the definition of marriage merely removes a built-in discrimination in the traditional definition and advances equality by allowing any two persons to marry each other regardless of sex, sexuality or gender identity.

However, it must be considered whether or not such a fundamental change to a definition would leave marriage as the same thing it has always been. The traditional definition includes several components:

- a union
- of a man and a woman
- to the exclusion of all others
- voluntarily entered into
- for life.

Altering any of these components would radically alter the definition so that it could no longer be said that the changed definition was of the same thing.

For example, removing the reference to the *voluntary* nature of marriage might accommodate those cultures in which marriage is a contract arranged by others into which a man and a woman are obliged or even coerced to enter regardless of their own will on the matter. However, including coercive unions within the definition of marriage would alter the nature of marriage substantially.

Similarly, removing the requirement for *exclusivity* to accommodate polygamy would alter the nature of marriage.

Likewise diluting the element of *union* in the definition to, say, *relationship*, would change the substantial nature of marriage.

Even in the face of an easy divorce regime imposed on marriage by the Family Law Act 1975, the Marriage Act 1961 preserves the traditional notion that marriage is *intended for life*. Changing this element of the definition would change the substantial nature of marriage to make it unrecognisable.

These illustrations help to clarify that what is being proposed by the Bill is not a mere fine-tuning of the definition of marriage but a full-on assault on one of its key elements, namely that it involved the union of *a man and a woman*.

To change the definition of marriage to encompass a union between any two persons would be to effectively abolish marriage in Australian law by replacing it with something quite different and alien.

Marriage has traditionally been given a highly respected and protected status in law precisely because it regulates the sexual relationship between men and women – the only sexual relationship that can result in the conception and birth of children.

Removing the requirement for marriage to involve a union of *a man and a woman* would detach marriage from this fundamental connection with the conception and birth of children. Same-sex unions cannot result in the conception and birth of a child by any bodily act the two people engage in together. Changing the definition of marriage to encompass same-sex relationships would reduce the content of marriage to a purely sexual or affective relationship lacking the critical nexus with childbearing.

2.1 Some activists admit same-sex marriage would destroy marriage

The late feminist essayist Ellen Willis wrote:

“Conferring the legitimacy of marriage on homosexual relations will introduce an implicit revolt against the institution into its very heart, further promoting the democratization and secularization of personal and sexual life. For starters, if homosexual marriage is OK, why not group marriage... Legalizing same-sex marriage would be an improvement over the status quo. But let's see it for what it is - a step toward the more radical solution of civil unions, not vice versa.”⁴

By “civil unions” being a more radical step Willis meant that “marriage” understood as a lifetime exclusive union would no longer be a socially supported institution with legal status.

Reviewing Andrew Sullivan’s book “*Same-sex marriage: pro and con*” homosexual activist Daniel Harris writes:

“Like the prom, gay marriage seems to us a simple matter of a basic civil right but not something we can get terribly excited about, having watched too many relationships founder on the rocks, with once dotting spouses brawling in the divorce courts, haggling over every stick of furniture, pot holder, and place mat, taking each other to the cleaners and sparring cynically over the fate of the children.

“For us, gay marriage is like a lunch counter where homosexuals aren't allowed to dine and where we therefore fully intend to stage a lengthy sit-in, to park ourselves down right beneath the noses of the exasperated waitresses until they pull their pencils from behind their ears and take our orders. And yet please don't mistake our eagerness to sit at this counter as a sign that

we like the food. Please don't insist that we see this fast-food joint as a four-star restaurant that merits our unqualified respect.

"Conservative gay commentator Andrew Sullivan asks us to treat this endangered institution much more reverently than many of us really care to.

"One of the reasons that many gay baby boomers find the issue of gay marriage so troubling is that it is closely linked to another related issue, one that the uxorious purists in Sullivan's anthology almost unanimously take to task as the ultimate no-no, sexual promiscuity. The controversy over gay marriage has become so pressing in the last few years because many gay activists view it in explicitly prophylactic terms as a leash that will curb our voracious sexual appetites and save us from the ravages of AIDS. The subtext of the marriage debate is not love but death, not valentines but viruses.

"Writers in Sullivan's collection take every opportunity to cluck their tongues disapprovingly at casual sexual encounters, asserting with evangelical fervor that monogamy is the only permissible context for the expression of homosexual desire, which must be swathed in thick layers of sentimentality and viewed through the rose-colored glasses of romance."⁵

Stanley Kurtz cites homosexual academics on the attitude of Scandinavian homosexuals to same-sex marriage:

*"Danish social theorist Henning Bech and Norwegian sociologist Rune Halvorsen offer excellent accounts of the gay marriage debates in Denmark and Norway. Despite the regnant social liberalism in these countries, proposals to recognize gay unions generated tremendous controversy, and have reshaped the meaning of marriage in the years since. Both Bech and Halvorsen stress that the conservative case for gay marriage, while put forward by a few, was rejected by many in the gay community. Bech, perhaps Scandinavia's most prominent gay thinker, dismisses as an "implausible" claim the idea that gay marriage promotes monogamy. He treats the "conservative case" as something that served chiefly tactical purposes during a difficult political debate. According to Halvorsen, **many of Norway's gays imposed self-censorship during the marriage debate, so as to hide their opposition to marriage itself. The goal of the gay marriage movements in both Norway and Denmark, say Halvorsen and Bech, was not marriage but social approval for homosexuality.** Halvorsen suggests that the low numbers of registered gay couples may be understood as a collective protest against the expectations (presumably, monogamy) embodied in marriage."⁶ [emphasis added]*

3. Marriage provides the best environment for raising children.

Marriage – understood as the union of a man and a woman to the exclusion of all others, voluntarily entered into for life – provides the best environment for raising children.

A large body of social science research confirms this near universal belief, across times and cultures. It demonstrates that children flourish best on a range of indicators (including educational outcomes, school misbehaviour, smoking, illegal drugs, and alcohol consumption, sexual activity and teen pregnancy, illegal activities and psychological outcomes) when they are raised by a mother and a father in a publicly committed, lifelong relationship.⁷

Children's well-being is adversely affected by being deprived of either a mother or a father. Fathers and mothers make different contributions to a child's upbringing. Neither can adequately substitute for the other.⁸

3.1 The child's need for a mother

Male same-sex couples cannot provide a child with the care and love of a mother.

Mothers alone have the capacity to breastfeed. According to a 2005 NSW Public Health Bulletin: "Breastfeeding has been consistently shown to be protective against a large range of immediate and longer term health outcomes that are a significant burden on individuals, the health system and society."⁹

There is convincing evidence that breastfeeding is protective for children in developed countries from gastrointestinal illnesses, otitis media, respiratory tract infections and neonatal necrotising enterocolitis. There is probable evidence that it is protective for asthma and allergy, cognitive ability/intelligence, some childhood leukaemias, urinary tract infection, inflammatory bowel disease, coeliac disease, sudden infant death syndrome and obesity.¹⁰

Handing a baby to two men to raise puts it at risk of missing out on these protective benefits.

"Mothers have a distinctive ability to understand infants and children. Mothers also excel in interpreting their children's physical and linguistic cues. Mothers are more responsive to the distinctive cries of infants. They are better able than fathers, for instance, to distinguish between a cry of hunger and a cry of pain from their baby, and better than fathers at detecting the emotions of their children by looking at their faces, postures, and gestures ... adolescents report that their mothers know them better than their fathers do.

"In sum, mothers are better able than fathers to read their children's words, deeds, and appearance to determine their emotional and physical state. This maternal sensitivity to children helps explain why mothers are superior when it comes to nurturing the young, especially infants and toddlers. Because they excel in reading their children, they are better able to provide their children with what they need—from a snack to a hug—when they are in some type of distress."¹¹

"The hormone peptide oxytocin, which is released in women during pregnancy and breastfeeding, makes mothers more interested in bonding with children and engaging in nurturing behaviour than fathers ... when children look for comfort and consolation, no one compares with mom."¹²

"The critical contributions of mothers to the healthy development of children have been long recognized. No reputable psychological theory or empirical study that denies the critical importance of mothers in the normal development of children could be found."¹³

3.2 The child's need for a father

Female same-sex couples cannot provide a child with the care and love of a father.

"Fathers excel when it comes to discipline, play, and challenging their children to embrace life's challenges... Typically, fathers engender more fear than mothers in their children because their comparatively greater physical strength and size, along with the pitch and inflection of their voice, telegraph toughness to their children... Engaging in rough physical play with dad teaches children how to deal with aggressive impulses and physical contact without losing control of their emotions... Compared to mothers, fathers are more likely to encourage their children to take up difficult tasks, to seek out novel experiences, and to endure pain and hardship without yielding. Fathers are more likely than mothers to encourage toddlers to engage in novel activities, to interact with strangers, and to be independent; and as children enter adolescence, fathers are more likely to introduce children to the worlds of work, sport, and civil society."¹⁴

Girls whose fathers left the family early (before age 5) were five times more likely in the US and three times more likely in New Zealand to become pregnant as a teenager compared to girls from traditional families.¹⁵

Male adolescents in all types of families without a biological father (mother only, mother and step-father, and other) were more likely to be incarcerated than teens from two-parent homes, even when demographic information was included in analyses. Youths who had never lived with their father had the highest odds of being arrested.¹⁶

3.3 Same-sex couples as parents?

In addition to depriving a child of either a father or a mother, children raised by same-sex couples face increased risk of adverse outcomes in a number of areas.

A key Australian study has shown significant detrimental outcomes from homosexual parenting. Dr Sotirios Sarantakos, when Associate Professor of Sociology at Charles Sturt University, Wagga Wagga, NSW, undertook a number of studies on heterosexual and homosexual couples. In 1996 he published a paper, *Children in three contexts*, where he explored the relationship between family environment and behaviour of primary school children living in three family contexts - married heterosexual couples, cohabiting heterosexual couples and homosexual partners.¹⁷

The major finding of the study was that family type did make a significant difference to the children's school achievements. Children in families where their biological parents were married to each other scored best of the three groups in language ability (7.7), mathematics (7.9) and sport (8.9). Children of cohabiting heterosexual couple families generally did next best in these areas (6.8, 7.0 and 8.3), while children of homosexual partners scored lowest (5.5, 5.5, 5.9). In class behaviour more children of homosexual partners were reported to be timid and reserved, unwilling to work in a team or talk about family life and holidays. In general they felt "uncomfortable when having to work with students of a sex different from the parent they lived with". Sex identity was reported by teachers to be a problem area for some children of homosexual families. Sarantakos cautiously concludes that "married couples seem to offer the best environment for a child's social and educational development".

Advocates of parenting by homosexual partners frequently claim that about 50 studies have been done "proving" no difference in outcome between children raised by married couples or by homosexual partners. Any social science study depends for its validity on following rigorous statistical and research procedures. Dr Robert Lerner and Dr Althea Nagai, experts in quantitative analysis, after dissecting each of 49 of such studies found at least one fatal research flaw in each study.¹⁸ These studies are therefore no basis for good science or good public policy.

In her book *Children as Trophies?*¹⁹ British sociologist Patricia Morgan reviews 144 published studies on same-sex parenting and concludes that it fosters homosexual behaviour, confused gender roles, and increased likelihood of serious psychological problems later in life.

Professor Lynn D Wardle shows even from those studies which conclude in favour of homosexual parenting that there is data showing that homosexual parenting may be harmful.²⁰ There is a greater incidence of homosexual orientation in the children raised by homosexual partners with resulting problems including suicidal behaviour, promiscuity, etc. There is also a greater incidence of anxiety, sadness, hostility, defensiveness and inhibitions (some of these especially among boys of lesbian mothers).

A recent meta-analysis by two gay activists failed to support the "just like other children" myth. In 2001, Judith Stacey and Timothy J Biblarz, both supporters of gay parenting, published a study entitled, "(How) Does the Sexual Orientation of Parents Matter?" In it they re-examined twenty studies of same-sex parenting that had supposedly shown no difference, and charged their authors with

ignoring the differences they had indeed found. There were differences: children raised by same-sex parents showed empathy for "social diversity", were less confined by gender stereotypes, more likely to have confusion about gender identity, more likely to engage in sexual experimentation and promiscuity, and more likely to explore homosexual behaviour.²¹

In a "Review and Analysis of Research Studies Which Assessed Sexual Preference of Children Raised by Homosexuals" Dr Trayce Hansen found that 14% of children raised by same-sex parents identified as homosexual by late adolescence or early adulthood. As the most reliable surveys place the incidence of homosexual identification at approximately 2% this means that being raised by same-sex parents makes it 7 times more likely that a child will identify as homosexual.²²

Professor George Rekers' evidence as an expert witness has been instrumental in the success of several US court actions defending State laws excluding homosexual adoption or fostering as having a "rational basis". Rekers is Professor of Neuropsychiatry & Behavioral Science at the University of South Carolina School of Medicine.

Professor Rekers states that "in a household with a homosexually-behaving adult, the foster child would be exposed to additional stress with the impact of the significantly higher rates of psychological disorder (particularly affective disorders such as depression), suicidal ideation, suicide attempt, suicide completion, conduct disorder, and substance abuse in homosexually-behaving adult."²³

"Homosexual partner relationships are significantly and substantially less stable and more short-lived on the average compared to a marriage of a man and a woman, thereby inevitably contributing to a substantially higher rate of household transitions in foster homes with a homosexually-behaving adult."²⁴

"Homosexual foster-parent households lack a daily resident model of either a mother or a father, lack the unique contributions of either a mother or a father to childrearing, and lack a model of a husband/wife relationship which is significantly healthier, substantially more stable socially and psychologically, and is more widely approved compared to homosexual lifestyles. The best child adjustment results from living with a married man and woman compared to other family structures. It is clearly in the best interests of foster children to be placed with exclusively heterosexual married-couple foster families because this natural family structure inherently provides unique needed benefits and produces better child adjustment than is generally the case in households with a homosexually-behaving adult."²⁵

Dale O'Leary in his book *One Man, One Woman* discusses "science, myths and same-sex parenting" He concludes: "As more persons with SSA [same-sex attraction] acquire children, society will increasingly be pressured to ignore the problems caused by same-sex parenting – just as it ignores the problems caused by divorce – and join in the pretence that that having two mommies is just the same as having a mommy and a daddy. But no matter how many people praise "family diversity", children being raised by parents with SSA will always know that it's not the same, and someday they will resent how their needs have been sacrificed for the sake of a social experiment. In a sad irony, the more that cultural elites insist that there is nothing wrong with their situation, the more these children will feel guilty about resenting it, and this guilt will lead them to conclude that there must be something wrong with them."²⁶

A 30 member multi-party commission of the French National Assembly on the Family and the Rights of Children commented in its 2006 report on "research on children raised by same-sex couples" which concluded that there was an "absence of any ill effects on the children." The commission stated that the "scientific nature and the representation of the samples of the populations studied were broadly criticized and contested during the hearings... the lack of objectivity in this area was flagrant." The commission endorsed the statement of an expert witness on adoption: "inasmuch as there is absolutely no reason to doubt the educative and emotional qualities of homosexual parents, we do not yet know all the effects on the construction of the adopted child's psychological identity. As long as there is

uncertainty, however small, is it not in the best interest of the child to apply the precautionary principle, as is done in other domains?"²⁷

3.4 Legalising same-sex marriage may increase cohabitation

There is some evidence from Scandinavia that giving legal recognition to same-sex relationships is associated with an increase in the trend among male-female couples to cohabit rather than marry. With cohabitation breaking up at a much faster rate than marriage this leaves more children growing up in a fatherless home, with exposure to the risks of adverse outcomes detailed above.

Stanley Kurtz writes:

“Will same-sex marriage undermine the institution of marriage? It already has.

*“More precisely, it has further undermined the institution. The separation of marriage from parenthood was increasing; gay marriage has widened the separation. Out-of-wedlock birthrates were rising; gay marriage has added to the factors pushing those rates higher. Instead of encouraging a society-wide return to marriage, **Scandinavian gay marriage has driven home the message that marriage itself is outdated, and that virtually any family form, including out-of-wedlock parenthood, is acceptable.***
[emphasis added]

“Scandinavia's out-of-wedlock birthrates may have risen more rapidly in the seventies, when marriage began its slide. But the push of that rate past the 50 percent mark during the nineties was in many ways more disturbing. Growth in the out-of-wedlock birthrate is limited by the tendency of parents to marry after a couple of births, and also by the persistence of relatively conservative and religious districts. So as out-of-wedlock childbearing pushes beyond 50 percent, it is reaching the toughest areas of cultural resistance. The most important trend of the post-gay marriage decade may be the erosion of the tendency to marry at the birth of a second child. Once even that marker disappears, the path to the complete disappearance of marriage is open.

“And now that married parenthood has become a minority phenomenon, it has lost the critical mass required to have socially normative force. As Danish sociologists Wehner, Kambskard, and Abrahamson describe it, in the wake of the changes of the nineties, ‘Marriage is no longer a precondition for settling a family - neither legally nor normatively... What defines and makes the foundation of the Danish family can be said to have moved from marriage to parenthood.’”²⁸

4. Marriage is the institution which benefits both men and women

Marriage socialises men in important ways. Societies with significant numbers of unmarried men often have significant social problems.

“Married men drink less, fight less, and are less likely to engage in criminal activity than their single peers. Married husbands and fathers are significantly more involved and affectionate with their wives and children than men in cohabiting relationships (with and without children). The norms, status rewards, and social support offered to men by marriage all combine to help men walk down the path to adult responsibility.”²⁹

Women also benefit significantly from marriage, including better mental health outcomes. *“When a range of types of mental disorders are considered, marriage reduces the risk of mental disorders for both men and women.”*³⁰

These social benefits for children, men and women are sufficient grounds for society and the law to encourage marriage by granting it a unique legal status and preserving the longstanding definition of marriage as the union of a man and a woman to the exclusion of all others, voluntarily entered into for life.

There is no valid reason to change this definition to accommodate a demand for “equality” by persons in a same-sex relationship. These relationships are of no interest to society and those who enter into them do not enter into a “union” equivalent to marriage. The parties to such relationships have no grounds for demanding public recognition of their relationships as “marriages”.

5. Same-sex relationships are *not* equal to marriage

No matter how intense they may appear to be, same-sex relationships cannot be considered the equivalent of marriage. They confer none of the unique benefits of marriage and family on Australian society.

5.1 For life?

Both male homosexual and lesbian relationships are significantly more unstable than marriage. A study of registered same-sex partnerships in Sweden found that over the eight years of the study registered lesbian relationships broke up at 303% the rate of marriages and registered male homosexual relationships broke up at 135% the rate of marriages.³¹

While some homosexual partners remain together for lengthy periods, most are relatively brief. Dr James Dobson, of Focus on the Family, has said: “Studies show that homosexual men in particular have a difficult time honouring even the most basic commitments of ‘marriage’. A recent study conducted in the Netherlands ... found that the average homosexual relationship lasts only 1.5 years and that gay men have an average of eight sexual partners per year outside of their ‘primary’ relationship...”³²

5.2 For children?

Treating same-sex relationships as “marriages” would strike at the foundations of society by ignoring the most fundamental reason for marriage: to safeguard our future as a nation. Every society which wants to continue must encourage the bearing and raising of children as good future citizens. Every society therefore has a vital interest in protecting the family as the basic social unit of society and marriage as the heart of the family. Allowing same-sex couples to “marry” would undermine the special status of marriage and the natural family and thereby place at risk the future of the society.

Same-sex relationships are naturally sterile. Same-sex relationships are not capable of producing children. Society has no valid interest in encouraging those in such relationships to procure children through adoption, reproductive technologies or surrogacy, because these processes necessarily involve a third party biological parent. Whatever means are used to procure a child, the child is intentionally deprived of a genuine parental relationship with either a father or a mother.

5.3 To the exclusion of all others?

Changing the definition of marriage to include same-sex relationships would impact on the expectation that marriage involves a commitment to exclusivity, that is to sexual fidelity between the spouses. Same-sex marriage advocates and gay couples often downplay the importance of sexual fidelity in their definition of marriage.

In a comprehensive study of 156 male couples it was found that “[o]nly seven couples have a totally exclusive sexual relationship, and these men all have been together for less than five years. Stated another way, all couples with a relationship lasting more than five years have incorporated some provision for outside sexual activity in their relationships.”³³

A survey of men entering same-sex civil unions in Vermont indicated that 50% of them did not value sexual fidelity compared to 79% of both lesbians and married couples.³⁴

The Bill, in amending the definition of marriage, drops the phrase “to the exclusion of all others” from the definition. This highlights the radical nature of the proposal to accommodate same-sex relationships – which lack a shared acceptance of sexual exclusivity – within the definition of marriage.

6. Conclusion and recommendation

The Bill would radically alter the nature of “marriage” in the law of Australia by effectively abolishing marriage as traditionally understood in most times and places and in common law in Australia since settlement. Instead a new thing, falsely called “marriage”, would be established in law: a union between any two persons.

Such a legal concept would lack any obvious connection with the purpose of marriage as traditionally understood: to regulate the sexual relationships of men and women to ensure the well-being of children by providing for a publicly recognised commitment to a voluntary, exclusive and lifelong union of a man and a woman.

It would undermine marriage (properly understood) to the detriment of the future of Australia.

Recommendation:

The Bill should not be supported.

7. Endnotes

-
1. cf. Lord Penzance in *Hyde v. Hyde and Woodmansee* (1866), L.R. 1 P&D 130 at 133.
 2. *Halpern et al. v. Attorney General of Canada et al.* (2003), Court of Appeal for Ontario, <http://www.ontariocourts.on.ca/decisions/2003/june/halpernC39172.pdf>
 3. *Goodridge v. Mass. Department of Public Health*, 440 Mass. 309 (2003), <http://masscases.com/cases/sjc/440/440mass309.html>
 4. Willis, E. *et al.*, “Can marriage be saved? : A Forum”, *The Nation*, 5 July 2004, http://www.accessmylibrary.com/coms2/summary_0286-21764743_ITM

-
5. Harris, D., "Same-sex marriage : pro and con: [Review]", *International Gay & Lesbian Review*, 2006 <http://gaybookreviews.info/review/3287/750>
 6. Kurtz, S., "The End of Marriage in Scandinavia : The 'conservative case' for same-sex marriage collapses.", *Weekly Standard*, 2 February 2004, <http://www.weeklystandard.com/Content/Public/Articles/000/000/003/660zypwj.asp>
 7. Barbara Schneider, Allison Atteberry and Ann Owens, *Family Matters: Family Structure and Child Outcomes* (Birmingham: Alabama Policy Institute) June 2005.
 8. Wilcox, W. Bradford, "Reconcilable Differences: What Social Sciences Show about the Complementarity of the Sexes & Parenting"; <http://www.family-men.com/The%20necessity%20of%20both%20sexes%20in%20parenting.htm>.
 9. Allan, J. and Hector, D., "Benefits of breastfeeding", *NSW Public Health Bulletin*, Vol 16, nos 3-4, 2005, p 44; http://www.publish.csiro.au/?act=view_file&file_id=NB05011.pdf.
 10. *Ibid.*, Table 1, p 43.
 11. Wilcox, W. Bradford, *op cit*.
 12. *Ibid.*; Palmer, Linda F., "Bonding Matters ... The Chemistry of Attachment", *Attachment Parenting International News*, Vol 5, No 2, 2002; <http://www.babyreference.com/BondingMatters.htm>.
 13. Byrd, A.D., "Gender Complementarity and Child-rearing: Where Tradition and Science Agree"; <http://www.narth.com/docs/GenderComplementarityByrd.pdf>.
 14. Wilcox, W. Bradford, *op cit*.
 15. Ellis, B., Bates, J., Dodge, K., Fergusson, D., Horwood, L.J., Pettit, G. & Woodward, L., "Does father absence place daughters at special risk for early sexual activity and teenage pregnancy?" *Child Development*, 2003, Vol 74, 801-821.
 16. Harper, C., & McLanahan, S., *Father absence and youth incarceration*, (Center for Research on Child Wellbeing) 2003, Working Paper 99-03.
 17. Sarantakos, S., "Children in three contexts", *Children Australia*, 1996, Vol 21, No 3.
 18. Lerner, Robert and Nagai, Althea, 2001, *No Basis: What the Studies Don't Tell Us About Same-Sex Parenting*, Marriage Law Project, Ethics and Public Policy Center, Washington, DC, 2003.
 19. Morgan P., *Children as trophies? : examining the evidence on same-sex parenting*, Christian Institute, Newcastle, 2001.
 20. Wardle, Lynn D, 1997, "The Potential Impact of Homosexual Parenting on Children", *University of Illinois Law Review*, Vol 1997, Issue 3, p 833.
 21. Stacey, J and Biblarz, TJ "(How) Does the Sexual Orientation of Parents Matter?", *American Sociological Review*, April 2001; <http://www.soc.iastate.edu/soc522a/PDF%20readings/Stacey.pdf>
 22. http://www.drtraycehansen.com/Pages/writings_sexpref.html
 23. Rekers, G. *Review Of Research On Homosexual Parenting, Adoption, And Foster Parenting*, p 2; <http://www.narth.com/docs/RationaleBasisFinal0405.pdf>.
 24. *Ibid.*, p 3.

-
25. *Ibid.*
 26. O'Leary, D., *One Man, One Woman*, Sophia Institute Press, 2007, extract available at: http://www.mercatornet.com/articles/view/science_myths_and_same_sex_parenting/
 27. <http://www.preservemarriage.ca/docs/France%20-%20summary.pdf>
 28. Kurtz, S. "The End of Marriage in Scandinavia : The 'conservative case' for same-sex marriage collapses.", *Weekly Standard*, 2 February 2004, <http://www.weeklystandard.com/Content/Public/Articles/000/000/003/660zypwj.asp>
 29. *Why Marriage Matters, Second Edition: Twenty-Six Conclusions from the Social Sciences* (New York: Centre for Marriage and Families, September 2005)
 30. David de Vaus, "Marriage and Mental Health" in *Family Matters* No.62 Winter 2002, pp 27-32
 31. Andersson, G., "Divorce-Risk Patterns in Same-Sex Marriages in Norway and Sweden", *PAA 2004 Annual Meeting*, Boston, 1-3 April 2004, Table 5
 32. *Family News From Dr James Dobson*, September 2003, p 5, citing a study by Xiridou, Maria *et al.*, "The Contribution of Steady and Casual Partnerships to the Incidence of HIV Infection Among Homosexual Men in Amsterdam," *AIDS*, 17 (2003): 1029-38.
 33. McWhirter, D.P. and Mattison, A.W., *The Male Couple: How Relationships Develop*, 1984, p 252-53.
 34. Rothblum, E. and Solomon, S., *Civil Unions in the State of Vermont: A Report on the First Year*, 2003, University of Vermont Department of Psychology.