



23 October 2012

**Secretariat
Government Administration Committee
Parliament Buildings
WELLINGTON 6011**

SUBMISSION

Marriage (Definition of Marriage) Amendment Bill

This submission is being made by Family First NZ, a charitable organisation that researches, educates and advocates on family issues in the public domain.

We OPPOSE the Marriage (Definition of Marriage) Amendment Bill.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Marriages are a matter of significant public concern, as the record of almost every culture shows. If it weren't for the fact that sexual intercourse between a man and a woman leads to children and brings with it a further obligation to care for those children, the notion of marriage would probably never have existed, and the state would not have been interested in it.

Marriage encourages the raising of children by the mother and father who conceived them. On average, children raised by their biological parents who are married have the best outcomes in health, education and income, and by far the lowest involvement with the criminal justice system. As Prominent Irish homosexual and political commentator Richard Waghorn says, this is certainly not to cast aspersions on other families, but it does underscore the importance of marriage as an institution.

It is true that marriage by definition is discriminatory. A homosexual cannot now legally marry. But neither can a whole lot of other people. Three people cannot get married to each other. A married man can't marry another person. Two old aunties living together cannot marry. A father cannot marry his adult daughter. A football team cannot enact group marriage – the list is endless.

It is also important to note that marriage is not solely a religious belief. Marriage is a social practice and every culture in every time and place has had some institution that resembles what we know as marriage, associated with procreation. Every society needs natural marriage.

If the law were to allow same-sex marriage, and only same-sex marriage, we would then be discriminating against those seeking polygamous, polyamorous (group), or incestuous consenting adult unions – if all that counts is love and commitment, and the need not to discriminate.

Supporters of same sex marriage argue that civil unions are a 2nd-class type of marriage. But there are many same-sex advocates who argue against 'marriage' for same sex couples, and even suggest that the claim is hurtful to those who have deliberately chosen civil unions.

Same-sex marriage is, by definition, an oxymoron. Equality does not mean we must redefine marriage for everyone.

Being pro-marriage and wanting to maintain its definition as being between a man and a woman is not 'anti-gay'.

Same-sex couples do have a right to form meaningful relationships – they just don't have a right to redefine marriage. Everyone has a right to love who they choose, but nobody has a right to redefine marriage.

The state – which did not invent marriage – has no authority to re-invent it.



FULL SUBMISSION

TO BE CLEAR

This debate over same-sex marriage is not a discussion of...

- * whether homosexuals are good people or good citizens. They are.
- * whether homosexuals can form loving relationships or be loving parents. Of course they can.
- * whether homosexuals should be treated with dignity. Every member of the human race should be treated with dignity.

Many people in the homosexual community do not agree with same-sex marriage either. Like us, they simply hold a particular view on an important social issue. This argument has nothing to do with hate or fear, and everything to do with history and culture.

We would be making exactly the same submission if the bill before Parliament was about changing the definition of marriage to allow polygamy or polyamory.

MARRIAGE IS FOUNDATIONAL

Throughout history and in virtually all human societies, marriage has always been a union between men and women. Marriage did not arise because some government or religious organisation dictated that people must marry. Marriage predates both the organised church and the state. The State should not presume to re-engineer a natural human institution.

NATURE'S WAY

Marriage combines the complementary characteristics of men and women as defined by nature. Gender distinctions are important. Men and women complement each other physically and emotionally. Nature is exclusive in that only the union of a man and a woman can produce another life.

In *Skinner v. Oklahoma*, the US Supreme Court stated:

*"Marriage and procreation are fundamental to the very existence and survival of the race."*ⁱ

The state has no right to redefine marriage. Dr Seana Sugrue, who holds the degrees of B.B.A. from Bishop's University, LL.B. from the University of Ottawa, and both LL.M. and D.C.L. from McGill University, and has taught at Princeton and McGill, says:

"Same-sex marriage is necessarily a political institution, whereas marriage is pre-political. Marriage has an existence independent of state power; same-sex marriage does not. The reality of children, and the duty of care imposed upon mothers and fathers to rear their offspring, would exist absent a political order."

"Same-sex couples can only marry insofar as the state decrees that they can. In claiming for homosexuals the right to marry, the state also claims for itself the ability to declare what constitutes

marriage. It endows itself with the prerogative of defining its terms. It transforms marriage from a pre-political obligation into its own creation. At the same time, it replaces marriage as an obligation within conjugal society to marriage as a choice and a means of self-gratification. In this way, it changes the character of marriage not just for same-sex couples, but for everyone. By allowing same-sex marriage, the state decrees that, henceforth, marriage is what the state says it is. Marriage then loses its status as a fundamental institution of civil society, and becomes a right, granted by the state, for the desiring self.”ⁱⁱ

EVERY CHILD HAS A RIGHT TO A MUM AND DAD

Marriage between a man and a woman says to a child that mum and dad who made you will also be there to love and raise you. Although death and divorce may prevent it, the evidence shows that children do best with a married mother and father.

Princeton Professor Robert P George, who recently visited the country, says:

“Marriage is valuable in itself, but its inherent orientation to the bearing and rearing of children contributes to its distinctive structure, including norms of monogamy and fidelity. This link to the welfare of children also helps explain why marriage is important to the common good and why the state should recognize and regulate it.”ⁱⁱⁱ

MUM AND DAD MATTER TO KIDS

One of the consequences of amending the definition of marriage is that same-sex couples will be able to adopt. The debate around same-sex adoption should be focused on a review of the Adoption Act, not the Marriage Act.

However, we note the following.

Marriage is one of the best ways to ensure that children grow up with their biological mother and father. Marriage encourages the raising of children by the mother and father who conceived them. Social science confirms that children who are raised by their own married mother and father are happier, healthier, and more prosperous than those raised in any other family structure.

When compared with children raised by both parents, children deprived of mum or dad in their daily lives fare worse in virtually every measure of well-being. Men and women are distinctly different. Each gender brings vitally important – and unique – elements to a child’s development.

Two men might each be a good father, but neither can be a mum. Two women might each be a good mother, but neither can be a dad.

As a prominent Irish homosexual and political commentator Richard Waghorn says:

“(T)his is certainly not to cast aspersions on other families, but it does underscore the importance of marriage as an institution”^{iv}.

While a compassionate and caring society always comes to the aid of motherless and fatherless families, a wise and loving society never intentionally creates fatherless or motherless families. No adult has the ‘right’ to adopt a child. It is perfectly legitimate, and indeed essential, to discriminate in favour of the child to ensure the child’s social and emotional wellbeing. Deliberately depriving a child of a mum or a dad is not in the child’s best interests.

The noted British philosopher Bertrand Russell, a socialist and an atheist, said:

“But for children, there would be no need of any institution concerned with sex...It is of children alone that sexual relations become of importance of society, and worthy to be taken cognizance of by a legal institution.”

Australian Ethicist Tom Frame, in his book ‘*Children on Demand*’, says:

“Nature dictates that a man and a woman are required for procreation and this limitation should be acknowledged and respected because it discloses something of the purposes and providence of nature: that a child’s best interests are served by it having a mother and father.”^v

Greg Donnelly, who was the Labour Government Whip in the New South Wales Parliament, says the following:

“As a member of the Legislative Council’s Standing Committee on Law and Justice that examined the issue of same-sex adoption, I am familiar with the various arguments put forward to support the case for change. At the heart of the matter is a profoundly important question that needs to be clearly understood and then answered.

“Is having both a mother and a father important for babies and children, or not? Some people, and I do not count myself as one of them, believe that society has progressed beyond the concepts of motherhood and fatherhood. For them, it is all a question of parenting; a matter of function over form.

“I, and I believe many others in the community, do not accept the proposition that society has moved on to a model of parenting where gender is irrelevant. In fact a great deal of evidence presented to the Legislative Council’s inquiry on this very issue drew the opposite conclusion. Mothers matter. Fathers matter. They both matter.

“There can be no doubt about how the complementary nature of both motherhood and fatherhood benefits the wellbeing of children. Indeed, up until recent time, and I literally mean the last few years, this perspective about parenting has been taken as a given. Society has accepted the proposition that it is good for a child to be raised by a mother and father in a permanent, preferably married relationship.

“Another point worth noting is that there was very little evidence presented to the inquiry from children expressing their desire to be raised by two mothers or two fathers as opposed to a mother and a father. I don’t say this to be trite but rather to demonstrate the point that the overriding force behind this drive for change in the adoption laws is not children but same-sex couples.”^{vi}

Responding to a growing body of research literature in this field, the Head Start Bureau of the United States Department of Health and Human Services writes:

“Scholars now know that boys and girls who grow up with an involved father, as well as an involved mother, have stronger cognitive and motor skills, enjoy elevated levels of physical and mental health, become better problem-solvers, and are more confident, curious, and empathetic. They also show greater moral sensitivity and self-control.”^{vii}

DECADES OF STUDIES

There are large, scientifically strong studies from the past four decades showing children do best with their married biological mother and father – when compared with every other type of family structure. Studies which purportedly show that children of homosexuals do just as well as other children are, so far, methodologically weak and thus scientifically inconclusive.

In a study just released by Loren Marks of Louisiana State University, it states the assertion made by the American Psychological Association - that 'not a single study has found children of lesbian or gay parents to be disadvantaged in any significant respect relative to children of heterosexual parents'

"were not empirically warranted. Recommendations for future research are offered."^{viii}

Further details of this study are discussed below.

And John McKellar, Executive Director of H.O.P.E. (Homosexuals Opposed to Pride Extremism) says:

"Children need a biological mother and father. We know that this is not always possible, even in the context of opposite-sex marriage, but we don't solve the problem or alleviate the inconsistency by adding to it. Self-interested partisans will manufacture statistics to support their specious claims that children of same-sex marriages fare as well as those of opposite-sex marriages. However, the phenomenon of same-sex parenting doesn't have the longevity needed for such conclusive evidence, whereas the experience of single parent families has, not always, but often shown detriment to the development of the offspring."^{ix}

THE 'RIGHT' TO MARRY

Nobody has an absolute right to marry *any* person they love. Marriage rightly discriminates. A 14 year old cannot get married. Three people cannot get married to each other. A person who is currently married cannot marry another person. A father cannot marry his adult daughter. A woman cannot marry her adult son. Both sides of this debate agree there should be limits to who can marry, even when the parties involved love each other.

Julian Rivers is Professor of Jurisprudence at the University of Bristol Law School. He puts it succinctly:

(T)he law of marriage discriminates on grounds of age. One must be at least 16 years old. In our society, we do not consider this discrimination to be unacceptable, because it is justified. It is right that children should not marry. The law of marriage also discriminates on grounds of kindred and affinity: one cannot marry a parent, sibling or child, nor a range of more distant relations. But once again, we think this is justified - marriage between close blood relatives is medically unwise and in any case sexualised families are abusive and oppressive - so we do not think of it as discrimination. It is just good moral sense.^x

As popular NZ Herald columnist Jim Hopkins writes:

"(Discrimination) happens all the time. If equality was Parliament's objective, there'd be no minimum drinking age, no ban on bigamy or specified drugs, no requirement to pass a test to get a driver's licence and no Maori seats either."^{xi}

Prominent Irish homosexual and political commentator Richard Waghorn, mentioned earlier, writes:

"Marriage is vital as a framework within which children can be brought up by a man and woman. Not all marriages, of course, involve child-raising. And there are also, for that matter, same-sex couples already raising children. But the reality is that marriages tend towards child-raising and same-sex partnerships do not.

"I am conscious of this when considering my own circle of friends, quite a few of whom have recently married or will soon do so in the future. Many, if not most or all of them, will raise children. If, however, I or gay friends form civil partnerships, those are much more unlikely to involve raising children. So the

question that matters is this: Why should a gay relationship be treated the same way as a marriage, despite this fundamental difference?

“A wealth of research demonstrates the marriage of a man and a woman provides children with the best life outcomes, that children raised in marriages that stay together do best across a whole range of measures. This is certainly not to cast aspersions on other families, but it does underscore the importance of marriage as an institution.

“This is why the demand for gay marriage goes doubly wrong. It is not a demand for marriage to be extended to gay people – it is a demand for marriage to be redefined. The understanding of marriage as an institution that exists and is supported for the sake of strong families changes to an understanding of marriage as merely the end-point of romance. If gay couples are considered equally eligible for marriage, even though gay relationships do not tend towards child-raising and cannot by definition give a child a mother and a father, the crucial understanding of what marriage is actually mainly for has been discarded.

“What that amounts to is the kind of marriage that puts adults before children. That, in my opinion, is ultimately selfish, and far too high a price to pay simply for the token gesture of treating opposite-sex relationships and same-sex relationships identically. And it is a token gesture. Isn’t it common sense, after all, to treat different situations differently? To put it personally, I do not feel in the least bit discriminated against by the fact that I cannot marry someone of the same-sex. I understand and accept that there are good reasons for this.”^{xii}

NO NEED TO RE-DEFINE MARRIAGE TO ACHIEVE EQUALITY

It is perfectly possible to support traditional marriage, while also recognising and respecting the rights of others. There is absolutely no need to redefine marriage to provide legal recognition and protection for committed same-sex relationships. In 2004, the government introduced Civil Unions and changed over 150 pieces of legislation to achieve this very thing.

Tony Milne, who helped co-ordinate the campaign for Civil Unions when working for Tim Barnett MP, wrote:

“I’m one of those who prefers Civil Unions over marriage. It is modern and inclusive from its very beginning. Compared to most countries, where Civil Unions have been designed as a separate institution for same-sex couples, New Zealand chartered a different course. We created a relationship recognition that was open to both opposite-sex and same-sex couples, changed the prescribed “I take you” language to be more flexible and less possessive – and removed virtually all discrimination in New Zealand law between de facto and married/civil unionised couples!... To describe Civil Unions as a second-class institution is hurtful for some of us who are in a Civil Union. It’s just not necessary either.”^{xiii}

We would not accept a law that changes the definition of a father to include mothers. By doing so, we would cover up reality. Definitions matter. We would also not support a law change that red means green.

SAME-SEX MARRIAGE COULD STRENGTHEN THE INSTITUTION OF MARRIAGE?

Marriage does not thrive under the inclusive banner of "the more the merrier." A marriage culture, which is essential to a healthy society, is nourished when we are faithful to and honour its time-tested definition, and understand its important purpose. Extending the definition of marriage to include polygamy and group marriage does not strengthen marriage because more people could get married.

HOW DOES IT AFFECT YOUR MARRIAGE?

While it may not affect an individual marriage, we need to be concerned with more than what merely affects us personally. Changing the definition of something changes the way society views it and the important role it plays. This Bill isn't just a simple change in the wording of a current law. It is proposing the complete redefinition of an institution as it has existed for thousands of years until now.

AN IDEOLOGY FORCED ON OTHERS

If marriage is redefined, everyone would be subject to the new definition. Anyone who disagrees with it will be at odds with the law.

A legal opinion^{xiv} obtained by Family First NZ from Barrister Ian Bassett and reviewed by human rights legal expert Grant Illingworth QC^{xv} describes the Marriage Amendment Bill, if it is enacted, as having the following effects:

"1. Marriage celebrants (including church ministers) exercising their public function will be in breach of the New Zealand Bill of Rights Act 1990^{xvi}, if they refuse to perform their public function as marriage celebrants by reason of the same sex of a couple seeking to be married.

"2. Church ministers, marriage celebrants, church elders/ leaders, churches hiring out their facilities, photographers and caterers and any other person or entity supplying services to the public will be in breach of the Human Rights Act 1993^{xvii}, if they refuse to supply services to a couple seeking to be married, by reason of the same sex of the couple."

He further elaborates that

"(A)Although no marriage celebrant can be forced to solemnise a marriage (in conflict with their beliefs or otherwise), nevertheless it will be unlawful for such a person (with a s3(b) NZBORA role) to refuse to solemnise a marriage on any prohibited grounds of discrimination (refer section 19 NZBORA, which refers in turn to the prohibited grounds set out in s21 of the Human Rights Act 1993).

"Although section 29 of the Marriage Act 1955 provides that "A marriage licence shall authorise but not oblige any marriage celebrant to solemnise the marriage to which it relates", that is not an exemption in respect of the s19 NZBORA obligations."

The full opinion is included at the conclusion of our Submission. (**Appendix 1/2**)

THE EVIDENCE OVERSEAS

Overseas experience would support this opinion:

in Canada, Saskatchewan's highest court ruled that marriage commissioners who are public servants cannot refuse to marry same-sex couples^{xviii};

in the UK, a government MP called for churches to be banned from holding marriages if they refuse same-sex couples^{xix}, a marriage registrar in London was sacked for refusing to carry out civil partnerships^{xx}, and a Christian marriage conference was banned for their opposition to gay marriage^{xxi};

in Denmark, same-sex couples have won the right to get married in any church they choose, even though nearly one third of the country's priests have said they will refuse to carry out the ceremonies^{xxii};

in New Jersey a judge ruled against a United Methodist retreat house that refused to allow a same-sex civil union ceremony to be conducted on its premises ruling the Constitution allows ‘*some intrusion into religious freedom to balance other important societal goals*’^{xxiii};

in Israel, the Jerusalem Magistrate's Court ordered the owners of an Israeli reception hall to pay \$25,000 damages to a lesbian couple after refusing to host their same-sex wedding on the grounds of their religious beliefs^{xxiv};

in Kansas, a proposed law would force churches to host same-sex weddings^{xxv};

and in Australia, there were calls for a member of the board of the Victorian Equal Opportunity and Human Rights Commission to resign over his views on gay marriage^{xxvi}.

There are many more examples.

WHAT NEXT?

If marriage is redefined once, what is to stop it being redefined again to allow, for example, polygamy? Allowing only *same-sex* marriage on the basis of love and commitment would discriminate against those seeking polygamous, group, and consensual adult incest-type marriages.

French author and philosopher Thibaud Collin says:

“The (French) justice minister considers that from now on it is appropriate to abolish one of the conditions of access to marriage. Why abolish this condition and not the others? If it is in the name of simple equality of individuals’ rights, going as far as their intimate desires, it’s difficult to see how those prohibited from practising incest and bigamy wouldn’t add their voice to those seeking equality.”

In 2002, the Ministry of Women's Affairs reported that

“New Zealand legislation gives a mixed message about what State counts as family. For example... only the male and one wife from a polygamous family are allowed to immigrate to New Zealand. There is an increasing recognition of the need to avoid enshrining in legislation concepts of family which are exclusive.”^{xxvii}

In their 2006 statement “*Beyond Same-Sex Marriage*,” more than 300 “LGBT and allied” scholars and advocates— including prominent Ivy League professors—call for legal recognition of sexual relationships involving more than two partners.^{xxviii}

In 1972 the National Coalition of Gay Organizations in the US demanded the “*repeal of all legislative provisions that restrict the sex or number of persons entering into a marriage unit*,” Also in this 1972 *Gay Rights Platform* was the call for the abolition of all age of sexual consent laws.^{xxix}

Q&A

Q. Shouldn't two people who love each other be allowed to commit themselves to one another?

A. Yes, they should and they can – so we don’t need to redefine marriage to achieve this. Same-sex couples have the freedom to form meaningful and legally recognised relationships under the Civil Union Act.

Q. What about a married man and woman who are childless?

A. Having babies is not a requirement for marriage – but it is a natural outcome. It is a union that can naturally lead to procreation. It is for this reason that the State became interested in marriage in the first place. We do not disqualify couples from marrying, based on exceptions. Older people marrying is the exception also, not the norm. Every man and woman who marries is capable of giving any child they create (or adopt) a mother and a father.

Q. If most religions object to same-sex marriage, can't we just allow same-sex marriages and let churches do what they want?

A. As mentioned earlier, if same-sex marriage is seen as a fundamental human right, then all will be forced to recognise it. You can't be selective about which groups will recognise fundamental human rights.

Q. Isn't this just progress? Shouldn't we be open to new concepts?

A. Not all new concepts are beneficial. We need to assess any attempt at social engineering on its merits, the public good and the wellbeing of children.

It was also argued that the social experiment of "no-fault divorce" would improve family life - with no knowledge of how it would really turn out. Since then, experience and social science research have shown this experiment to be a massive failure. Although there are exceptions, children (and adults) have been hurt far deeper — and for much longer — than we could have ever imagined.

The Council on Families in America, a diverse group of America's leading progressive, conservative and moderate family scholars declared in a joint statement:

"America's divorce revolution has failed. The evidence of failure is overwhelming... [It] has created terrible hardships for children. It has generated poverty within families. It has burdened us with unsupportable social costs. It has failed to deliver on its promise of greater adult happiness and better relationships between men and women..."^{ixxx}

Q. Isn't banning same-sex marriage the same as banning inter-racial marriage?

Laws banning interracial marriages were unjust, and were designed to keep races apart. The historic definition of marriage is rooted in bringing the genders together. Marriage has nothing to do with race. Marriage has everything to do with men and women. Overturning the ban on inter-racial marriage did not mean a *redefinition* of marriage but an *affirmation* of it.

POLITICAL U-TURNS

These quotes are significant because they show that only recently, the arguments we are making to retain the definition of marriage were also being made by politicians from both sides of the House.

HELEN CLARK (Labour):

NZ Herald June 21 2004

"Should people who want to have legal recognition of a marriage be able to get it? The Government says yes, but you can't marry. Marriage is only for heterosexuals. The Government is not -- underline -- not, changing the Marriage Act. That will remain as an option only for heterosexual couples."^{ixxxi}

Hon MARGARET WILSON (Labour):

1st Reading Civil Unions Bill

“The Marriage Act applies only to heterosexual couples. The opponents of the Civil Union Bill feel strongly that that should remain so. The Government respects that view, which is why there is no proposal to change that Act.”^{xxxii}

TIM BARNETT (Labour):

1st Reading Civil Unions Bill

“The Civil Union Bill is an acceptable alternative; marriage can remain untouched.”^{xxxiii}

Hon DAVID BENSON-POPE (Labour, Associate Minister of Justice):

1st Reading Civil Unions Bill

“Through the Civil Union Bill, the Government ...is also confirming that in New Zealand marriage remains solely available to a man and a woman. Marriage will continue to be covered by a separate Act and recognised as a separate institution. ...The social, religious, and traditional values associated with marriage will remain”

3rd Reading

“Marriage remains something available solely to a man and a woman. Civil unions offer an alternative to those unable to marry, or who do not wish to marry.”^{xxxiv}

Hon CHRIS CARTER (Labour):

1st Reading Civil Unions Bill

“I accept that marriage has a traditional and religious heritage, which is why our churches are so protective of it ...Having said that, I utterly reject the idea that the State cannot create an alternative way of recognising couples—be they straight or gay—...”^{xxxv}

METIRIA TUREI (Green):

1st Reading Civil Unions Bill

“Marriage as understood in our society, and as formalised in law, is a specific culturally and historically bound institution. ...This bill does not affect the Marriage Act. It does not change in any way the structure, the validity, of the institution of marriage.”^{xxxvi}

JOHN KEY (National):

2006

“Marriage is an institution of the church, I don't think it is necessary to have that label put on every relationship.”

2008

“I don't think there's a real need to change the current legislation or to adopt new legislation.”^{xxxvii}

GERRY BROWNLEE (National):

1st Reading Civil Unions Bill

“Marriage exists essentially for the protection of children, and, as I said at the start, this country is increasingly putting unacceptable pressures on children.”^{xxxviii}

CHRISTOPHER FINLAYSON (National):

Marriage (Gender Clarification) Amendment Bill 2005

“I believe that marriage is a union between a man and a woman, and I could not support any attempt to amend the Marriage Act to accommodate marriages between persons of the same sex. ... (W)e have all received correspondence in recent days from people who genuinely believe that same-sex marriage is just around the corner. ... Same-sex marriage is not around the corner.”^{xxxix}

Hon Dr NICK SMITH (National):

3rd Reading Civil Unions Bill

“There is a simple, historical quid pro quo: that this Parliament provide, in the law of the land, special recognition of marriage, because marriage between a man and a woman is the beginning of the next generation of a family and of the future of our country.”^{xli}

BARACK OBAMA (US President):

2008 Presidential Campaign

“I believe that marriage is the union between a man and a woman..... for me as a Christian, it is also a sacred union....but I do believe in civil unions.”^{xlii}

THE AUSTRALIAN DEBATE ON SAME-SEX MARRIAGE

We note that the Australian House of Representatives and the Senate have voted down separate private members bills seeking to legalise same-sex marriage. In separate votes the House of Representatives voted 98 to 42 to ensure that marriage remains exclusively between a man and a woman. In the Senate the vote on a different bill but one that was seeking the same outcome, to legalise same-sex marriage, the vote was 41-26.

And more recently Tasmania's 15-member Legislative Council voted down a similar same-sex marriage bill 8-6. From the speech of Senator Smith who is a homosexual Liberal Senator.

Senator SMITH (Western Australia)

during the Marriage debate in Australia in September 2012:

“I rise to add my views to the debate on the Marriage Amendment Bill (No. 2) 2012 and its desire to extend the definition of ‘marriage’ to include couples in same-sex relationships. My views are my own and have been formed after years of discussion, observation and careful consideration. I accept that to some the idea of an openly gay man rejecting a proposition to extend the definition of ‘marriage’ to same-sex relationships seems unusual or counterintuitive. In response, I say that it speaks to the often overlooked fact that opinion on the issue of extending the definition of ‘marriage’ is heavily divided even among gay and lesbian Australians. I do not doubt that there are many gay and lesbian Australians and their families and friends that support the legislation, but there are also others who do not....

“The debate on same-sex marriage has been a complex and controversial one... It has been controversial also because many have confused the religious institution of marriage with marriage as a civil institution. It is marriage as a civil institution that should demand the primary concentration and deliberations of parliamentarians. I believe any future deliberation by the parliament on matters regarding the legal treatment of same-sex couples should make as its focus the task of creating a starker distinction between marriage as a civil institution and its role for some as a religious institution.

“My primary opposition to this proposal is born from my strong regard and faith in the cautionary, conservative and traditional approach to these matters. As I have said previously, I distrust sentiments and actions that seek to dismiss, modify or reject as relics our institutions and customs—institutions and customs that have evolved to serve our community well. I believe that cautious and considered change is critical if we are to bring about stability and continuity for our community.

“I reject the suggestion of marriage equality. Marriage equality has been a slogan; it has been a campaign. The claim to equality ignores the widely accepted fact that marriage is an institution that has a long and well-accepted definition—a definition that is heavily laden with cultural meaning and values crafted by custom and by law over the years. It is an institution that has a common and well-understood meaning in Australia. I dispute the commentary in this place and others suggesting that the majority of Australians are ready to extend the meaning of marriage to same-sex relationships. I also

dispute the view that the inability to utilise the Marriage Act restricts in any fundamental manner the quality of life experiences of gay and lesbian Australians.

“The case for equality for gay and lesbian Australians was a battle too-long fought. It must be acknowledged that on the substantive matters of equality in Australia, gay and lesbian Australians can live at law without discrimination....

“Let me share with you the view of at least one other gay Australian who has challenged the current marriage equality movement. This comment was recorded in April this year in OUTinPerth, a community newspaper based in Perth, my home town. It said: The other thing that’s irritating I suppose about it is that it has become this orthodoxy within the community. Dissenting voices are not allowed, it’s just assumed that if you’re gay you’re for it, as it’s clearly a human right – which it’s not. The article goes on to what I regard as the most important, but all too often forgotten, critical element in the debate when it says: The right is to have our relationship recognised equally by the State; the right is not to marriage.

“...By not agreeing to same-sex marriage, I am not choosing to endorse discrimination against my fellow gay and lesbians Australians or to be disrespectful to their domestic relationships, or to lessen the value of their commitments, companionship, love and unions. Instead, for me, it is an honest acknowledgement, of the special and unique characteristics of the union described as ‘marriage’.”^{xlii}

UNITED NATIONS

A just-released report from the UN High Commissioner for Human Rights “*Born Free and Equal*” looks at sexual orientation and gender identity in international human rights law and sets out the source and scope of State obligations to protect the human rights LGBT people.

The report reminds us that under International human rights laws, States are not required to allow same-sex couples to marry. (p53)^{xliii}

The Universal Declaration of Human Rights says;

Article 16.

(1) Men and women of full age, without any limitation due to race, nationality or religion, have the right to marry and to found a family. They are entitled to equal rights as to marriage, during marriage and at its dissolution.

(2) Marriage shall be entered into only with the free and full consent of the intending spouses.

(3) The family is the natural and fundamental group unit of society and is entitled to protection by society and the State.^{xliv}

We note the emphasis on ‘natural and fundamental group’, and the absence of sexuality in the Article.

Former Australian Crown Prosecutor James Bowen says:^{xlv}

“There is no widely recognized right for same-sex couples to marry. If such a right had ever existed, we could expect to find it enshrined in the major international human rights instruments signed by Australia, and in particular, the Universal Declaration of Human Rights (compare articles 15 (1) and 16 (1)) and the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights (compare articles 22 (1) and 23 (2)). Those articles specifically acknowledge the right of “men and women” to marry. This wording in relation to marriage is critical because other rights are granted to “everyone”. If the articles had said “Everyone has the right to marry”, homosexuals would have a case to argue, but they are specifically excluded from marriage.”

MISREPRESENTING RESEARCH ON TEEN SUICIDE

We note comments made by politicians and supporters of the bill relating to teen suicide.^{xlvi} They have referred to research done by the New Zealand Adolescent Health Research group, and they suggest that the disproportionately high rates of suicide attempts by same-sex attracted teens is due in part to the current definition of marriage.

But significantly, the report says:

“It is apparent that further investigation of potential differences according to sexual attraction is warranted and that studies in the area of human sexuality require some understanding of a range of inter-related concepts, with the issues of definition and description holding particular importance.” (page 5)

And in a comparison of rates between 2001 and 2007, the report says:

“There were no major changes observed between the two surveys (2001 and 2007) in the proportions of same/both-sex-attracted students reporting depressive symptoms or suicide attempts, even though there were substantial reductions in suicide attempts among opposite sex- attracted students over that time.” (page 21)

This is significant because during this period of time, major changes were made to legislation regarding same-sex couples including the Civil Union Act and the Relationships Act. If the assertions were correct, there should have been a drop in these rates.

Massachusetts has been tracking gay high school students for a decade using the Centre for Disease Control and Prevention's Youth Risk Behaviour Survey. In 2001, gay teens in Massachusetts were almost four times more likely to have attempted suicide (31% vs. 8%). In 2007 -- after four years of legalised same-sex marriage in that state -- gay teens were still about four times more likely to attempt suicide than non-gay teens (29% vs. 6%).^{xlvii}

What politicians and supporters also *didn't* mention was one of the conclusions from the Fergusson, Horwood & Beautrais 1999 study (quoted in the Youth '07 report) –

“it has been argued that because of a series of social processes that centre on homophobic attitudes, GLB youth are exposed to serious personal stresses that increase their likelihood of suicidal behaviour. However, a reappraisal of these claims showed them not to be well founded in evidence, and reviews of this issue concluded that problems in existing research were such that no clear conclusions about the role of sexual orientation in suicidal behaviour could be drawn.”^{xlviii}

Teen suicide is always a tragedy. But tragedies should not be manipulated in order to advance an agenda.

The attempts to argue that if we allow same-sex marriage, same-sex attracted teens will be less likely to have disproportionately high rates of alcohol and other drug-abuse problems, depression, other mental health problems, self-harm, unsafe sexual behaviour, including HIV risk, and suicide attempts are not supported by research, and are therefore not relevant to this particular debate.

THE PROBLEMS RELATING TO RESEARCH ON PARENTING BY SAME SEX COUPLES

In a review of all the studies that purport to find no difference between children raised in families by same-sex parents and parents of different sex, major methodological flaws have been noted. For example, the studies have very small sample sizes, biased sample selection, or lack of control groups.

This is summed up from three sources:

1. Research on homosexual parenting

American College of Paediatricians

“Studies that appear to indicate neutral to favourable child outcomes from homosexual parenting have critical design flaws. These include non-longitudinal design, inadequate sample size, biased sample selection, lack of proper controls, failure to account for confounding variables, and perhaps most problematic - all claim to affirm the null hypothesis. Therefore, it is impossible for these studies to provide any support for the alleged safety or potential benefits to children from same-sex parenting.”^{lix}

2. Why Same-Sex Parenting Is Hard to Study^l

The Future of Children is a collaboration of the Woodrow Wilson School of Public and International Affairs at Princeton University and the Brookings Institution.

“This body of research grew partly out of court cases in which lesbian and gay parents (or co-parents) sought to defend or obtain custody of children.^{li} Many researchers approached the subject with a sympathetic or protective attitude toward the children and families they studied. Critics have accused researchers of downplaying differences between children of gay and straight parents, especially if those differences could be interpreted unfavourably—a charge that has been debated in the field.^{lii} We will not enter that debate here, beyond noting that the best defence against bias is always to judge each study, whatever its author’s motivation, critically and on its merits.

“More significant, we believe, are the daunting methodological challenges that the researchers faced, especially at first.

“Difficulty Finding Representative Samples

Perhaps the most important such challenge is that researchers have no complete listing of gay and lesbian parents from which to draw representative samples (probability samples, as researchers call them). To find study participants, they have often had to rely on word-of-mouth referrals, advertisements, and other recruiting tools that may produce samples not at all like the full population of gay and lesbian parents. All but one of the studies we examined employed samples composed of either totally or predominantly white participants. Almost all the participants were middle- to upper-middle-class, urban, well educated, and “out.” Most were lesbians, not gay men. Participants were often clustered in a single place. It may be that most same-sex parents are white, relatively affluent lesbians, or it may be merely that these parents are the easiest for researchers to find and recruit, or both may be partly true. No one knows. Absent probability samples, generalizing findings is impossible.

“Small Sample Sizes

Gay- and lesbian-headed families can be difficult to locate, and funding for this research has been sparse. Those factors and others have forced researchers to deal with the challenge of small samples. Most studies describing the development of children raised in gay or lesbian homes report findings on fewer than twenty-five children, and most comparative studies compare fewer than thirty children in each of the groups studied. Other things being equal, the smaller the number of subjects in the groups studied, the harder it is to detect differences between those groups.^{liii}

“Comparison Groups

The question is often not just how well same-sex parents and their children fare, but compared with whom? Should a single lesbian mother be compared with a single heterosexual mother? If so, divorced or never married? Should a two-mother family be compared with a two-biological-parent family, a mother-father family headed by one biological parent and one stepparent, or a single-parent family? It all depends on what the researcher wants to know. Identifying appropriate comparison groups has proved vexing, and no consistent or wholly convincing approach has emerged. Many studies mix family forms in both their homosexual and heterosexual groups, blurring the meaning of the comparison being made. Some studies do not use comparison groups at all and simply describe children or adults in same-sex households. Some, in fact, have argued that comparing gay and straight families, no matter how closely matched the groups, is inappropriate inasmuch as it assumes a “heterosexual norm” against which same-sex parents and their children should be judged.

“Subject-Group Heterogeneity

As we noted, families headed by same-sex parents are structurally very different from one another. That fact presents researchers with another challenge, because studies are most accurate when each of the groups being examined or compared is made up of similar individuals or families. When the pool of potential subjects is small, as it is for same-sex parents, assuring within-group homogeneity is often difficult. Thus some studies use “mixed” groups of lesbian-headed households, yielding results that are difficult to interpret. For example, partnered lesbians are often included with single lesbians, with all called “single” by the author; children who live both in and outside the home are discussed as a single group; children born into homes that originated both as heterosexual marriages and as lesbian households are included in the same sample; and separated and divorced women are mixed with never married women and called “single.” In at least one of the studies reviewed, children of transsexuals and lesbians, children who are both biological and adopted, and parents who are both biological and adopters are treated as a single group.

“Measurement Issues

Another challenge is to gauge how well children are faring. Few studies collect data from the children directly, and even fewer observe the children's behaviour—the gold standard for research of this kind, but more expensive and time-consuming than asking parents and children to evaluate themselves. Some studies use non-standardised measures, while others use either measures with poor reliability and validity or measures whose reliability and validity were either not known or not reported.

“Another measurement issue arises from the sometimes dated content of the measures used. In one 1986 study, for example, dressing in pants and wanting to be a doctor or lawyer were considered masculine for girls, and seeking leadership roles was considered a display of dominance.^{liv} Those classifications look rather quaint today.

“Statistical Issues

To some extent, researchers can compensate for heterogeneous samples and non-equivalent comparison groups by using statistical methods that control for differences, particularly in studies with larger samples. Not all studies have done so, especially in the era before today's advanced software made statistical work considerably easier. Some studies thus did not perform appropriate statistical analyses when that was possible. Others did not report the direction of the significant relationships that they found, leaving unclear which group of children fared better. Most failed to control for potentially confounding factors, such as divorce stress or the status of a current relationship with a former partner.

"Putting the Research Challenges in Perspective

This is an imposing catalogue of challenges and shortcomings, and it needs to be seen in context. The challenges we describe are by no means unique to the research on same-sex parenting, and neither are the flaws that result. Studying small, hard-to-locate populations is inherently difficult, especially if the subject pool is reticent. One of us, Meezan, has been conducting and reviewing field research on foster and adoptive families since the 1970s; he finds that the studies reviewed here are not under par by the standards of their discipline at the time they were conducted."

3. APA - Wrong on Same-sex parenting and children's outcomes

Science Direct.com July 2012

Loren Marks, Louisiana State University

"In 2005, the American Psychological Association (APA) issued an official brief on lesbian and gay parenting. This brief included the assertion: "Not a single study has found children of lesbian or gay parents to be disadvantaged in any significant respect relative to children of heterosexual parents" (p. 15). The present article closely examines this assertion and the 59 published studies cited by the APA to support it. Seven central questions address: (1) homogeneous sampling, (2) absence of comparison groups, (3) comparison group characteristics, (4) contradictory data, (5) the limited scope of children's outcomes studied, (6) paucity of long-term outcome data, and (7) lack of APA-urged statistical power. The conclusion is that strong assertions, including those made by the APA, were not empirically warranted. Recommendations for future research are offered.^{lv}

Highlights:

- *A 26 of 59 APA studies on same-sex parenting had no heterosexual comparison groups.*
- *In comparison studies, single mothers were often used as the hetero comparison group.*
- *No comparison study had the statistical power required to detect a small effect size.*
- *Definitive claims were not substantiated by the 59 published studies."*

WHAT DO THE POLLS REALLY SAY?

One of the arguments for passing this bill is the proposition that the bill enjoys majority public support. We dispute this. It depends on the poll and on the question.

A Research NZ poll last month^{lvi} shows that support for same-sex marriage has dropped to less than 50%, down 11% from a similar poll in 2011^{lvii}. Only 49% of the 500 respondents said that they were in favour of same sex couples being allowed to marry. This is down from 60% in a July 2011 poll by the same research company.

What Research NZ didn't ask was whether NZ'ers felt that the availability of Civil Unions dealt with the issue of same-sex couples who wanted their relationship legally recognised. Some respondents who answered yes to same-sex marriage may believe that this option is sufficient without redefining marriage.

Other polls show that NZ'ers are anything but decided on this issue – which is why we have welcomed this debate.

NZ Herald Digi-Poll June 30 2012

More than half of New Zealanders approved of gay marriage, while 40.5 per cent opposed it^{lviii}

 News Poll

Should same-sex marriage be legalised?

Yes - Gay couples should have the same legal rights as everybody else (4205)

 37%

No - Marriage should be between a man and a woman (6938)

 61%

Not sure (270)

 2%

[Back to poll](#)

11,000+ respondents

May 2012

One News Colmar Brunton poll

Question: "In New Zealand same-sex couples can enter into a Civil Union, but they are not able to get married. Do you think same-sex couples should be able to get married?"

Yes 63%

No 31%

Don't know 5%

Prefer not to say 1%

Base: n=1,005 Eligible New Zealand Voters, 26th – 30th May 2012

However, earlier polling of 1,000 NZ'ers through independent research company Curia Market Research found greater support (52%-42%) for maintaining the definition of marriage as a man and a woman.^{lx}

The full report is attached – **Appendix 3**

In the US, polls have also shown support for same-sex marriage increasing, yet in 32 states where the issue has been on the ballot, voters have rejected it. Experts have said that the phrasing of the question can determine the outcome of the poll. We note that as recent as May this year, North Carolinians voted by a margin of more than 20 percentage points for an amendment that would ban same-sex marriages.^{lxi}

We wish to appear before the Committee

Yours sincerely



Bob McCoskrie
National Director
bob@familyfirst.org.nz

- ⁱ 316 U.S. 535, 541 (1942).
- ⁱⁱ The Meaning of Marriage: Family, State, Market and Morals, Spence Publishing Company, Dallas, 2006
- ⁱⁱⁱ http://papers.ssrn.com/sol3/Delivery.cfm/SSRN_ID1722155_code1540388.pdf?abstractid=1722155&mirid=4
- ^{iv} <http://richardtwaghome.wordpress.com/2011/04/05/gay-marriage/>
- ^v http://books.google.co.nz/books?id=hoPYv_I4g_4C&printsec=frontcover&source=gbs_ge_summary_r&cad=0#v=onepage&q&f=false
- ^{vi} <http://www.thepunch.com.au/articles/the-law-shouldnt-be-changed-in-nsw-to-allow-gay-adoption/>
- ^{vii} Head Start Bureau of the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services (2004). Building Blocks for Father Involvement, Building Block 1: Appreciating How Fathers Give Children a Head Start, <http://www.hsnc.org/fatherhood/Resources/root/data/Building%20Blocks/HSBCombo4.1.pdf>
- ^{viii} <http://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0049089X12000580>
- ^{ix} http://pfox.org/Homosexuals_Opposed_to_Pride_Extremism.html
- ^x <http://www.jubilee-centre.org/document.php?id=432>
- ^{xi} http://www.nzherald.co.nz/nz-government/news/article.cfm?c_id=144&objectid=10830645
- ^{xii} <http://richardtwaghome.wordpress.com/2011/04/05/gay-marriage/>
- ^{xiii} http://www.gaynz.com/articles/publish/5/article_11534.php
- ^{xiv} <http://www.protectmarriage.org.nz/archives/ian-bassett-barrister-legal-opinion>
- ^{xv} http://www.southerncrosschambers.co.nz/Grant_Illingworth.php
- ^{xvi} <http://www.legislation.govt.nz/act/public/1990/0109/latest/DLM224792.html>
- ^{xvii} <http://www.legislation.govt.nz/act/public/1993/0082/latest/DLM304212.html>
- ^{xviii} <http://www.cbc.ca/news/canada/saskatchewan/story/2011/01/10/sk-marriage-commissioners-1101.html>
- ^{xix} <http://www.pinknews.co.uk/2011/09/02/tory-mp-calls-for-churches-to-be-banned-from-holding-marriages-if-they-refuse-gay-couples/>
- ^{xx} <http://www.bbc.co.uk/news/uk-19467554>
- ^{xxi} <http://www.telegraph.co.uk/news/uknews/law-and-order/9260335/Storm-as-Law-Society-bans-conference-debating-gay-marriage.html>
- ^{xxii} <http://www.telegraph.co.uk/news/worldnews/europe/denmark/9317447/Gay-Danish-couples-win-right-to-marry-in-church.html>
- ^{xxiii} <http://ionainstitute.org/index.php?id=1907>
- ^{xxiv} <http://www.haaretz.com/news/national/israeli-lesbian-couple-awarded-nis-60-000-after-being-turned-away-from-wedding-hall.premium-1.464503?block=true>
- ^{xxv} <http://radio.foxnews.com/toddstarnes/top-stories/proposed-law-would-force-churches-to-host-gay-weddings.html>
- ^{xxvi} <http://www.abc.net.au/news/2012-05-14/gay-marriage-view-controversy-in-vic/4010034>
- ^{xxvii} <http://www.google.co.nz/url?sa=t&rct=j&q=ministry%20of%20women's%20affairs%20polygamous&source=web&cd=5&ved=0CFgQFjAE&url=http%3A%2F%2Fwww.mwa.govt.nz%2Fnews-and-pubs%2Fpublications%2Fwork-and-enterprise%2Fwork-balance.doc&ei=0VXFT87OINCPiAeioOTyAg&usq=AFQjCNH0kcnQummY4dQa66kGGb3jSdhAZQ>
- ^{xxviii} Beyond Same-Sex Marriage: A New Strategic Vision For All Our Families & Relationships, BEYONDMARRIAGE.ORG (July 26, 2006), http://beyondmarriage.org/full_statement.html
- ^{xxix} National Coalition of Gay Organizations, "The 1972 Gay Rights Platform," Chicago, 1972
- ^{xxx} http://www.americanvalues.org/html/r-marriage_in_america.html
- ^{xxxi} http://www.nzherald.co.nz/nz/news/article.cfm?c_id=1&objectid=3573846
- ^{xxxii} http://www.parliament.nz/mi-NZ/PB/Debates/Debates/e/b/d/47HansD_20040624_00000745-Civil-Union-Bill-First-Reading.htm
- ^{xxxiii} Ibid;
- ^{xxxiv} Ibid;
- ^{xxxv} Ibid;
- ^{xxxvi} Ibid;
- ^{xxxvii} <http://www.protectmarriage.org.nz/wp-content/uploads/2012/09/John-Key-Gay-express.pdf>
- ^{xxxviii} Ibid;
- ^{xxxix} http://www.parliament.nz/en-NZ/PB/Debates/Debates/3/f/2/48HansD_20051207_00001276-Marriage-Gender-Clarification-Amendment.htm
- ^{xl} http://www.parliament.nz/en-NZ/PB/Debates/Debates/b/a/a/47HansD_20041209_00000803-Civil-Union-Bill-Procedure-Third-Reading.htm
- ^{xli} <http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=rJhQBZ1La0w>
- ^{xlii} <http://parlinfo.aph.gov.au/parlInfo/search/display/display.w3p;db=CHAMBER;id=chamber%2Fhansards%2F2e9571fe-03fd-411b-9e11-6c9629474f79%2F0066;query=Id%3A%22chamber%2Fhansards%2F2e9571fe-03fd-411b-9e11-6c9629474f79%2F0000%22>
- ^{xliiii} <http://www.ohchr.org/Documents/Publications/BornFreeAndEqualLowRes.pdf>

^{xliv} <http://www.un.org/en/documents/udhr/index.shtml>

^{xlv} <http://www.endeavourforum.org.au/Newsletters/2012/nosamesex.html>

^{xlvi} <http://www.greens.org.nz/speeches/kevin-hague-speaks-marriage-definition-marriage-amendment-bill>

^{xlvii} <http://www.doe.mass.edu/cnp/hprograms/yrbs/>

^{xlviii} <http://archpsyc.jamanetwork.com/article.aspx?articleid=205418>

^{xliv} <http://acpeds.org/Homosexual-Parenting-Is-It-Time-For-Change.html>

The College was founded in 2002 by a group of pediatricians including Joseph Zanga, a past president of the American Academy of Pediatrics (AAP)

<http://www.princeton.edu/futureofchildren/publications/journals/article/index.xml?journalid=37&articleid=108§ionid=700>

^{li} “A third perspective from which [research] interest in lesbian and gay families with children has arisen is that of the law. . . . Because judicial and legislative bodies in some states have found lesbians and gay men unfit as parents because of their sexual orientation, lesbian mothers and gay fathers have often been denied custody or visitation with their children following divorce.” Charlotte Patterson, “Lesbian Mothers, Gay Fathers, and Their Children,” in *Lesbian, Gay and Bisexual Identities over the Lifespan: Psychological Perspectives*, edited by Anthony R. D’Augelli and Charlotte Patterson (Oxford University Press, 1995), p. 264.

^{lii} Judith Stacey and Timothy J. Biblarz examine twenty-one studies and find that “researchers frequently downplay findings indicating difference regarding children’s gender and sexual preferences and behavior.” Judith Stacey and Timothy Biblarz, “(How) Does the Sexual Orientation of Parents Matter?” *American Sociological Review* 66 (April 2001): 159–83. Golombok and others reply that it is Stacey and Biblarz who “have overemphasized the differences that have been reported between children with lesbian and heterosexual parents.” Susan Golombok and others, “Children with Lesbian Parents: A Community Study,” *Developmental Psychology* 39, no. 1 (January 2003): 21.

^{liii} For example, Tasker and Golombok note that there was only a 51 percent chance of detecting a moderate effect size in their sample, and an even lower possibility (if any at all) of detecting a small effect size. See Fiona Tasker and Susan Golombok, *Growing Up in a Lesbian Family* (New York: Guilford Press, 1997).

^{liv} Richard Green and others, “Lesbian Mothers and Their Children: A Comparison with Solo Parent Heterosexual Mothers and Their Children,” *Archives of Sexual Behavior* 15, no. 2 (1986): 167–83.

^{lv} <http://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0049089X12000580>

^{lvi} <http://www.researchnz.com/pdf/Media%20Releases/RNZ%20Media%20Release%20-%20Same%20sex%20marriage.pdf>

^{lvii} <http://www.researchnz.com/pdf/Media%20Releases/RNZ%20Media%20Release%20-%202011-07-12%20Same%20sex%20marriages.pdf>

^{lviii} http://www.nzherald.co.nz/nz/news/article.cfm?c_id=1&objectid=10816487

^{lix} <http://nz.news.yahoo.com/a/-/top-stories/13956231/two-gay-marriage-bills-in-the-ballot-box/>

^{lx} <http://www.familyfirst.org.nz/wp-content/uploads/2011/09/Definition-of-Marriage-Mar-2011-FULL-REPORT.pdf>

^{lxi} http://www.nytimes.com/2012/05/09/us/north-carolina-voters-pass-same-sex-marriage-ban.html?_r=0