

**STANDING COMMITTEE ON LAW AND JUSTICE**  
**Inquiry into legislation on altruistic surrogacy in NSW**

**ADDITIONAL INFORMATION IN RESPONSE TO QUESTIONS ON  
NOTICE AND QUESTIONS TAKEN AT THE INQUIRY**

**Catholic Archdioceses of Sydney**  
**Mr Christopher Meney**  
Submission 10

**Government regulation of altruistic surrogacy**

1. In your submission (p 7) you raise the possibility that government regulation of altruistic surrogacy might be perceived as encouraging and condoning the practice. Can you explain further how government regulation might have this effect?
  - Governments exist to uphold and defend what are truly the best interests of the people they represent. By their very nature governments are expected to regulate society and as a result of what they accept and reject in law, governments influence the moral views of those they represent.
  - We might reasonably ask ourselves what would be the point of regulation and law if they did not affect the understandings of people on what is right and wrong, good and bad. For many people, legal equates to moral. That is why law-making which is unconnected with moral or ethical principles is so potentially harmful.
  - The Catholic Bishops of Victoria in their recent letter to the people of that State during the debate surrounding the controversial abortion legislation made the following point, "The law is a great educator and if the law approves something then people gradually accept a new understanding of what is right and what is wrong".
  - Government regulation of surrogacy risks being seen by the community as a sign of endorsement of surrogacy as a form of family formation.
  - We need a balance between protecting the best interests of all the parties involved – especially those of children – and not promoting surrogacy as a 'right' or social good by enacting legislation to facilitate surrogacy.
  - One illustration of where government regulation has had the effect of encouraging and condoning social practice can be seen with the initiatives of the UK government in their pledge to cut teen pregnancy rates by 50%. To achieve this they implemented high levels of sex education and the distribution of contraceptives and morning after pills at high schools.

Official figures released last week showed that teenage pregnancies in England rose year-on-year by more than 800, despite the £15 million spent by the Government on strategies to reduce them... There has also been a 62 per cent increase in the number of cases of sexually transmitted diseases among young people aged 19 and under, rising from 25,143 cases in 1997 to 40,821 in 2002. ('Teen pregnancies increase after sex education classes', Telegraph, Britain, 16/03/04)

In this case we have a not uncommon occurrence of a government stepping in to regulate an undesirable behaviour (teen sexual activity) in order to limit one

complication (teen pregnancy) with the effect of further legitimising the behaviour which the society is attempting to discourage.

### **Social impact of surrogacy**

2. In your submission (p 5) you state that surrogacy ‘undermines the role and ability of the natural family to contribute to the flourishing of persons, communities and society.’ Can you explain how surrogacy has this effect?

- It is a sensible sociological and historical given that sound, flourishing families are vital for healthy communities and societies.
- Surrogacy intentionally results in confused family relationships (between parents and children, between spouses, between siblings),
- Amounts to a social experiment
- Government sanctioned surrogacy arrangements affect more than just the adults or child concerned. They send a clear message to the wider community that:
  - biological connectedness between generations is unimportant
  - biological sibling or half sibling relationships don’t matter – or at least are not important during the process of a child’s development
  - contrary to all they may hear about mother-child bonding and maternal *in utero* attachment, such relationships are of no importance
- Heterologous surrogacy diminishes that sense of social connectedness that encourages grandparents to lay up store for those grandchildren with whom they are connected by blood and kinship ties;
- In the case of homosexual parents who obtain children via surrogacy arrangements, this says that having a father and a mother is an unnecessary duplication and that fathers can ‘mother’ just as well as women and that mothers can ‘father’ just as well as men.
- Surrogacy says that no child has the right to be created in an act of love between two spouses who have made a lifelong commitment to both each other and to the nurture and protection of their children
- In summary, it is enormously distortive of the understanding of family and of that social unit which has been the basis of all flourishing societies.

3. In your submission (p 6) you state that surrogacy contributes to the deconstruction of parenthood. Can you elaborate on this?

- Surrogacy involves an *intentional* rupture between genetic, gestational, and social parenting roles.
- Undermines our understanding of traditional roles of mother and father.
- The parent child relationship is the most pivotal and foundation relationship that a person can have. To know that one is biologically connected to parents and thus to a line of grandparents, great-grandparents etc gives each person a secure place where they gain a sense of inter-generational belonging
- If government is seen to support (even nominally) the idea that we should be unconcerned about deliberately creating children who will be intentionally displaced from some or all of their genuine biological and parental connections it begins to erode the notion that the child-parent relationship is preeminent in building a healthy society.

- Endorsed surrogacy also says that children are not gifts in and of themselves but rather are commodities that can be subject to contractual arrangements which can be shaped to satisfy the wants of adults.
- Children are the ones who have the most to lose.

### **Wellbeing of surrogate children**

4. In your submission (p 3) you refer to some of the health risks to children through using ART procedures. Can you elaborate on what these risks are as they relate to surrogacy?
  - If we have data which suggests that children are at greater health risk through the use of ART, then we are not acting in the interests of children if we legislate so as to encourage the creation of children through the use of such technology.
  - The medical risks as they relate to surrogacy are the same as for any child born of IVF.

---

[ZENIT, Dr. Carlo Bellieni, professor of neonatal therapy at the School of Pediatrics of the University of Siena, 6.6.04]

Q: What are the risks for children conceived in vitro?

Three studies on large numbers of children conceived in vitro were published in 2002 in prestigious international scientific journals and the conclusions are not at all comforting.

The conclusions verify that "Children who are underweight at birth run the risk of incapacity and death. The use of IVF implies an increase of children who are underweight at birth in the U.S. because it is associated with a high rate of twin births. Until 1997, IVF was the cause of 40% of triple births. Likewise, studies show that there are more underweight children at birth by IVF than in normal pregnancies" [Citation from Schieve, L.A. et al: "Low and Very Low Birth Weight in Infants Conceived with Use of Assisted Reproductive Technology," The New England Journal of Medicine, 2002; 346:731-737].

"Our study suggests that children born by IVF have an increased risk of developing cerebral problems, in particular cerebral paralysis" [Stromberg B. et al: "Neurological Sequelae in Children Born after In-Vitro Fertilization: A Population-Based Study," The Lancet, 2002; 359: 461-5].

"Children conceived with the use of 'Intracytoplasmic Sperm Injection' (ICSI) or IVF run a double risk of presenting a greater defect at birth in relation to the general population" [Hansen, M. et al: "The Risk of Major Birth Defects After Intracytoplasmic Sperm Injection and In Vitro Fertilization," The New England Journal of Medicine, 2002; 346 (10): 725-30)].

These studies were used in other paediatric journals that emphasized: "In February of 2002, a team of Uppsala, Sweden, referred to a retrospective work on 5,680 children born by IVF: it showed that in general, children born by IVF have greater need for rehabilitation centres in relation to the normal population and the risk (OR) of cerebral paralysis is 3.7. The greatest difference is observed among children of single birth, while

the risk of those born as twins is similar to that of the normal population. In an Australian study, 8.6% of children born by IVF had greater defects at birth, double that of the control group" [Koren, G.: "Adverse Effects of Assisted Reproductive Technology and Pregnancy Outcome," *Pediatric Research*, 2002].

The risk of having a handicapped child by opting for IVF is 11% compared to 5% by normal conception [NN: "Neurological Sequelae and Major Birth Defects in Children Born after In Vitro Fertilization or Intracytoplasmic Sperm Injection," *European Journal of Pediatrics*, 2003; 162:64].

Australian research group referred to above has subsequently analysed 25 studies from around the world and found that IVF babies consistently showed a 25 to 40 per cent greater risk of abnormalities including cleft palate, spina bifida and heart problems. However, the researchers do not know why the birth defects are more common among IVF babies. [Defect risk is 40pc higher with IVF, Clara Pirani, Medical reporter, *The Australian*, 28jan05.]

A recent analysis of 25 scientific studies published in the *British Medical Journal* concludes that single pregnancies from assisted reproduction have a significantly worse perinatal result in relation to the normal population. [Frans M. Helmerhorst et al.: "Perinatal Outcome of Singletons and Twins After Assisted Conception" A Systematic Review of Controlled Studies," *British Medical Journal*, 2004; 328:261.]

5. In your submission (p 4) you argue that a child can suffer 'indignity and harm' and experience 'genealogical bewilderment' through surrogacy arrangements. Can you elaborate on this view?
  - Genealogical bewilderment is a term referring to potential identity problems experienced by a child who was either fostered, adopted, or conceived via an assisted reproductive technology procedure such as surrogacy or gamete donation.
  - The term was coined in 1964 by psychologist H. J. Sants, referring to children who have uncertain, little, or no knowledge of one or both of their natural parents. Sants argued that genealogical bewilderment constituted a large part of the additional stress that adoptees experienced that is not experienced by children being raised by their natural parents.
  - To date, most of the literature in this area has focussed upon how an adoptees' lack of knowledge of their origins can result in difficulties in the development of self identity and self esteem. It points to how a sense of continuity, of a past and present is necessary for identity formation.
  - It has also considered how a lack of "biological mutuality" among adoptive family members, such as shared biologically based characteristics regarding appearance, intellectual skills, personality traits, and so forth, can impede an adoptee's ability to identify with adoptive parents.
  - Study in this area has been a significant factor in the shift towards open adoption.
  - Surrogacy intentionally deprives children of clear parental relations: a secure and recognised relationship to his own parents is important to helping a child to discover his or her own identity, develop self esteem and achieve his/her own proper human development

6. In your submission (p 5) you note the 'personal and cultural consequences of further commodifying children by making them the objects of formal contracts.' Could you elaborate on this?
  - Even when parties enter into altruistic surrogate arrangements, freely and with good intentions, human procreation still occurs in a context of contracts – a drawing up terms.
  - Creates and sustains the notion that children as 'something' to which adults are entitled rather than 'someone' who is received into a family as a gift.
  - When children become subject to contracts between adults, this further undermines the notion of unconditional love which should be reflected in every parent's love for their child.

### **Wellbeing of adult parties to surrogacy arrangements**

7. In your submission you state (p 6) that surrogacy can have 'detrimental effects upon the family relationships of the commissioning couple, as well as the surrogate mother and her husband/partner.' Can you elaborate on this? Can you direct the Committee to any studies or evidence that address this point?
  - The point here is that surrogacy involves a radical departure from our understanding of the exclusivity of marriage (and stable defacto relationships).
  - The promise of fidelity that a couple make when they marry encompasses the promise to only conceive, and in the case of a woman bear, the child of your spouse.
  - Surrogacy involves the breaking of these promises
    - weakens the integrity of marriage
    - may cause harm to spouses/partners who are not directly involved in the surrogacy process (e.g. the husband of the surrogate mother or the commissioning mother in cases where the commissioning father's sperm is used to fertilise the surrogate (and biological) mothers ovum)
    - feeling that other people are intruding into their marriage.
  - Dani Shapiro, *There is no me without you* (Elle magazine, 29 January 2007)  
 "Sitting across the table from Carly, I examined her carefully – though, I hoped, surreptitiously. I wondered if our meeting was as weird for her as it was for me. At the very moment we sipped our drinks, Carly's eggs were in a petri dish being fertilized by my husband's sperm. I felt jealous, as if she were the other woman in our marriage. Michael's genetic material – his DNA – was cheating on me with the DNA of this blond, blue-eyed UCLA Law student. I imagined his millions of sperm swimming, tails wagging madly, toward her lovely, ripe eggs."
  - Need also to consider the wellbeing of any other children that the commissioning couple, or surrogate mother may have. (What would it be like for a young child to watch his mother carry a baby for nine months and 'give the child away'?). Supporters of surrogacy might argue that the child could benefit from his mother's example of generosity and altruism; but the child might also be left wondering if he will be 'given away' in the future. The reality is that in the

absence of empirical evidence we are experimenting with children's lives. The State's response should be to undertake a very prudential approach which provides no incentives implicit or explicit to create children through surrogacy arrangements which are at best, highly problematic in terms of outcomes for children

8. In your submission (p 6) you raise the possibility that surrogacy arrangements can result in 'emotional coercion' if the surrogate mother is a relative or close friend of the intending parents. Can you elaborate on this possibility?

- The risk here is that the expectations created by close personal relationships will limit a woman's freedom to refuse a request to be a surrogate mother for one's best friend, sister, sister-in-law, or even mother.
- A woman could experience a significant degree of subtle (or overt) emotional coercion to act as a surrogate mother, in order to maintain important relationships with the 'commissioning couple', as well as acceptance within the wider network of family and friends.
- It is a common experience that we are more likely to perform an act against our will, for the sake of loved ones. The unusual and onerous physical and psychological demands of surrogacy, however, mean that acting in this way could have a range of negative effects upon the reluctant surrogate.
- Leon Kass, *Life, Liberty and the Defense of Dignity* (Encounter Books, 2002) on the deep, natural facts of begetting...  
"Human societies virtually everywhere have structured child-rearing responsibilities and systems of identity and relationship on the bases of these deep natural facts of begetting. The mysterious yet ubiquitous natural "love of one's own" is everywhere culturally exploited, to make sure that children are not just produced but well cared for, and to create for everyone clear ties of meaning, belonging and obligation. (p.154) But it is wrong to treat such naturally rooted social practices as mere cultural constructs (like driving on the left or the right, or like burying versus cremating the dead) that we can alter with little human cost. What would kinship be without its clear natural grounding? And what would identity be without kinship?" (p.154)

### **Comments concerning the question of the advantages of Married Couples over Same Sex Couples in relation to the care of children**

**1. Heterosexual Marriage respects and models the difference and complementarity of persons; same sex relationships promote different models, values and behaviours.**

Through marriage we move to a circumstance where we are with an 'other' who is different, who is equal but complementary, who is biologically and psychologically different and yet physically compatible at the most intimate of levels. An acceptance of this natural complementarity of men and women enables an individual to mature in their psychosocial understanding of what it is to be a human person. Same sex relationships cannot welcome children in the same way as a heterosexual couple. This is because same sex couples cannot exemplify the same level of difference and complementarity and

openness to new life. Respect for this natural complementarity is described by sociology professor Dr David Popenoe:

"We should disavow the notion that 'mummies can make good daddies' just as we should disavow the notion of radical feminists that 'daddies can make good mummies'...The two sexes are different to the core and each is necessary – culturally and biologically – for the optimal development of a human being".

David Popenoe, *Life Without Father: Compelling New Evidence That Fatherhood and Marriage are Indispensable for the Good of Children and Society*, (New York: The Free Press 1996), p 197

Although conducting research in the homosexual community appears to be fraught with methodological problems, the few experimental studies that used modestly large samples of children reared by homosexual parents revealed indications of the impact of parent modeling behaviour and found:

"...developmentally important statistically significant differences between children reared by homosexual parents compared to heterosexual parents. For example, children raised by homosexuals were found to have greater parental encouragement for cross-gender behaviour (and) greater amounts of cross-dressing and cross-gender play/role behaviour".

R. Green et al, "Lesbian Mothers and Their children: A Comparison with Solo Parent Heterosexual Mothers and Their Children", *Archives of Sexual Behaviour* 15 (1986): 167-184.

While various studies indicate that around 3% of persons have ever practiced homosexual behaviors in their lifetime, a study in *Developmental Psychology* found that 12% of the children of lesbians became active lesbians themselves.

F. Tasker and S. Golombok, "Adults Raised as Children in Lesbian families", *Developmental Psychology* 31 (1995): p 213

Another longitudinal study which compared children from lesbian families with heterosexual families commented:

"With respect to actual involvement in same-gender sexual relationships, there was a significant difference between groups...None of the children from heterosexual families had experienced a lesbian or gay relationship. By contrast, five of the seventeen daughters and one of the eight sons in homosexual families reported having at least one same-sex relationship".

S. Golombok and F. Tasker, "Do parents Influence the Sexual Orientation of Their Children?", *Developmental Psychology* 32 (1996): 9.

## **2. Heterosexual Marriages are more likely to value fidelity and exclusivity.**

Successful cultures have always esteemed fidelity and exclusivity within marriage. Although adultery is not illegal in Australia, the vast majority of Australians view it as undesirable and wrong. This is because most of us realize that sanctioned dishonesty has an insidious and damaging effect on any society. The *Australian Study of Health and Relationships* (2001) revealed that over 77% of both men and women regard having an affair when in a committed relationship as wrong. Data from the *Australian Family Values Survey* (1997) also revealed that 'faithfulness' was considered the most important aspect for a successful marriage.

In contrast, in the first edition of his book in defence of same-sex marriage, '*Virtually Normal*', homosexual advocate and intellectual Andrew Sullivan wrote:

"There is more likely to be greater understanding of the need for extramarital outlets between two men than between a man and a woman."

One recent university study of civil unions and marriages revealed that 79 percent of heterosexual married men and women reported that they strongly valued sexual fidelity. In comparison, only about 50 percent of gay men in civil unions valued sexual fidelity.

Esther Rothblum and Sondra Solomon. 2003. *Civil Unions in the State of Vermont: A Report on the First Year*. University of Vermont Department of Psychology.

This is consistent with the results of the extensive study of 156 males in homosexual relationships lasting from one to thirty-seven years conducted by McWhirter and Mattison:

"Only seven couples have a totally exclusive sexual relationship, and these men have all 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".

D. McWhirter and A. Mattison, *The Male Couple: How Relationships Develop* (Englewood Cliffs: Prentice-Hall, 1984), p 252,253

Another study published in 2003 found that among homosexual men in the Netherlands, "the rate at which men with a steady partner acquire casual partners' averaged eight per year".

M. Xiridou et al, "The contribution of steady and casual partnerships to the incidence of HIV infection among homosexual men in Amsterdam", *AIDS* 17 (2003): 1031.

Thus, while same sex couples have no monopoly on outside sexual activity, the evidence is considerable that married heterosexuals better value and model sexual fidelity and exclusivity. It is highly likely that higher rates of household promiscuity would impact upon children. One study in the *American Sociological Review* acknowledged the 'political incorrectness' of their finding of higher rates of homosexuality among children of homosexual households:

"We recognize the political dangers of pointing out that recent studies indicate that a higher proportion of children of lesbian parents are themselves apt to engage in homosexual activity...The adolescent and young adult girls raised by lesbian mothers appear to have been more sexually adventurous and less chaste..."

J.Stacey and T. Biblarz, "(How) Does the sexual orientation of Parents Matter", *American Sociological Review* 66 (2001): 174, 179

**3. Heterosexual Marriage respects the intrinsic differences of fatherhood and motherhood.**



There are intrinsic differences between what fathers and mothers are able to offer their children. While gratefully respecting the often heroic efforts made by lone parents, people do not usually enter into parenthood intending to be a single parent. All single mothers and fathers wish that they could still enjoy the complementary contributions of a spouse to the raising of their children. To suggest that fathers' and mothers' contributions to the raising of children are exactly the same is to 'dumb down' sexual difference and complementarity.

Legislative actions that imply that to have both a father and a mother is an unnecessary duplication would also create a dangerous precedent. Promoting the idea that children do not need both a mother and a father would further encourage fathers or mothers to rationalise the abandonment of their children to the other parent thereby further increasing the number of single parents and the number of children in broken families.

In the case of lesbians who obtain children via surrogacy, such children would be without a father in the home. We know that fathers are very important for reducing both antisocial behavior and delinquency in boys and early sexual activity in girls. Fathers exercise a unique social and biological influence on their children. As the journal *Psychology Today* reports:

"Fatherhood turns out to be a complex and unique phenomenon with huge consequences for the emotional and intellectual growth of children."

"Shuttle Diplomacy", *Psychology Today*, July-August, 1993, p.15

A recent study of the effects of father absence on girls found that girls who grew up with an absent biological father were much more likely to experience early puberty and a teen pregnancy than girls who spent their entire childhood in an intact family.

Ellis, Bruce J., Bates, John E., Dodge, Kenneth A., Fergusson, David M., Horwood, L. John, Pettit, Gregory S., & Woodward, Lianne. *Does Father Absence Place Daughters at Special Risk for Early Sexual Activity and Teenage Pregnancy?* Child Development, 74, 801-821.

Relationships where homosexual men raise children deny children a mother. Everything that we know about mothers tells us that they excel in providing children with emotional security and in reading the physical and emotional cues of infants. They also give their daughters the trusted counsel they need as they negotiate the physical, emotional, and social challenges associated with puberty and adolescence.

#### **4. Homosexual Parents May have an Increased Health Risk**

A factor which appears to contribute to an increased risk for children produced via surrogacy and placed in the care of homosexual men is the apparent reduced life expectancy for male homosexuals. A study published in the *International Journal of Epidemiology* concluded:

"In a major Canadian centre, life expectancy at age twenty for gay and bisexual men is eight to twenty years less than for all men. If the same pattern of mortality were to continue, we estimate that nearly half of gay and bisexual men currently aged twenty years will not reach their sixty-fifth birthday."

A case in point involves Wayne Tardiff and Allan Yoder who were the first homosexuals permitted to become adoptive parents in the state of New Jersey. They both died prematurely in 1992 within a few months of each other leaving an orphaned five-year-old.

## **5. Lack of Evidence to Support Equivalence of Same Sex Parenting**

Some 'experts' and professional associations have boldly asserted that there are "no effects" of single-sex couple parenting on children. But it is early days to be making such claims. The studies to date have generally been undertaken by same-sex advocates and they all suffer from serious methodological problems. In a review of 14 studies of homosexual parenting, Belcastro et al reported that:

"All of the studies lacked external validity. The conclusion that there are no significant differences in children raised by lesbian mothers versus heterosexual mothers is not supported by the published research data base".

P. Belcastro et al, "A Review of Data Based Studies Addressing the Effects of Homosexual Parenting on Children's sexual and Social Functioning", *Journal of Divorce and Remarriage* 20 (1993): 105,106

In a further thorough review of homosexual parenting studies, Lerner and Nagai, who are professionals in the field of quantitative analysis, 49 empirical studies on same-sex parenting, were evaluated. They found little evidence to support the position that homosexual households are the same as traditional families:

"We conclude that the methods used in these studies are so flawed that these studies prove nothing. Therefore, they should not be used in legal cases to make any argument about 'homosexual' vs. 'heterosexual' parenting. Their claims have no basis."

Dr R. Lerner and Dr A. Nagai, *No Basis: What the studies Don't Tell us About Same-sex Parenting*, (Washington Ethics and Public policy Centre, 2001): 6.

Perhaps the most thorough review was prepared by sociology professor Steven Nock, who was asked to review several hundred such studies as an expert witness for the Attorney General of Canada. Nock concluded:

"Through this analysis I draw my conclusions that 1) all of the articles I reviewed contained at least one fatal flaw of design or execution; and 2) not a single one of those studies was conducted according to general accepted standards of scientific research."

\*Steven Nock. 2001. Affidavit to the Ontario Superior Court of Justice regarding Hedy Halpern et al. University of Virginia Sociology Department.

## **6. Evidence in Support of Married Heterosexual Parenting**

In contrast, there is significant research in support of the position that children from married heterosexual two-parent households do better academically, financially,

emotionally and behaviorally than children raised in other forms of relationships. One significant study reported in the journal *Children Australia* compared 174 children living in either heterosexual married, heterosexual cohabiting or homosexual cohabiting homes. The study collected information primarily from teachers and only secondarily from parents and teachers. (As such, it avoided the risk of bias on the part of parents who may be tempted to show how 'successful' they are.) The study found that the children of married couples did the best in nine out of thirteen measures including language, mathematics, sport, sociability and attitude to school and to learning. The author concluded:

"Overall, the study has shown that children of married couples are more likely to do well at school, in academic and social terms, than children of co-habiting heterosexual and homosexual couples...In this study, married couples seem to offer the best environment for a child's social and educational development".

S. Sarantakos, "Children in three contexts: Family, Education and Social Development," *Children Australia*, Vol 21, No 3 (1996), 23

See also the following: Sara McLanahan and Gary Sandfeur, *Growing Up with a Single Parent: What Hurts, What Helps* (Cambridge:Harvard University Press, 1994), p. 45; Pat Fagan, "How Broken Families Rob Children of Their Chances for Prosperity," Heritage Foundation *Background* No. 1283, June 11, 1999, p. 13; Dawn Upchurch et al., "Gender and Ethnic Differences in the Timing of First Sexual Intercourse," *Family Planning Perspectives* 30 (1998): 121-127; Jeanne M. Hilton and Esther L. Devall, "Comparison of Parenting and Children's Behavior in Single-Mother, Single-Father, and Intact Families," *Journal of Divorce and Remarriage* 29 (1998): 23-54; Jane Mauldon, "The Effect of Marital Disruption on Children's Health," *Demography* 27 (1990): 431-446; Frank Furstenberg, Jr., and Julien Teitler, "Reconsidering the Effects of Marital Disruption: What Happens to Children of Divorce in Early Adulthood?" *Journal of Family Issues* 15 (June 1994); Elizabeth Thomson et al., "Family Structure and Child Well-Being: Economic Resources vs. Parental Behaviors," *Social Forces* 73 (1994): 221-42.

We recognize that not all married heterosexuals make good parents and that many homosexuals are loving and generous in how they provide for children in their care. However, if we are concerned with giving children the best possible start, on average, married heterosexuals offer this.