



## **SB 1066 Domestic Partnerships**

Carole Migden (D-San Rafael)

CWA Position – Oppose

### Talking Points

1. SB 1066 extends California domestic partnerships to any two persons who share a common residence and are over 18. All marriage rights would accrue to any two people living under one roof sharing “one another’s lives in an intimate and committed relationship of mutual caring.”
2. Less than six years ago, 61.4 percent of California voters supported Proposition 22. The intent of this initiative, which is now law, was to define marriage, and the rights and responsibilities of this foundational relationship, as between one man and one woman. Marriage is granted certain privileges because of the unique role it plays in our society. The union of a man and a woman, who complement each other physically and emotionally, provides the best environment for raising well-rounded and healthy children and forms a stabilizing force in our society. Since the passage of Proposition 22 the benefits of marriage, without the consent of the people of California, have been wrongly transferred to same-sex relationships. SB 1066 seeks to further extend the rights and benefits of marriage to any two people living together in a “committed relationship.”
3. Extending marriage benefits to same-sex relationships, which are simply not as stable as marriage, was wrong. Now Sen. Migden wants to compound one error with another, giving these benefits to heterosexual relationships where two persons are not “committed enough” to take the step of marriage, but desire its benefits – the proverbial having one’s cake and eating it, too. The California legislature should not continue to undermine marriage by granting its benefits to adult relationships that do not offer society and children the stability and value that marriage does.
4. Migden asserts that her idea is “a very practical expansion that absolutely reflects the new family unit today.” The family unit has taken on new variants, to be sure, but fatherless households, same-sex relationships and cohabiting parents have not been shown to benefit those involved. Why, then, should government form alternative weaker bonds and purposefully grant marriage benefits to those relationships merely because they exist?
5. SB 1066 is an expensive experiment using children as test subjects. Migden has stated, “Perhaps providing benefits will lead to marriage by stabilize (sic) couples with children.” Statistics on cohabitation reveal the opposite is true. For example:
  - The divorce rates of women who cohabit are nearly 80 percent higher than those who do not, and the percentage of couples who marry after cohabiting has steadily declined since the 1970s.
  - Cohabiting increases the risk of domestic violence for women.
  - The risk of physical and sexual abuse for children is 20 times more likely if biological parents are cohabiting and 33 times more likely if the male is not the natural father.
  - Seventy-five percent of children born to cohabiting couples will see their parents split up before they reach age sixteen compared to one-third of children born to married parents.
  - Children living with their mother and her unmarried partner have more behavior problems and poorer academic performance than children from intact families.
6. The ability of any two people in a “committed” relationship to create a domestic partnership and receive special privileges creates an environment ripe for exploitation and abuse. Essentially, mere roommates can file for a partnership just to receive insurance from their cohabitant’s employer as well as other financial advantages.

**CONCERNED WOMEN FOR AMERICA  
OF CALIFORNIA**