

Submission to the Senate Committee for the Marriage Equality Amendment Bill 2010.

This submission is short and simple. The word “Marriage” has a definition and it is hard to understand that anyone would seek to change the definition just because some people don't like it.

Should we consider changing the definition of other words just because some don't like the established definition? Some might not like the definition of “thief” This definition when applied causes all sorts of problems for the people identified as a thief. They are discriminated against in our society, they can't get the employment they seek, they can't get a loan and they have their details recorded and used against them should they be a suspect again.

Where would we be if we just started changing definitions at will. We would create confusion everywhere, in business, in our legal establishment, in financial matters, everywhere. Our language and the definition of words is close on being an absolute and must be stable for reliable communication and for our nation and community to build upon as a stable foundation.

Most people understand the definition of “Marriage” and accept the definition, they understand what it means and what conditions need to be met for them to be eligible to marry. Marriage is a stable foundation upon which our community is based. Our Governments recognise this and have created all sorts of benefits and rules and regulations to support those married and support the outcome of these marriages being the pro-creation of children.

People assess their eligibility and decide what they want to do. Some eligible people proceed and get married. Some eligible people proceed but do not marry. Someone who is already married is not eligible to marry again, siblings and other close relationships are not eligible to marry. People “under age” cannot marry. Same sex people are excluded as well.

I have not heard of claims of discrimination or inequality from a couple (man and woman) who are not eligible as above. Such people just accept the definition and behave accordingly. But we do hear these claims from homosexual people. People who are completely outside the definition of marriage, people who can never pro-create to establish a family unit and yet claim that they are disadvantaged in some way.

The argument used by the homosexual people to seek change in the definition of marriage can be used to seek other multiple person arrangements, This could lead to a complete collapse of the society we are used to and the loss of the foundation that has served humanity for millennia.

Our society is built on solid foundations and this must remain so to preserve what has been achieved. The definition of the words of our language is one such foundation and the more one thinks about this, the more convincing the argument becomes. We meddle with definitions at our peril so I submit that the suggestion to change the definition of “Marriage” should not be considered but rejected.