

Committee Secretary  
Senate Legal and Constitutional Committee  
PO Box 6100  
Parliament House  
Canberra ACT 2600  
Australia

Dear Sir/Madam,

**Re Marriage Equality Amendment Bill 2010**

I respectfully request the Committee to take this submission into consideration.

As there will no doubt be many submissions on this controversial matter, I propose to limit my remarks to two main points.

**Firstly**, as you state on your website, the bill “seeks to remove all discriminatory references from the Marriage Act 1961 to allow all people, regardless of sex, sexuality and gender identity, the opportunity to marry.”

It should be obvious that any Act of Parliament must of necessity ‘discriminate.’ Good Acts discriminate against wrongs; bad ones discriminate against good. So to chant the ‘It’s discriminatory’ mantra carries zero weight: one must ask whether the Marriage Act 1961 discriminates against what is **wrong**. I stand with centuries of human tradition and practice which says that the particular institution of marriage refers to a life-long commitment to a shared life between one man and one woman. Sexual relations outside this commitment are immoral. If this ancient tradition is wrong, then those advocating “marriage equality” need to prove it, and prove it conclusively.

**Secondly**, the proposed amendment purports to remove all discriminatory references, but apparently has a very limited view of discrimination, namely to remove any restriction of “people, regardless of sex, sexuality and gender identity, the opportunity to marry.”

If non-discrimination is the goal, then why limit it to these categories? For instance, the proverb says that a dog is a man’s best friend. If I love my dog, and she loves me, why should we not marry? Because she’s a bitch? That is no answer, because ‘speciesism’ is also discriminatory – against me, and against my dog. It denies us the ‘right’ to express our love in a married relationship.

Furthermore, why limit marriage to a partnership between **two** people (Sections 5.1 and 46.1)? Is that not also ‘discriminatory’? Why not authorize polyamory, with

multiple partners in all kinds of mixes? On what moral basis should such groups be denied the opportunity to marry?

And why limit all this to **adults**? Is that not also discriminatory? Should not children also have the right to marry? (Should we legitimize paedophilia? And if not, why not?)

This proposed amendment purports to remove "all discriminatory references" from the Marriage Act 1961, but it cannot do so without itself discriminating, and failing in its purpose to remove "all discriminatory references" from the Act. It should therefore be rejected not only as immoral, but also as illogical.

Yours faithfully,

W P Gadsby