

To Whom It May Concern,

I would like to express my opposition to changing the current definition of marriage.

Marriage as the union of a man and a woman to the exclusion of all others for life is a unique and very special relationship which should be both held up as an ideal for marital intimacy and should be specially respected and protected by governments.

Clearly men and women while of the same species wonderfully complement in their respective natures. It is only by the intimacy of sexual union of a male and a female that children can naturally be procreated. The current definition of marriage provides for stability born of expressed public lifelong commitment and boundaries of exclusion of all others and insisting upon complementary genders. Such stability is important for the nurture of children in the most natural family environment which will be most beneficial for the development of healthy well-balanced children.

The argument against this ideal from the brokenness of divorce and family breakdown, single parenthood and same sex marriage such that the ideal marriage would be less and less even aimed at is extremely disappointing and reckless. If this law is passed social education will be rewritten so that marriage as has been known and idealized in every culture on earth until recently now will be trashed. Social mediocrity and worse will prevail. Marriage aspiration will vanish. Marriage will be degraded as being next to worthless at the stroke of the Governor General's pen. Single parent families, same sex families polygamous families and many others all have value and worth in varying degrees love and comfort for the adults and children involved and are to be respected but they are not marriage. They simply do not qualify as a marriage. What I do as a person has value but I do not qualify as an MP for the seat ofor senator for the state of If a same sex union is called marriage what will we then call the union of a man and a woman committed to each other for life and that has a capacity to naturally generate children and raise them with their biological mother and father, so as to distinguish them and describe that relationship.

It is hypocritical in principle for the Green to be so outspoken for preservation of the natural rhythms and processes of nature and yet want to promote same sex marriage, test tube babies and same sex adoption of children to the denial of a child being raised by their own biological parents or having both a mother and a father at all. Hello??? Do they miss the whole respect for gender value altogether? This is a sell out of respect for nature when it comes to human beings. Test tube greenies are losing all integrity when they speak out against the concrete jungle, damming, mining yet want to manipulate natural species reproduction. No-one will be listening to such lack of integrity. May a real green party arise and overtake them because respect for nature is more important than they truly believe.

The mess this proposed legislation will cause will be tragic socially for Australia. Normal romance will be discriminated against so as to correct homophobia. Good and decent people will be labeled homophobic and victimized not by individuals and lobby groups but be persecuted by full authority and force of law and government and discriminated against in employment, adoption, and in many ways. Christian marriage celebrants will eventually be made to wear the homophobic label, pressured, intimidated and shamed by governments and courts. When this inevitably happens I think people will be surprised at the level of conscientious objection and civil disobedience to it.

The mess will be so great and so reacted against that I believe any MP that votes for this will be marked and named at their next election and thrown out of office with such enthusiasm that the QLD ALP demise will seem just like a warm up. It is will be a watershed and defining issue and a prerequisite before any other issue for a rising concern in the community. This will awaken not only the Christian vote but all faiths and the majority of decent people.

I believe this marriage act should not be changed without going directly to the people. If the Federal ALP votes for it after assurance to the contrary given by our Prime Minister prior to the last election then that will further energize voter reaction.

I would like to express my opposition to changing the current definition of marriage.

Graham Eggins