To whom it may concern

I am writing to voice my opposition to changing the definition of marriage.

I am writing to you out of a deep concern that we would give such serious consideration to a radical change to the long standing institution of marriage which has served this nation of Australia so well.

I do not believe that any legislation should be created or substantially altered under duress or without validation of the change being in the best interest of the nation. I have yet to understand how extending marriage to homosexuals is in the best interest of the nation.

To be taken seriously, the magnitude of changing the Marriage Act should at least come from a united community, not one divided against it self. I am not at all persuaded that the majority of homosexuals want this change. Many I have spoken to and read about are quite happy to just get on with life, do not want to get married and would like politicians to address far more pressing issues such as the cost of living, housing, petrol, employment and food.

Yet it seems a noisy pressure group has been successful in advancing its cause as far as this enquiry today.

The shift to change our historical Marriage Act is not one that should be embraced lightly or emotionally. Changing the Marriage Act is not simply about two men or two women who declare a right to be married. It involves moving what has been an immovable 'plumb line' for relationships as well as many, many pieces of legislation. It will, for future generations of Australian children, change the very fabric of society

they will be born into. Once the plumb line has been moved once, it will be easy to move again and again... what for next time? Two men, 1 woman, visa versa? Changing the Marriage Act is akin to opening Pandora's box.

An over arching concern for me is for the children being raised by homosexuals. Are we confident that placed with homosexual parents they will be allowed to choose their sexuality? Will the children expect to conform to their parents' sexual preference? How would we know? What priority is given to the rights of the child to choose their sexuality?

Already I resent that the innocent of my grandchildren is being violated by having to explain why a classmate has two men or two women as parents. It distresses me greatly that Government state schools have already taken on the role of desensitising our children to homosexuality, often in conflict with what is being taught in the home.

I am persuaded this debate is driven by people who have felt, rejected and isolated by society because of their life style choice. I am deeply concerned that even if a law change was to occur, it would not give this group of people the recognition and acceptance they are so desperately looking for. What then? What next?

The law can only change the law. It may issue a muzzle of silence to those who oppose this lifestyle, but the law cannot and will not change people's heart or convictions that certain things are not and never will be right. What about the democratic rights of these people?

In Queensland, just prior to the State election, the Labor, Bligh government, who have supported gay rights over many years, were barely able to pass the recent Civil Partnership Bill. Since the 'much wanted' Civil Partnership passed in early December, just four couples have chosen to go through a civil union ceremony. Yet with just four exceptions the entire *ex ALP Bligh Government* emphatically stated that there were so many homosexuals queued up to take advantage of the new law. Where are they?

While a democratic society gives us some inalienable rights, it also establishes societal

boundaries and constraints so we can all live in harmony together. We can't steal, we

can't be violent, we can't commit fraud – because it is not good for society as a whole.

Before we change the Marriage Act we must be fully persuaded that that change also

is good for society – as a whole. Are we?

Changing the Marriage Act has far deeper ramifications than perhaps we are willing to

consider. The drive to change the Act is an 'I want it now' at any cost, whereas

politicians and law makers have a duty and responsibility to consider how changing the

Act will affect not only the 'now' but also the future of Australia and its families.

I will not even address the ridiculous proposition that changing the Marriage Act will

bring us in line with other countries in the world.

I appreciate having this opportunity to express my deep concerns and thank you for

your consideration of the few issues I have raised in this short document.

God bless you and guide you in your deliberations

Carolyn Cormack

CFO

Christian Values Alliance.