

**FAMILY LIFE INTERNATIONAL
AUSTRALIA LTD**

PO Box 205, Broadway NSW 2007

176 Parramatta Road, Camperdown NSW 2050

Phone (02) 9519 9111 Fax (02) 9519 9622

Email: fliaust@internode.on.net

ABN: 83 109 697 261

SUBMISSION

TO

THE SENATE LEGAL AND CONSTITUTIONAL AFFAIRS COMMITTEE

ON

THE MARRIAGE EQUALITY AMENDMENT BILL 2009

Marriage between a man and a woman has been recognised by all societies throughout history regardless of race, religion or system of government. It is ordered to the procreation and education of children and the unity and wellbeing of the spouses.

Since marriage is a relationship between human beings, it is a relationship embedded in human nature and thus governed by natural law. Through unaided human reason, we can come to understand that marriage is a 'good' for society, since it not only satisfies the deepest yearnings of the human heart for love and companionship, it also guarantees the future of the human race through the sexual union of man and woman resulting in the begetting of children.

A sexual relationship between two men or two women is, by its very nature, sterile. How can such a union affect the future of the human race except negatively? If children are desired in such a relationship, recourse must be had to adoption or to artificial means of begetting children, through assisted reproductive technologies (ART).

It is in the child's best interests that he/she be raised by his/her natural father and mother. This rule is confirmed by the evident difficulties faced by the many children who are raised by a single parent, a relative, or a foster parent.

With regard to adoption/fostering, we should not ignore the analysis of the 1999 findings of the National Crime Victimization Survey (NCVS), which the US Department of Justice (DOJ) has conducted since 1973, and which demonstrates that rates of serious abuse of children are lowest in the intact married family but six times higher in the step family.

While adoption/fostering may be the best option for a child deprived for one reason or another of biological parents, it must always be the second best arrangement. Why, therefore, should society legislate for step families to be the 'norm' for the upbringing of children?

More to the point in the current consideration, why should society legislate for 'same-sex' step families to be the norm? In this situation, a child will always be deprived of mother or father in his new 'family'.

Children of assisted reproductive technologies have their own particular problems, especially the crisis of identity, even if one biological parent is known. ART is also expensive and psychologically problematic. It should never be anyone's 'right' to have a child by whatever means. Children are human beings with equal human rights with their parents.

Homosexual activists claim that the legal recognition of same-sex 'marriage' is a civil rights struggle. Not so. A human being is a human being regardless of race or colour which are unchangeable. No such claim can be made for a same-sex orientation, since there is no shortage of evidence that such an orientation can be and often is, re-oriented.

To remove all reference to man and woman from the Marriage Act 1961, is to discriminate against marriage itself and force a new definition, one which is contrary to man's well being and understanding of marriage from the beginning. It will simply promote the homosexual lifestyle and force everyone else in society to act against their consciences.

The State then becomes the official and active promoter of the homosexual lifestyle. Marriage celebrants will be forced to officiate at same-sex 'weddings', and businesses providing wedding services such as catering, car hire, photography etc will be forced cater for same-sex 'marriages'.

Only a few short years ago, the Australian public supported the traditional definition of marriage with an unprecedented number of submissions.

Families based on traditional marriages form the basis of all societies. Marriage between a man and a woman existed prior to any state or any government. It is not in the competence of any parliament in the world to redefine the nature of marriage.

The proposal before the Committee is contrary to the natural moral law and therefore to the right ordering of society. It should be rejected.