

Dear Sir/Madam,

I am writing in regard to the Senate Committee's request for the public's opinion on the Marriage Equality Amendment Bill 2009. As a citizen, I humbly request the Australian Government to oppose the Marriage Equality Amendment Bill and maintain the existing definition of marriage which is "the union of a man and a woman to the exclusion of all others, voluntarily entered into for life."

Let me clarify myself right from the outset. The issue I write to about is not homosexuality itself but the move to ammend current legislation.

Not all change is beneficial, so it is crucial that our nation honestly and unselfishly acts in the best interests of our children and the long-term welfare of families. The most stable upbringing for a child is in the home of a happily married (male) father and (female) mother. Men cannot be mothers, and women cannot be fathers, and it's undeniable that children need one of each.

While a minority in our society do not enjoy this ideal form of family it is also true that the laws of our nation should create the best opportunity for our children to be afforded the best family life. The introduction of homosexual marriage would open the door for many Australian children to be deprived of the opportunity to grow up in with the balanced input of a male and female parent. The implications of this would be dire for our children. Imbalance brought on by upbringing in the home of two mothers or two fathers in the absence of an opposing gender parent would give rise to challenges additional to those faced by children in single-parent or broken homes.

The sacred union of marriage is and has throughout history being the bedrock of stable family life and is an institution that does not need changing. What it needs is honor, when we honor

If we normalize and legitimize same-sex marriages based simply on some notion of 'love' or 'human rights' then why not normalize and legitimize multi-partner relationships such as two, three, or even ten women and a man - or three men and two women - if they 'love' each other. Are not their so-called 'human rights' also important? Then we must ask ... just how far do we go? Rights and benefits should not be given based on some simple definition of 'love' or on 'rights' but on what is good, healthy and beneficial for the whole community and for the most vulnerable - our children. Anything less is irresponsible idealism.

All people are intrinsically equal, but marriage and same-sex unions are not synonomous nor do they have the same effect so please don't propergate this by calling them by the same name. Perhaps a new legal term should be phased in over time for same-sex unions rather than redefine "marriage", not as an "us and them" thing, but out of respect for the contribution heterosexual unions make to the society.

I humbly call on the Australian Government to oppose the Marriage Equality Amendment Bill 2009. Per

Your's Sincerely,

David