

The bill has three stated objectives

The objects of this Act are:

- (a) to remove from the Marriage Act 1961 discrimination against people on the basis of their sex, sexuality or gender identity; and
- (b) to recognise that freedom of sexuality and gender identity are fundamental human rights; and
- (c) to promote acceptance and the celebration of diversity.

It is important not to discriminate against people, but how do we achieve this? Is it sameness in everything? Should we call all groups of people who live together for more than a certain period of time married? Else are we not discriminating against defacto relationships? How does sameness in title promote point (c) to promote acceptance and the celebration of diversity if the only way to achieve that is to have identicalness? It does not make sense.

Is it discrimination to call a man a man or a woman a woman? No we recognise and celebrate the difference – equality is not in a title. A marriage is an agreement between a man and a woman, not between a man and a man or a woman and a woman. We managed to come up with a different title for legal identification for a man and woman who live together for a period of time. Why can we not do so for those in a homosexual relationship?

It is important to understand what discrimination is and what it isn't. Where a distinction is made in favour or against someone based on their group, class or category, that is discrimination. Calling different groups different things is not discrimination. The fact that I am no longer a teenager and therefore can't call myself a teenager does not mean that an age title is discrimination, what is discrimination is how I am treated according to my age. Therefore let's focus on discrimination not on name calling.

The stated objectives of this bill change cant be met by calling what is not marriage marriage. Discrimination is not the name we call something but how that group is treated, thus objective A is not met. Objective B also is not met by giving the same identification tag in fact objective B is not a valid objective in Australian society. It is illegal to undertake many forms of sexuality by law for instance paedophilia . And object C is plainly in contradiction of itself by calling different things by the same name.

I am objection to the changes proposed by the bill.