

Peter Hallahan
Committee Secretary
Senate Standing Committee on Legal and Constitutional Affairs
PO Box 6100
Parliament House
Canberra ACT 2600 Australia
Submission to the Inquiry into the Marriage Equality Amendment Bill 2009

Dear Mr Hallahan

I wish to register my objection to the changes to the Marriage Act 1961 proposed by the Marriage Equality Amendment Bill 2009.

Marriage needs to remain defined as being between a man and a woman.

It is my belief that marriage is between a man and a woman as God created it. This is the historic Christian belief, as Jesus Christ teaches in Matthew 19:

And Pharisees came up to him and tested him by asking, "Is it lawful to divorce one's wife for any cause?" He answered, "Have you not read that he who created them from the beginning made them male and female, and said, 'Therefore a man shall leave his father and his mother and hold fast to his wife, and the two shall become one flesh'? So they are no longer two but one flesh. What therefore God has joined together, let not man separate."

Matthew chapter 19, verses 3–4.

I don't think that we should go against God. I believe that the very messy state of marriage in Australia is a result of going against God's intention for marriage. Clearly others don't agree but, having enjoyed the benefits of a happy, stable marriage for the last 14-and-a-bit years, I'm happy to back God on this point. As a Father who loves us, God really does know what's best for us.

Indeed, this is recognised in the Family Law Act (Section 43), which sets out the need to preserve and protect marriage as the union of a man and a woman to the exclusion of all others voluntarily entered into for life, and the need to give the widest possible protection to the family as the natural and fundamental unit of society.

The Marriage Equality Amendment Bill appears to be an attempt to normalise the homosexual lifestyle. It is merely political, not beneficial.

Rather than preserving and protecting marriage for the good of the community, and our children, I believe this legislation will undermine it. I expect it will be children who suffer for it since the a stable loving family with a mother and father is best environment for children to be raised—as is more often being recognised in recent studies, if the evidence of thousands of years of human history and evolution were not enough.

Arguably, being raised by two fathers or two mothers will undermine the rights of children to be raised in the best environment: by their birth mother in a stable family, with both a mother and a father.

There is ample scope in other legislative avenues for those in homosexual relationships to preserve their legal rights in, for example, property or superannuation law, as has been made for defacto relationships, but marriage as a legal institution should remain the union of a man and a woman to the exclusion of all others voluntarily entered into for life.

Kind regards,

David McKinnon