

August 10, 2009.

Submission re:
Inquiry into Marriage Equality by Senate Legal and Constitutional Affairs Committee.

Hello,

There are a number of points I would like to raise in regards to the proposed amendments to marriage in Australia.

1. Governments did not invent Marriage.

Marriage has existed for millennia as the foundation and building block of society. Stable marriage between a man and a woman is recognised as the best environment in which to raise children. Governments did not invent or create marriage. While Governments may recognise marriage they should not seek to re-define it to include same-sex relationships for this reason.

2. Unintended consequences.

To effectively make same-sex unions the same as marriage, is to make a moral judgement and moral affirmation that the majority of parents would prefer to reserve for themselves to make.

I do not want my children to receive marriage certificates with 'party A' and 'party B' on them instead of 'bride' and 'groom'. Furthermore I do not want my children to be read stories in school about the 'prince who married another prince'. Any amendments to the marriage act to include same-sex relationships will have dramatic flow-on effects for the rest of society. I have mentioned two of these but we can probably not anticipate the full extent of these effects.

3. Discrimination is not automatically bad.

In Australia we discriminate about who can be an Australian citizen, we discriminate about who can join our armed forces, who can be a judge, who can perform medical surgery, who can teach children. All of these are examples of good and appropriate discrimination – despite the fact that this discrimination hurts some people who don't fulfill the criteria.

Our culture has come to see discrimination as automatically a bad thing. It is not.

Marriage deserves the current recognition it has, because of its special place as the building block of our society. Same-sex relationships are different. They are not the same as marriage between a man and a woman. To legislate that they are the same is to deny biological reality. One may as well legislate to change the speed of light. It is not an area that Governments should seek to re-define.

4. Majority rule.

A very small percentage of our society is homosexual, within that group only a small percentage desire 'marriage'. This small group, in seeking the proposed amendments to marriage, will have a massive impact on the rest of society. I argue that this small group should show some tolerance and respect for the majority and recognise that they are different and are therefore logically excluded from marriage on the basis of biology.

I want the Australian Parliament to uphold my current right to have my own marriage recognised in the way it currently is – as a unique and exclusive relationship between a man and a woman. To say that a same-sex relationship is the same as my own marriage is grossly detrimental to this right. Any time you assign a right to one, you limit the rights of another. To assign equality to same-sex relationships for a small few is to extinguish the right of a large majority to have their relationships recognised as unique and special.

Thank you for your time,