

Marriage Equality
Legal and Constitutional Affairs Committee
Senate

Matthew Lawler

web.senate@aph.gov.au

Thursday, 20 August 2009

To whom it may concern

I am deeply concerned about the Senate reviewing or changing the definition of marriage.

As a Christian, I believe that marriage is instituted and ordained by God for the lifelong relationship between one man as husband and one woman as wife. The primary purpose of a marriage is to provide a healthy environment where children can be brought into the world. It is self evident even to non-Christians that this is the basis of a healthy society.

It introduces a fundamental confusion into the definition. Re-branding these relationships as marriages with simply force heterosexuals to use a different term or adjective to describe natural relationships, in precisely the same way that the word "gay" has been redefined. When people use the term partner, one is often left wondering what is meant. Now we will be just as confused by the word marriage.

These sham marriages cannot receive the dignity that a natural marriage has, which is often one of the core motivations that homosexuals seek. So, the homosexual's hope of equal social treatment will remain a sham, and their happiness will not increase as a result of this effort. So why bother? Their sense of grievance is unending.

Furthermore, entertaining this does not make sense as a practical piece of public policy. The cost of producing children in a natural marriage is nothing. On the other hand, those in unnatural marriages will, of course, need support and funds. It simply creates an additional class of rent seekers, who will then start to make demands for access to sperm, orphans, etc. I find these next steps to be especially repugnant, as they imply a blithe level of irresponsibility on the part of our leaders that has always astounded me.

Therefore, on both Christian and natural grounds, redefining these relationships is a bad policy outcome.

Regards
Matthew Lawler