

To Whom it May Concern,

I have recently been made aware of a proposal to delete the words "a man and a woman" from the definition of marriage in the federal Marriage Act, replacing them with "two persons".

Whilst I generally support the right of all people to form non-abusive, non-coercive lifelong unions in whatever form they take and support the common law property and other rights that may be associated with such unions, it seems both incongruous, misleading and unjust just to seek to legitimize one form of union by adopting the term for another. Unions which are not based upon "a man and a woman" should simply adopt another term.

Such a redefinition of marriage represents the use of legislation to provide an intervention to create a profound shift in the use of language from that which has been its common and accepted usage in our culture and history. It therefore constitutes an affront to those to whom the meaning and heritage of the term marriage as a committed life-long heterosexual, monogamous, child producing, family developing and nurturing union is a central and essential component of their world view.

Whilst I applaud any attempt to remove discrimination in any area of life religious, social or otherwise, I am concerned that this move would constitute a version of the very form of injustice it may be seeking to redress. For many, such a redefinition would constitute a severe intrusion to their rights by imposing upon them an unwelcome and confusing belief system through the manipulation and redefinition of their language and an abuse of power by the legislature.

Regards,

Peter

Dr Peter Carblis