
Dear Members of The Senate Legal and Constitutional Affairs Committee,

I write concerning the impending legislation as per above.

Firstly, by offering partners of same sex relationship the same superannuation benefits as married couples, the purposes and functions of normal marriage are devalued.

One of the main purposes and functions of marriage is to procreate and bring up the children of the marriage in the best of possible environments - pertaining to spiritual, moral, intellectual, physical and social health and well being. Marriage should not be treated as just another "couple relationship" along with same sex relationships.

Secondly, one has to consider why spouses were given superannuation benefits in the first place - because, on the whole, they were committed to building up society - sacrificially - through the process of setting up a stable marriage and home, through the rigours of childbirth and all the consequent responsibilities of being parents - ie some sort of minimal compensation which ultimately can't be measured in terms of finance.

Same sex couples have nothing like this kind of long term family commitment. In fact the very nature of same sex couples undermine the very basis of family and community life. Why should they be rewarded as a class with taxpayer funded benefits in this way? The fact that some same sex couples may care for one another or other people is beside the point. They can receive carer's benefits if they are /bona fide.

/Thirdly, the same sex lobby's claim for superannuation benefits stands or falls on their claim for marital status as couples. I believe their push here for superannuation benefits is arrogantly "jumping the gun". If the senate committee and government is wise, they will not seek to pass the Family Law Amendment Bill and then spare us the agony of contending the consequential Bills.

I am really saddened by these intended moves from the new Federal Government. I am sure that any "injustices" perpetuated to same sex couples can be resolved under existing civil law. It is spurious for them to say they are being unjustly treated because they are not considered as married couples. They wrongly not only want to radically change the meaning of marriage, but they also seek traditional marriage benefits to which they are not entitled to. In fact it would be quite unjust to grant them such benefits.

I do trust you will consider these points and work out what is really best for society as a whole and not just for one small section of it and their influential sympathisers.

Yours sincerely,

Rev Gordon Boughton

Senior Assistant Minister
St Marks Anglican Church

