

# FAMILY COUNCIL OF VICTORIA Inc.

PO Box 864, North Melbourne, Vic 3151  
Incorporation No. A352 37K

[www.fcv.org.au](http://www.fcv.org.au)



Committee Secretary  
Senate Legal and Constitutional Committees  
Parliament House  
Canberra  
10 March 2011

I have been asked by the Family Council of Victoria to write and express our total opposition to the proposed Australian Capital Territory (Self-Government) Amendment (Disallowance and Amendment Power of the Commonwealth) Bill 2010.

I trust you will accept this late submission as there was very little time given for such submissions making it very hard for organisations with many affiliates to meet to consider such issues.

Firstly, There is already too little accountability at a Territory government level due to both the NT and ACT having no Upper House.

It is, therefore, vital that the Federal parliament act as that Upper House to curb the excesses of these two very small territory governments.

Secondly, Senator Brown has clearly proposed this Bill in order to promote his personal desire to further normalise homosexual and lesbian relationships and to allow the Greens a better chance to legalise euthanasia in Australia.

The Family Council of Victoria is totally opposed to any law that legalises same-sex relationships because doing so, regardless of what you call them, will greatly undermine the very important and foundational group of society - the natural family.

Same-sex relationships are not natural - biology and anatomy very clearly tell us that.

Two people of the same gender cannot produce children without artificial means, and they cannot provide the stable, balanced environment to nurture and raise well rounded adults. That is why it takes a male and a female to produce them. If one 'type' was sufficient, would

ACT Chief Minister Jon Stanhope said he expected his Labor team would support the Greens in the ACT Legislative Assembly and predicted it would have the numbers to endorse a pro-euthanasia bill, although he would not vote for such a move.

The Family Law Directory recently stated "Julia Gillard has opened the door to the nation's first legal same-sex marriage laws, removing obstacles to the social agenda of the Australian Greens despite her personal opposition to gay unions.

Add to this the fact that Homosexuals have already stated that they actually want to change or even destroy marriage as we know it - not be a part of it.

Michelangelo Signorile, writing in Out! Magazine, stated that homosexuals should, "...fight for same-sex marriage and its benefits and then, once granted, redefine the institution of marriage completely... To debunk a myth and radically alter an archaic institution... The most subversive action lesbians and gays can undertake-and one that would perhaps benefit all of society-is to transform the notion of 'family' alto-

gether.” (Out! magazine, Dec./Jan., 1994)

Andrew Sullivan, a homosexual activist writing in his book, *Virtually Normal*, says that once same-sex marriage is legalized, heterosexuals will have to develop a greater “understanding of the need for extramarital outlets between two men than between a man and a woman.”

He notes: “The truth is, homosexuals are not entirely normal; and to flatten their varied and complicated lives into a single, moralistic model is to miss what is essential and exhilarating about their otherness.” (Sullivan, *Virtually Normal*, pp. 202-203)

Paula Ettelbrick, a law professor and homosexual activist said: “Being queer is more than setting up house, sleeping with a person of the same gender, and seeking state approval for doing so...

Being queer means pushing the parameters of sex, sexuality, and family; and in the process, transforming the very fabric of society... We must keep our eyes on the goals of providing true alternatives to marriage and of radically reordering society’s view of reality.” (quoted in “Beyond Gay Marriage,” Stanley Kurtz, *The Weekly Standard*, August 4, 2003)

Mitchel Raphael, editor of the Canadian homosexual magazine *Fab*, says: “Ambiguity is a good word for the feeling among gays about marriage. I’d be for marriage if I thought gay people would challenge and change the institution and not buy into the traditional meaning of ‘till death do us part’ and monogamy forever. We should be Oscar Wildes and not like everyone else watching the play.” (quoted in “Now Free To Marry, Canada’s Gays Say, ‘Do I?’” by Clifford Krauss, *The New York Times*, August 31, 2003)

**Even in Australia** - On the Jon Faine Conversation Hour, June 16 2006 homosexual activists Jon was interviewing stated that they want more than two people marriage a homosexual. He stated that, “he indeed saw no problem in three people or more forming a civil union of their own. In fact, he even knew of a gay threesome that shared a relationship.”

And the Greens, whose support the Prime Minister relies on to maintain her minority government, are also pressing Labor to facilitate a conscience vote aimed at reversing a 1997 bill that outlawed Northern Territory euthanasia laws.”

There you have it - pass this Bill and there will be an unprecedented attack on the very foundations of society - heterosexual marriage and the natural Family.

You will, in fact, also be guilty of starting to open the door to any form of relationship and any number of people involved. One only has to observe the legal cases now running in Canada and Switzerland, where same-sex marriage has been legalised, to see where it could end; with multi-partner marriage and possibly even incestuous marriage becoming a so-called ‘human right’.

I rest my case – If the members of this Senate enquiry take no notice of such statements then on their head be it. They will be responsible for the consequences – I will not.

Thank you for taking the time to read this submission.

I am happy to appear before a public hearing and state the facts, and consequences, of allowing a few people to destroy the foundations of our society.

Peter P Stokes  
President  
Family Council of Victoria