

Submission on Gay Marriage

First we must consider what marriage is.

The churches define marriage as a union between a man and a woman in sickness and in health till death. There is a far more important concept. Marriage is a contract between a man and a woman to stay together to have and bring up children, to provide a secure environment for those children. As a civilisation we value our children and want them to have all the essentials and everything else we can afford. Here is the RUB. It does not take long for some men to decide they can't afford the kids they have produced. There needs to be a reason to stay together and that's where "contract" comes from. A man and a woman can live together and bring up children without being married. There is no security and if they separate it will take court action to provide for the child. So marriage is about children not about the man and woman having sex, they can live together without marriage and if they separate come to an agreement about sharing the accumulated property.

Homosexuals have all the privileges of the unmarried man and woman. There is no hindrance in law to 2 men or 2 women living together. But here the differences start. Whereas in a male / female marriage fidelity is a prime requirement, in a homosexual union it can't be. If they are to have children they will need a 3rd or even 4th party to help provide the children. Fidelity stops right there.

Humans don't like to think of themselves as "instinct driven" but it's the truth. A father will risk death and even lay down his life for his own child. So will a woman. This is far less true of adopted children. (It is also not true if there are more than one child). This is said to be love but it is instinctive preservation of the genes.

Let's look at homosexuals, we could call them GAY because they usually are. By definition gay refers to people who have many partners. Many partners means uncertainty of genetic line. A man could be gay if he has many women partners and vice versa. In homosexual relationships there are no children, and only jealousy will cause resentment. Do homosexuals want to have children?

If homosexuals want children they will need a surrogate or they will need to adopt. Taking 2 men as the example (but it applies equally to 2 women) which will father the child? Will the non-genetic father be happy to pay child maintenance if they separate? He will have no genetic connection with the child and the child may be the cause of separation. This will take special laws to enforce payment. There would need to be special provisions in the adoption laws to accommodate a second father's liability. (There are far more heterosexual couples waiting to adopt than there are children available).

Serious considerations. Many if not most paedophiles are homosexual or bi sexual, and there is a risk that changes to the marriage act will let them adopt children and those children will suffer a life so bad they will eventually suicide. Is this worth the risk? The laws to prevent such a thing happening will be impossible to draft.

Take the situation of a family wanting to hire a married couple to do house work and care for their children. Will the law be changed so they can ask for a male and female married couple without the sex discrimination laws being used against them? Since most couples with children are man and wife, they will not want 2 men looking after mixed children or 2 women for that matter. Then there is the high risk that the same sex couple may be

perverts or paedophiles. Again, laws will be impossible to draft to protect ordinary people. It is too late, once the children have been molested, to charge the perpetrators.

There will come a time when men can carry babies and even use 2 male sperms to conceive a baby, that's when serious consideration should be given to Homosexual marriage, but not to GAY marriage, (which is an oxymoron). But again child abuse will be a risk. There will always be those that will produce a child to be used as a toy. We would not do it to an animal so why even consider it for humans.

The world's population is approaching saturation and one child families will soon be the norm. It will soon be a requirement to pass a character reference just to have the one child, and here we are looking at legalising homosexual marriage, and all the risks that that would entail.

The homosexual community has gathered strength in recent years but is still a minority. Among homosexuals there are more paedophiles than those wanting a baby. To be fair it should be put to a referendum to see if changes to the marriage act are the will of the people. You and I know what the outcome would be. So is this a democracy or are we governed by a queer minority?

Marriage is not a licence for sex and has little to do with sex except to produce children and bring them up in a home. Society has come a long way since babies were "illegitimate" if their parent were not married. We should be careful not to go too far in appeasing those with a sexual appetite far greater than normal people, and risking child abuse on a scale not heard of since SODOM and GOMORRAH .

The marriage act, as it is works just fine, and if homosexuals want equal rites then they must create a word for the type of union they enter into and the property rights when that union fails. There is nothing to be gained by damaging a relationship that's all about children to sanctify what is truly a relationship all about sex. As I said early in this submission, a time will come when it may be possible and necessary for men to bear children, and women to become pregnant without men, when that time comes we can look at GAY MARRIAGE.

There is no stigma to be a homosexual in today's society. The relationship between 2 men or 2 women in a relationship is purely sex, and they don't need any change in the law to have that relationship for as long as they want, even for life. If a homosexual couple want to live together and share the property accumulated they can draw up a deed of agreement to clarify the terms. This could be the beginning of a standard form of agreement similar to marriage. When you look at marriage there is a 40% chance of failure, and long drawn out legal battles that make lawyers rich, why would anyone want to enter such a thing? Marriage itself is not perfect and will change in time to a simple contract to stay together until the children grow up to adulthood. Then the "married couple" will part unless there is enough love to keep them together. This is better than marriage and this is what homosexual couples should aim for, not to change the marriage act but create their own form of union. SIGNED Peter Bond