

Warwick Poole

Committee Secretary  
Senate Legal and Constitutional Committee  
PO Box 6100  
Parliament House  
Canberra ACT 2600  
Australia

Email:- [legcon.sen@aph.gov.au](mailto:legcon.sen@aph.gov.au)

Dear Sir or Madam:

**Subject: Marriage Equality Amendment Bill 2010**

I am writing to you to implore you not to permit anything to undermine traditional marriage.

Marriage is something that most young people aspire to; where as homosexual marriage is and should never be aspired to, it is a lustful exercise designed for self-gratification, which if the condom breaks, could be deadly. The portrayal of the sweet / kind / humorous / monogamous homosexual couple on television is a lie; do not be deceived, the activity displayed during the Sydney Gay Mardi Gras is a faint inkling to the truth, and this activity is toned down for the cameras; what goes on when the cameras are not there, is shameful.

The House of Representatives Standing Committee on Legal and Constitutional Affairs, June 1998, published "To have and to hold, Strategies to strengthen marriage and relationships" (here after referred to as To Have And To Hold), it states on page 73 "Simply defined marriage is a relationship within which a community socially approves and encourages sexual intercourse and the birth of children" The next paragraph is similar and it talks about biological parents' responsibility for each other and their offspring. Marriage is for one male and one female, for life. In this relationship children can be nurtured. Simply put, marriage enables the individuals and society to prosper.

Yes, tolerance is a wonderful thing, but we do not tolerate some activities; why don't we allow copulation, masturbation, urination, defecation in public? The list of unacceptable behaviours is endless. We simply do not tolerate some behaviours, and homosexual marriage is one that we should not tolerate. Why? Because, few homosexual couples remain monogamous; few homosexual couples remain in a stable relationship for any appreciable length of time. This is not good for the individuals, or the society, and especially not good for any children acquired during the usually short

interlude. Traditional Marriage builds up the society, the couple, and the children; homosexual activity breaks down the society, the couple, and especially the children.

The homosexual lobby would have you believe that not permitting homosexuals to marry is: “discrimination”. It is no more discriminatory that not permitting brother and sister to marry, which is, of course, an ancient “rule” designed to achieve the best for the society, the couple, and the children. Also, it is no more discriminatory that not permitting couples that will not commit to a “life long union” to marry. This is, of course, an ancient “rule” designed to achieve the best for the society, the couple, and the children. This particular rule is interesting, in that, it could include our own prime minister. The many de-facto couples are not the people calling for a change to the very building blocks of our society. The homosexuals activists, a tiny tiny, minority, are calling for just this; they do not care if they under-mine the very fabric of our society as long as their own selfish desires are met. Redefining marriage is simply an experiment into human sociology that can only end badly.

In my youth I was promiscuous, something I am not proud of. It was, at the time, exciting and drove my life in ways I now regret. Eventually culminating in much heartache for my loved ones and myself. I write to you now in the hope I can stop other from similar heartache. People who know me understand that my arguments are not grounded in bigotry or hatred, but in sound reasoning.

Our society is built around the family unit. The family unit is under a lot of pressure in this modern era. The proliferation of pornography, and so-called sexual freedoms, are just some of the undermining agents. Our elected representative should be helping families by not allowing them to be undermined. To Have And To Hold, page 28 states “Virtually every study which has analysed mortality rates by marital status shows that the unmarried have higher death rates.” It goes on to say that the magnitude of this mortality factor is comparable to smoking **and** mental health factors. I.e. marriage makes a huge difference to your life expectancy. It isn’t just a piece of paper. Dabbling with this piece of paper can cause unforeseen outcomes.

A child needs good male and female role models; he/she needs a stable family. These are some of the basic building blocks for a well-developed child. In some cases a child, tragically, loses one or more of these building blocks, but to deliberately plan a family with these aspects missing is bad for the child and society.

Sometimes disputes end up in the family court. When children are involved, the court has to decide what is best for the children. Young children cannot make decisions for themselves. Members of parliament are now in the situation where they must think long and hard, what is best for the child. Not what feels good to a bunch of selfish adults. Do not be swayed by the exceptions, yes there are always exceptions, go for the general; generally a child with parents who are married has the highest likelihood of being loved and protected and nurtured. To Have And To Hold, page 47, states that even though only 4% of children live in step families, 21% of child abuse and neglect cases involve step children. Further, the proportion of suspected killers in de facto

relationships was 6.5 times (650%) higher than for the general population. This is telling us in very clear figures that the child is away better off with the birth mother and father. What are the characteristics portrayed in a household where a child is abused; do the words “unstable”, “selfish” and “polygamy” come to mind.

The proposed changes to the marriage act (1961) would deliver a decisive blow to traditional marriage. It will, over a time, break the back of marriage and society. Our parliament makes the laws; once homosexual couples are able to marry there will be no way of stopping any other challenges from other interest groups, e.g. Polygamist “but we love each other, all of us, ... how dare you discriminate against us ”. And then how will we answer the xxx person (the xxx person is a person that is involved in particular activity that, most people even in our liberal minded society, would consider strange) who says “but I love ..... don’t discriminate, how dare you judge me”.

I appeal to all members of parliament; do not design a floored system, instead design a system that is best for the child, married couples, and society or else we all will pay for it in the future, our society will be like a leaking bucket, requiring more and more effort and no one knowing why.

Regards,

Warwick Poole