

To Whom It May Concern:

I am writing to you on the subject of same sex marriage. This is a subject that has been weighing on my heart for a while now and I appreciate you taking the time to hear my views against this subject.

### **This will not be marriage as we know it**

The activists have made it perfectly clear that they intend to radically alter, and effectively **destroy, the institution of marriage**. The truth is, for all the talk about same-sex marriage, few homosexuals actually have in mind the same thing that heterosexuals have in mind. Most seek to radically expand and alter the common understanding of marriage. Long-term monogamous fidelity is seldom part of this new understanding.

If homosexual marriage contracts come into force, they would have to be “different”: that is, they would have to allow for “extra-marital outlets” and other major changes. Of course that **undermines the very essence of marriage, which is the covenant of life-long sexual faithfulness**.

Both the data on homosexual monogamy, as well as their own words, makes it clear that the idea of one partner for life is seldom desired. It is the exception to the rule. Consider just a tiny fraction of the data. One major Australian study found that 26 per cent of homosexual men had 21 to 100 partners in a lifetime; nearly 41 per cent had 101 to 1000 partners; and 17 per cent had over 1000 partners.

In countries where SSM has been legalised, a very discernable negative spill-on effect has been noticed. Marriage as an institution suffers when these counterfeits are allowed to come along and claim to be on a par with marriage. Many of the Scandinavian countries for example offer us a mountain of evidence in this regard.

### **Children will be put at risk**

Fifty years of social science data have made it absolutely clear that children need a **mother and a father**. The evidence is simply overwhelming: by every indicator, children do best when raised by their own biological mother and father, preferably cemented by marriage.

Many thousands of studies from the world over have made this overwhelmingly clear. Any other household structure simply does not compare. Obviously with homosexual couples, any child brought into that arrangement will be disadvantaged from the very start.

And a number of studies have also shown that children raised in same-sex households do suffer on a number of levels. Children deserve better. But the interests of the child seem to be the last thing being considered in this debate. Indeed, today everyone is demanding rights to do this and that, but very few seem to realise **that rights must be balanced by responsibilities**.

Among other things, children need to see how men and women interact together. A homosexual or lesbian union cannot provide that role model. The right to have a child must be balanced by the rights of the child. Children should be given the first priority, and not be allowed to be used as a political football by the homosexual lobby

in their efforts to seek legitimacy for their lifestyle. For the sake of our children, we should not be embracing homosexual adoption and SSM.

As one leading international authority has boldly asserted: “In three decades of work as a social scientist, I know of few other bodies of data in which the weight of evidence is so decisively on one side of the issue: on the whole, for children, two-parent families are preferable to single-parent families and step-families [and by logical implication, homosexual families as well]. If our prevailing views on family structure hinged solely on scholarly evidence, the current debate would never have arisen in the first place.”

### **High risk lifestyles should not be given official endorsement**

Countless studies have documented the high-risk and unhealthy nature of the homosexual lifestyle. So why should governments be endorsing and promoting such activity? Various studies show that homosexuals account for the majority of new cases of sexually transmitted diseases.

For example, a male homosexual is 14 times more likely to have syphilis than a male heterosexual, and eight times more likely to have hepatitis. And of course HIV/AIDS remains an overwhelmingly homosexual disease in Australia, with the overwhelming number of cases due to male homosexual activity, or intravenous drug use.

But don't take my word for it. Consider what the Gay and Lesbian Medical Association (GLMA) have said about this. They have issued two publications warning of the health risks associated with both homosexual and lesbian lifestyles. Each one lists ten major areas of concern.

As to male homosexuals, the GLMA says that they have “an increased risk of HIV infection” and have “an increased risk of sexually transmitted infection with the viruses that cause the serious condition of the liver known as hepatitis”. Also, they “use substances at a higher rate than the general population” and “depression and anxiety appear to affect gay men at a higher rate than in the general population”.

### **Conclusion**

In sum, same-sex marriage is a bad idea. It is bad for society, bad for marriage, and bad for children. The concept is oxymoronic, and it confers no benefits to society. Indeed, as shown above, it will in fact be harmful to society. As David Coolidge summarises:

“If one believes that a good society requires a critical mass of healthy male-female marriages with children, then any policies that redefine, and thereby weaken, that basic unit are a bad idea. I believe that same-sex marriage is a bad idea, not because same-sex couples are bad people, but because same-sex marriage is not marriage. A genuinely pluralistic society must do justice to individuals. But it must also do justice to marriage.”

Thank you for your time. I urge you not to take this subject lightly.

Yours sincerely,

Kristy Adams