

Dear Sir/Madam,

RE: Marriage Equality Bill 2010

I find it the arguments used to redefine Marriage to include same sex couples unconvincing. The issue at hand is not “allowing same sex marriage” but rather “redefining marriage”.

In the different examples below the common theme for the term Marriage is **complimentarity** and **potential**.

The concept of Marriage around the world, both historically and currently is of two complimentary things (to be elaborated on further under the headings of Food, Property and People) whereby they have the potential to create something extra from within their union. You don't marry two of the same things – all you will ever get from within this union is two.

FOOD

Around the world people marry food and wine together (they are different but complimentary and have the POTENTIAL to provide something greater than the sum of the parts). The phrase around the world “marriage of food and wine” is so universal that books and websites around the world are dedicated to this endeavour. Food and wine are both different but complimentary and if you get it right they have the POTENTIAL to create something special within their union. That is why this union gets its own word and people speak of it in terms of the “Marriage of Food and Wine”

PROPERTY

Judges have confirmed (Melbourne City Link v Teford 2001, English Court of Appeal in Trocette Property Co Pty v Greater London Council 1974, and Promenade Investments Pty Ltd v State of New South Wales 1992) that “Marriage Value” (a term still in use today) occurs where two properties once amalgamated, have the POTENTIAL to create extra value over and above the sum total of the two properties. In other words, the two properties created something extra once they were joined, which the owner had the choice to either realise that potential or not.

PEOPLE

Marriage between a male and female has the POTENTIAL to create something extra (children) from within the union of couple. For those couples who are sterile, the marital embrace is still the EXACT same sexual act that fertile couples enjoy – an act which is open to life however the ability to create life is outside of their control. For those couples that voluntarily contracept, they have made the decision to withhold their fertility from each other, but even in this instance, contraception is temporary and the potential is still there.

A union of two people of the same sex have zero potential to create from within their union. Because their bodies are the same and not complimentary, they will always have zero potential from within their union.

Just like a man can NOT be called a mother (even though he may perform motherly duties), Marriage can NOT refer to two people of the same sex.

What also comes to mind is how the Greens view the terms “husband and wife” as discriminatory, but also redefining marriage makes a mockery of the term “consummate your marriage”.

MARRIAGE

Marriage defines parenthood. A woman's husband is presumed to be the father of any children she gives birth to during the life of their union. This is called the legal "presumption of paternity." This, coupled with a social practice of sexual exclusivity within marriage, attaches children to their biological parents.

Marriage attaches the child's parents to each other. Attaching parents to each other is important because it protects the legitimate interests of children. The child is entitled to a relationship with and care from both of the people who brought him into being. The parent's relationship with each other provides the vehicle that allows the child to be in relationship with both parents. Therefore, the child has a legitimate interest in the stability of his parents' union.

Marriage connects the generations to one another. One might object that some marriages don't have children. This is perfectly true, but this objection views marriage strictly from the adult's perspective, instead of from the child's perspective. Remember that every child has parents. Depriving a child of relationships with his or her parents is an injustice to the child, and should not be done without some compelling or unavoidable reason.

Same sex marriages separate children from one of their biological parents by design. The state's role should be to recognize the natural reality of biological parenthood. Same sex marriage marginalizes sex roles, which minimalizes fathers.

Same sex couples obviously do not procreate naturally and there has been a lot of talk designed to get you to forget that point, designed to obscure that fact. Official documents such as a birth certificate records the biological truth but this truth will disappear. Therefore, the non biological "parent" (say lesbian) has the exact same rights over a child as the biological mother (the other lesbian), or to put it another way the biological lesbian mother has less rights than a heterosexual mother due to the effect of same sex marriage. (see *Lisa Miller v Janet Jenkins*)

I have no problem with anyone having the same rights as myself regarding inheritance, hospital emergencies, welfare benefits and the like. I understand policies have been changed to give same sex couple these same rights. This did not require the definition of Marriage to be changed.

Redefining Marriage will also affect our vulnerable and impressionable children. We are living in a pornified culture and we have already seen how the education system overseas has been hijacked to promote homosexuality.

CLAIM 1:

Married partners have immediate access to all relationship rights, entitlements, protections and responsibilities.

RESPONSE 1:

Married couples are at a disadvantage. Couples that cohabit access those rights well before a non cohabitating couple do prior to being married.

CLAIM 2:

It wasn't long ago that black and white people could not marry each other.

RESPONSE 2:

Rephrased this actually says: Some time ago a male and female who were of a different colour to each other couldn't get married in some countries and so that is why we should

change the Marriage Act from a male to a female which is ironically used in this example, to one where a man can marry a man or a woman can marry a woman.

CLAIM 3

There are examples of same sex marriage in history.

RESPONSE 3

Caligula famously made his horse, Incitatus, a member of the Roman Senate. So based on the handful of actual examples of same sex marriage that could be sourced from over thousands of years of history it follows that horses should be elected to the Senate. It would appear the ceremonies were novel but were not taken seriously by the society at the time.

CLAIM 4

Allowing same sex marriage won't affect you

RESPONSE 4

One example in how it will affect my family and I is in the School Curriculum

We can already see numerous schools in the US and Canada, where same sex marriage is now legal, teachers are teaching homosexuality as being natural and normal. It is neither of those. For something to be considered "natural", the conditions where it is found should not be extreme anomalies, rare in number and temporary as happens with the examples of homosexuality in nature. As for being considered normal where there is only two results, 95% of a dataset is normal, the other 5% is not normal, in the statistical sense.

Moves are afoot in by the Australian Education Union to "eliminated the discriminatory practices of heterosexism, The AEU tells us exactly what heterosexism is: "The assumption that heterosexual sex and relationships are 'natural' or 'normal'."

"Marriage equality" creates new inequalities

Kind regards,

Gary and Melissa Edmonds