To the President and Members of the Australian Senate, and to others
To whom it may Concern

I petition the Senate and the appropriate Senate Committee, to reject requests from a minority sector of the Australian Community to consider amendments to the Marriage Act (1961) in particular, amendment to the Definition of Marriage as contained in the Act vis: the definition of marriage contained in the Interpretation of the Act:

"marriage" means the union of a man and a woman to the exclusion of all others, voluntarily entered into for life.

I do not submit this petition lightly; I am an Authorised Marriage Celebrant and have been for many years. As such have solemnised many hundreds of Marriages.

My opposition to these minority claims, is that the current definition of Marriage, as contained in the Act;

- reflects community understanding of the meaning and status of Marriage
- has acceptance by the large majority of the Australian community, and
- it reflects the purpose of Marriage – the produce off-spring. That some married couples decline to have children, is not a counter-argument as the reasons for such decisions are many and varied .- economic circumstances, potential to pass on inherited genetic problems are just two.

I refute totally claims of "equality" ….. all eligible Australian citizens are able to marry under the current definition of Marriage; that they choose not so to do, is a personal choice and not a discriminatory factor.

There are many example under the laws of this nations' which are not universal and apply only to specific segments of the community – these are not considered "discriminatory" hence, I petition that the terms of the Marriage Act are not discriminatory – they apply to all eligible Australian Citizens - the fact that a minority segment choose not to marry, is a personal decision and not the result of discrimination.

That devoted couples of the same-sex do not have similar legal rights as those who Marry according to existing law, has some merit; I refer in the matters of inheritance, to pension and superannuation, and joint income provisions and other similar matters which apply to legally married couples.

I petition, and petition in the strongest terms that such matters … matters this minority sector of the community claim to be "discriminatory, are able to be provided without alteration to any existing provision of the Marriage Act, nor in particular, to any alteration of the definition of "Marriage".

I would therefore support a movement which seeks to offer equality in these matters by some other process but, not by altering the existing definition of "Marriage".

I further recommend that consideration be given to provisions in the act which allow “solemnisation” of same-sex relationships but, that relationship be given an alternative title ….”Marriage” is not appropriate in this case because of observations previously made.

I therefore support a process by which the community at large recognises that “Marriage” is a relationship between a man and a woman, and the “other term/title” be applicable to, and recognised by the community at large, as a legal relationship between same-sex couples.

Further to this recommendation, I support also that any legally binding same-sex relationship, be subject to divorce and dissolution provisions – including property-settlement provisions – as currently exist for Marriage.

I have found that same-sex couples have rarely considered this matter and those who have, rarely agree that a formal “divorce” process should apply; further, this minority also appear not to accept provisions which apply for property settlements as exist for man/woman defacto relationships.

My conclusion then, is that the same-sex minority seek the advantages which exist for a conventional marriage but do not wish to encumber themselves with the responsibilities.

Yours faithfully

John J. Moore
Marriage Celebrant