

I am writing to you to consider my thoughts and considerations on the issue of this Bill and why changing this Bill is not for the good of Australian society and family.

1 Subsection 5(1) (definition of marriage)

I don't agree with the changing of the definition of marriage. This change makes the Bill undermines the value of all existing marriages approved under the 1961 Act. What if a Bill was proposed that changed the definition of what it meant to be an Indigenous Australian? Would that be fair to existing Indigenous Australians? This change to the definition of Marriage, goes against the nature of what marriage is supposed to be and what it has been for society. I recommend not to change the this section. If there is a change to this section then only more groups will seek to change it again in the future - further diluting "marriage" to suit the passing will that generation.

2 Subsection 45(2), 3 Subsection 46(1), 4 Subsection 72(2) & 6 Part III of the Schedule (table item 1)

This change further devalues the different roles of a man and a woman in their marriage. By neutering the terminology from "husband" & "wife" to "partner" takes away from the richness of the act of marriage. Losing this unique terminology emphasises a rather homogeneous contract where "sameness" is celebrated. Marriage isn't about "sameness", it celebrates and unifies the intercomplementary and different nature between a man and woman. This Bill is seeking to recognise the anti-complementary nature of two same sex people within the construct of a newly defined "marriage" and that's not what marriage should be.

5 Section 88EA

This section seeks to recognise other differing "marriages" that have been solemnised in other jurisdictions and continues to undermine the value of marriage in the 1961 Act. Australian law should uphold the value of marriage as defined in the 1961 Act and not change the nature that our society has been founded upon.

I implore the Senate Legal and Constitutional Affairs Committee recognise that the nature of the Marriage Act 1961 makes for a rich and fruitful construct that only Marriage as defined by the 1961 Act can provide. The Bill does not seek to celebrate diversity, it instead seeks to celebrate similarity between two people of the same gender. This Bill does not strengthen the Marriage Act, it set outs to undermine marriage. I recommend that the Marriage Equality Amendment Bill of 2010 be dismissed because it undermines the nature of Marriage and unjustly discriminates against marriages for all Australians married validly under the 1961 Act.

Kind regards,

GIOVANNI PORTELLI