Committee Secretary,  
Senate Legal and Constitutional Affairs Committee  
P.O. Box 6100  
Parliament House,  
Canberra, ACT 2600  

Dear Secretary,  

Submission on Marriage Equality Amendment Bill 2010  

The Social Questions Committee presents this submission on behalf of members of CWL Victoria & Wagga Wagga Inc.  

Our organisation is a member organisation of CWLA Inc (our National Body) which has NGO status with the Economic and Social Council of the United Nations and is a member organisation of the World Union of Catholic Women’s Organisations which represents 5 million Catholic women worldwide.  

International human rights emanate from international treaties adopted by the United Nations Member States. To date, sexual orientation and gender identity are not mentioned in any UN treaty or other consensus document. When these issues have been proposed during UN negotiations they have been rejected even as recently as the CSW meeting in New York 2012.  

The LGBT community are using the Yogyakarta Principles and the Activist Guide to the Yogyakarta Principles to push their agenda and the drafters claim these Principles “affirm binding international legal standards with which all states must comply”. Yet they failed to identify the binding legal standards.  

The European Court of Human Rights has ruled unanimously that there is no obligation on states to recognise same sex marriage.  

Looking at what is happening in the American states and the nations that have legalised same sex marriage we see much intolerance and discrimination shown towards anyone who may hold the opinion that marriage can only be between a male and female to the exclusion of all others. Children are now being subjected to the most radical sexual teachings and parents are unable to do anything about it. No primary school child should be subjected to such teachings. It is child abuse. This is solely to appease a small minority of people within society.  

Much has been stated by the LGBT lobby with regards to discrimination, violence, hate speech, intolerance and social exclusion, yet this is exactly the position they have adopted when it comes to people exercising their right to ‘free speech’ and their ‘religious beliefs’. During the past two decades the strategy of the gay activists has been to vilify those who oppose their lifestyle. Christians in particular are being targeted. Yet Religious beliefs and practices are enunciated within UN Treaties and consensus documents as a human right.  

No government or group has the right to redefine marriage to mean anything other than between a man and a woman (male and female). To do so is messing with nature, and we all know that nature never
forgives. Throughout history and in all human societies, marriage has always been the union of a man and woman which reflects the complementary nature of both when two become one.

A mother and a father are the natural orientation of the marital relationship with children. Regardless of the mess our laws have created over the last 50 years (no fault divorce, contraception, abortion, etc) it does not justify the redefinition of marriage. It does not justify doing away with a mother and father in raising children. All social science research shows that children do best when raised by a mother and a father. Mothers and fathers bring different gifts to a marriage and to their children.

With the acceptance of surrogacy for same sex couples, what is to stop “men emotionally and sexually attracted to minors” (minor attracted persons) from marrying and using a surrogate to produce children. Yes, paedophiles now refer to themselves as minor attracted persons (refer to the conference B4U Act held in America last year).

Like a stone thrown into the water, to amend the Marriage Act as it currently stands to allow same sex marriage will have a huge ripple effect which will be detrimental to society in general.

Eighty four (84) pieces of legislation were amended by the Federal Parliament in 2007 to recognise same sex relationships. These changes did away with the word ‘spouse’ in relation to a husband and wife. Birth certificates are already using incorrect language to describe birth mothers/fathers. No doubt the same will apply to Passports. Some states have Relationship Registers. Unfortunately then as now, the MSM continue to promote SSM to the detriment of society. People who oppose this Amendment Bill are being told that we have no right to comment. In a democracy we as well as everyone else have the right to freedom of speech.

We do not have a problem with same sex people, we accept the as fellow citizens. However, we see their sexual act as not being natural and therefore cannot support it or accept that it is the same sexual act between a male and a female which is able to produce generations – past, present and future.

We are not homophobic. We are women who have supported all peoples and races, religions and non in times of need both here in Australia, the ASIA Pacific and many developing countries.

As we reflect upon the history of the world, nations who have adopted such policies have slowly died and we do not want that to happen to our great country Australia. Our fathers, husbands and now sons have fought and died for the freedom we now enjoy. Let us not then throw away that great freedom just to appease a small group of citizens who are pushing to change what has stood the test of time and that is ‘marriage between one man and one woman’.

Madge Fahy
Research Officer
Social Questions Committee,