

Hi there,

I am writing this submission because I had heard that there was a flood of same-sex activist form letters being pumped into your enquiry and I find that very disturbing. I am one of the 95% who do not identify as gay or lesbian and one of the 99.99% who do not easily put pen to paper unless there is a serious threat. Given that same sex couples get equivalent legal rights (property, superannuation etc) as married couples these days, I can only see this relentless push for redefining marriage away from the current understanding as an ideological battle by a minority activist group that is designed to destroy the true meaning of the marriage relationship, rather than provide benefit for the health of our society going forward. The relentless push to normalise the concept of same sex relationships as fully legitimate in our media, forums and television programmes is certainly gaining ground as those who do not think deeply about the true nature of anatomy, genetics and the health and longevity of societies (and humanity) gradually become desensitised to the truth. Having spent my formative childhood years in a rural environment away from the influences of mass media and ideology, I know exactly what is correct/natural and what is not in regards to animal husbandry and reproductive processes, but one of the big problems of this relentless ideological campaign is that anyone who speaks a differing (let alone diametrically opposed) view to the gay activists are subjected to vitriole, abuse and denigration on a massive scale. Thus, the majority of the population inherently know what is natural and what is unnatural, but are too scared to speak up for fear of being pilloried.

People who are "pro-family" are not vitriolic, abusive or denigrating to the activists. The difference is stark and I believe it points markedly to the truth of the matter. It is interesting that many gay people have in the past not wanted anything to do with the concept of marriage since it is something that has always been recognised as a rite of bonding male and female for the purpose of procreation of the species, even by them. That there is considerable activism of late to modify it does not mean that there is not a diversity of opinion even within the gay and lesbian community about this course of action. I would also say that the pro-gay marriage stance of the Blich Labor government (and disgraceful hurried push of legalisation of civil unions legislation through parliament late in the last session without proper debate) in no way swayed a deluge of voting public flocking to the LNP opposition to form government - a party campaigning on a platform of repealing that legislation. The Greens vote also dropped. Anyone of high level education knows that there are many intricacies to the nature vs nurture argument but that it is definitely biologically and sociologically logical to make the premise that a child needs both a male and a female as primary pastoral role models in their upbringing to become a 'working as designed' adult member of the community. Where there is one of these missing, there is ample societal evidence showing the devastating consequences of that absence. ('Ample' to anyone living on the street or the coalface, possibly not evident to someone at the 'bar', the 'bench' or even the 'cross benches'). To say that two gay or lesbian people have equal 'right' to raising a child and that there is no lack for the child in this relationship is both nonsensical and arrogant in the extreme, showing that the overriding concern is not for the child's well-being but for the activists' need to try justify themselves as fully legitimate. (Same goes for a single person such as me 'wanting a child', a childless person, or anyone else outside of the basic natural family building block, which is the biological mother and father in a full-time lifelong covenant partnership). That traditional marriage is not 100% perfect is not a valid argument for watering it down further. There are already murmurings of

**polygamist activists saying that once gay marriage is valid then they are next, and also pedophiles are believing that they should be considered legitimate too, since they, like gay and lesbian people, also believe 'they were born that way, so it must be legitimate'.**

**There is much much more evidence for the support of maintaining the sanctity of marriage as it currently stands, but my intent was just to briefly show that I am a concerned citizen standing with a very many others over this vexing issue, which is far more threatening to the fabric of our society (at the very least degrading our ability to repair damage already done through marriage breakdown and the migration of major sections of society from a world view of societal 'responsibility' to individual 'right') than what a lot of people may think, given this relentless ideological campaign to sway their thinking.**

**Thanks for your consideration of my views.**

**Cameron Todd**