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EXECUTIVE SUMMARY
The Christian Democratic Party sees such proposals as a path to national moral decline, with consequential adverse effects on adult and child mortality, health care and abusive violence against women and children. Children will be prejudicially affected by elevated child molestation, social maladjustment and psychological disorders. This is not acceptable. Marriage is God given and should be protected for what it brings to meaningful relationships and its part in the perpetuation of life.

Serious questions are also raised about the legal and constitutional validity of the proposals, and lack of support from the wider electorate. It would appear that only a rabid minority sub-group of the homosexual community is engaged in promoting the issue. We now find that some states in USA which had gone down that path have had such legislation overturned by democratic process.

We submit that proposals by the Federal Government to endorse homosexual (same sex) marriage are not in the best interest of the Australian society or our nation and should not be pursued.

A SOCIETAL AND CHRISTIAN WORLD VIEW
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10. Conclusion
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A SOCIETAL AND CHRISTIAN WORLD VIEW
Definition-While a minority of societies practise polygamy, the majority world view of marriage is the commitment to a lifelong union of one man and one woman. The man and woman in a public ceremony are joined together through an exchange of promises and leave their home of origin to start their own home and family. This is marriage and the reality is that anything different is not marriage.

Marriage is the oldest known institution in society, going back to the beginning of recorded time. It is the Biblical and societal model for ideal relationships that has and will always stand the tests of time. It should be regarded as of true heritage value for all that it brings and offers, be respected and be
left undisturbed. Yet, while some may question marriage today, based on the increasing divorce rates, the problem is not so much the institution of marriage, but the failure of the individuals within the marriage- for whatever reasons, but that is another topic.

**Consequence of free choice**- People in our society are free to choose their own form of relationship and this already has legal recognition, but anything different to a man and a woman does not meet the criteria for marriage and will always be queer, or different to the norm. *A homosexual activist told Archbishop Peter Jensen that he believed that society at large would not normalise homosexual behaviour. Peter Jensen agreed and said that society will not honour same-sex marriages like real marriage. [FWN Aug 2011 p 1.]* That is honest realism from both.

**Fundamental Issue**- A lack of general societal recognition is not because of negative discrimination per se, but because any form of homosexual relationship is not a marriage, either by definition or observable criteria. A USA Catholic bishop has stated that *supporters of homosexual “marriage” fail to understand both the purpose of sex and the nature of human beings.* Bishop Robert Vasa, coadjutor bishop of Santa Rosa, California, said *the emphasis on equality and civil rights completely misses the point. The real controversy revolves around a proper philosophical understanding of the nature of the human person, and the nature of sexual interaction between persons of the opposite sex. It also stems from a general failure to recognise and understand that sexual love is not about self-gratification and pleasure, but about entering into a relationship with another person which is by its nature capable of being fruitful.* Basic science defines the genetic and physical factors necessary for procreation.

This submission is NOT against a person's free choice of association, but rather against *any attempt to redefine marriage itself,* with resultant increased harm against women and children that would be expected, should the present legal definition of marriage be changed. We will now share some of the realities of same sex unions that illustrate the unnecessary cost of their relationships to society and government, because of their permitted freedom of association. If the marriage law was changed, the consequential social and financial impact on our society would be beyond our belief and begin the total decline of the open Australian society we all now enjoy.

**B OTHER FACTUAL ISSUES OF CONCERN**

1. **Sexual promiscuity leads to escalating health costs and premature deaths**
   It is likely that political endorsement of same sex “marriage” will lead to the escalation of disease and premature death for the homosexual community. *Common diseases include Hepatitis A, Hepatitis B, Gonorrhoea, HIV, Typhoid Fever, Herpes, Cancer, Amoeba, Giardia and Shigella.* [New England Journal of Medicine 1980, 302:45-48].

   **Escalating health costs** occur in part because sexual health *education programs have little to no effect* on this group- they are irresponsible. [Dr William Haseltine, Harvard Medical School. 1993 Study]. *Most homosexuals admit their willingness to allow “extramarital?” sexual outlets. Very few want “marriage” involving fidelity and long term monogamous commitment.* [Bill Muelhenberg ‘Quick Facts on Marriage’ FWN August 2011 p7]. The **average homosexual has 50**
to 70 different partners every year. Such partners increase their risk of getting or giving STD’s to others, both in the homosexual community and elsewhere. [P Cameron, Psych Reports 1989, 64:1167-1179]. In Australia, 30,486 people have been notified with HIV with 6,787 deaths. [The Kirby Institute, HIV, viral hepatitis and sexually transmissible infections in Australia Annual Surveillance Report 2011].

A gay newspaper survey found that gay couples lasted 3.5 years at the most, and lesbian couples lasted 2.2 years [P Blumstein & Pschwartz, American Couples 1983]. Even if homosexual “marriages” could last, which they do not, both partners would be dead within a couple of decades. [Homosexual Fact Sheet]. It is clear that proliferation of homosexuality, consequent to same sex “marriage” laws, will result in higher national medical and surgical costs.

2. Homosexual relationships are not the best for children, particularly girls
Every scientific study confirms the reality that children flourish best when they have both a mother and a father living at the same home. The essential purpose of heterosexual marriage is to attach fathers and mothers to their children and to one another. Children need a relationship and care from both of the people who brought them into the world. [Babette Francis FWN Aug 2011 p 6 and many other references].

Dr Bruce Ellis, Psychologist in Sexual Development, University of Canterbury in Christchurch found that one of the most important factors in determining early menarche for girls is the father. With an absent father, a girl is more likely to experience early onset of puberty and teenage pregnancy. “There seems to be something special about the role of fathers in regulating daughter’s sexual development”.

A lesbian same sex relationship will therefore not enhance a girl’s development, but will prejudice it. [Sexual Integrity, Fatherhood Foundation and Integrity Alliance, p 12, item #5]

3. Same sex “marriage” increases violence against women
Women are safest when in a heterosexual marriage. There is greater chance of abuse and violence being committed against women in a relationship which is other than a heterosexual married relationship. [Sexual Integrity – Fatherhood Foundation p 14 item 7].

7% of lesbians (& 1.4% of gays) were murdered 100 times the rate of non homosexuals.
5.7% of lesbians (& 0.6% of gays) committed suicide about 50 times that of non-homosexuals
4.3% of lesbians (& 0.6% of gays) died in motor accidents 18 times more than non-homosexuals.

4. Same sex “marriage” increases child molestation
A survey of white gays found that 25% admitted to having sex with boys 16 years or younger, when they were 21 yo or older. [A P Bell, Sexual Preference, 1981,19]. In their magazines, gays admit that one of their objectives in doing this is to increase the number of homosexuals. [Homosexual Fact Sheet p 4]
With the removal of legal inhibitions relating to “marriage”, more children of all ages and of both sexes will be raised in a homosexual environment. Same sex partners will find little impediment to further their practices and goals on the children in their custody. The same arguments used to justify same sex “marriages” can be fully used to justify polygamy, incest, group sex and so on. Once the fundamental idea of marriage is tossed out, any and all types of sexual activity becomes permissible. [Bill Muehlenberg, Quick facts on Marriage, FWN Aug 2011, p7]

5. **Short duration same sex “marriages” adversely impacts children**

A gay newspaper survey found that gay couples lasted 3.5 years at the most, and lesbian couples lasted 2.2 years [P Blumstein & Pschwartz, American Couples 1983]. If children are involved in this most unstable and transitory relationship, they suffer earlier and experience greater trauma, more frequently than children in a heterosexual marriage and family. Consequently, counselling and family law costs escalate. These children will be deprived of their carers earlier and more frequently than for those in normal heterosexual married parent families. Rehabilitation will be most difficult for them.

6. **International trend against same sex “marriages”**

Same sex “marriage” laws are now being overturned democratically. Two states in the USA have reversed attempts to legalize homosexual “marriage”. California amended its constitution by a ballot initiative to reverse homosexual “marriage”. Maine voters exercised their “citizen’s veto” to prevent a same sex marriage bill passed by the legislature and signed by the Governor, from becoming law. [Babette Francis FWN Aug 2011, p1].

7. **Ethical implications**

This submission and multiple other sources clearly demonstrate that *same sex unions* do not offer the same relational fulfilment, personal benefits, security or happiness for two people that *opposite sex marriages* do. In fact they are largely harmful for whoever is involved in such a union. Therefore on the basis of this information and identifiable facts it would be ethically wrong to either encourage or legislate on the acceptance of same sex “marriages”.

8. **Grammatical implications**

Good grammar enables us to understand that the words “same” and “opposite” do not mean the same thing. The reality is the meanings of these two words “same” and “opposite” are so far apart, that no one would suggest otherwise. Grammatically the adjectives describe and define the nouns. So it is that when we read or hear the words *same sex union* and *opposite sex marriage* we all understand what is being said and there is no confusion- we are speaking of two different types of relationship.

An understanding of “same” and “different,” are two of the basic cognitive skills that are tested and measured in the standard Australian IQ tests. This fact demonstrates that not all discrimination is negative. Rather the ability to recognise difference is essential. Life and work experience teach us the enormous value of this area of mind development, it is essential to work practise, safety and career success.
9. **Same sex “marriage” laws will not be democratic**
Homosexuals comprise a very small portion of Australian society and homosexuals who want to “marry” make up an even smaller number. Therefore there is no reasonable justification to overturn the institution of marriage—especially considering the negative factors against such a change. *Homosexual “marriage” has never been legalised by a direct vote of the people.* [Babette Francis “In Defence of Marriage” FWN Aug 2011, p1]. If the Government pursues the issue, it will not be democratically supported by the electorate.

**CONCLUSION**
We submit that proposals to, or actions by the Federal Government to endorse homosexual (same sex) marriage, are not in the best interest of the Australian society, or our nation and should not be pursued, or acted upon.
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