

INQUIRY INTO SAME SEX MARRIAGE LAW IN NSW

Name: Name suppressed

Date received: 16/02/2013

Partially Confidential

I am opposed to the NSW government changing the definition of marriage

Marriage as the union of a man and a woman has existed across cultures, religions and millennia, reflecting the biological complementary of the sexes.

Redefining marriage creates the presumption that a child no longer has the right to be raised within their biological family. This is a serious human rights issue for our most vulnerable.

Marriage is a federal issue – the New South Wales parliament should not be attempting to redefine marriage.

A child's right needs to be considered in this debate also. I think we can ensure non-discrimination against same sex couples while at the same time maintaining a commitment to children of future generations being born of and being reared by a father and a mother. To date, international human rights law has appreciated this rational distinction.

Australian-born ethicist Professor Margaret Somerville condemns the deliberate destruction of a child's biological identity as the child of a real mother and a real father:

It is one matter for children not to know their genetic identity as a result of unintended circumstances. It is quite another matter to deliberately destroy children's links to their biological parents, and especially for society to be complicit in this destruction.

The UN Declaration on the Rights of the Child affirms that a child must not, "save in the most exceptional circumstances, be separated from his mother", and yet 'marriage' of two men and subsequent surrogacy will do exactly that, in a premeditated way. Why should a little girl without a mother, purely to satisfy the desire of two men to have a baby of their own. What then of the rights of the child?

I also believe that this is not discrimination but definition. It is not about preventing same sex couples from being in relationship.