## INQUIRY INTO SAME SEX MARRIAGE LAW IN NSW

Name: Name suppressed

**Date received**: 9/02/2013



It is of grave concern that the social engineers in our society are endeavouring to undermine, redefine and ultimately weaken marriage.

The fact that you need to change the law and add the term same-sex, means that a bedrock institution is being redefined to be not only what it shoudn't be but ultimately what it can't be.

We live in our society where people are free to make relational choices. This is a personal matter unless decency in areas such as age of consent, bestiality .... are involved. Yet who one lives with, how many one lives with .... are personal choices. Yet the state should not and cannot endorse every alternative arrangement.

As well, government health surveys show that for the small percentage of the population that is gay (2-3%), only a small percent are involved in monogamous relationships, with the lifestyle in the main not being one of stable and exclusive arrangements that require marriage. Hence, for a very, very small percentage of society we are turning a significant institution into a tool to endorse relationships that cannot be called marriage with out the cavaet of 'same-sex' being added.

Yet a change like this is so much more. Universally, everyone will have to accept this is the law. There will be no freedom for people to choose this not to be the case. What is taught in our schools, what is allowed in our churches, what choices our businesses will be able to make will be wrapped in this law because the state will say what marriage is, even though much of the population will not be in agreeance with this measure.

Much work has been done to give equality to those choosing to live in relationships outside of marriage. This is enough. This provides the stability and fairness that is needed. Marriage must be left alone as the bedrock institution of a healthy society. As well, marriage is not legislatively a State responsibility.

NSW faces far more serious issues and our resources should be better deployed rather than on the diversion of a minority driven and highly divisive issue.