

INQUIRY INTO SAME SEX MARRIAGE LAW IN NSW

Name: Mr Lee Dobson

Date received: 8/02/2013



To all NSW Members of the NSW Parliament

This letter is to respond to what I understand is a period of consultation by State MPs with their constituencies regarding the issue of Gay marriage.

I would like to convey my strong objection to fundamentally compromising the most important institution in society along those lines. The pro Gay marriage lobby constantly speak of equality and removing discrimination; these terms sound reasonable – even unarguable – but they are misplaced. Marriage may vary in degree from age to age – culture to culture, but it is always a context for a man and woman building a family. It is crucial for the coherence and propagation of society.

For same sex partnerships to be regarded in the same manner does not ‘widen’ the parameters marriage – it redefines and distorts it.

This is not just a cultural or religious issue. Yes, I am a Christian, a Pastor, a husband and father; I no doubt fit into that demographic the Gay marriage lobby would describe as homophobic or fossilized. I am neither. I am a thinking person who sees the family unit being torn apart at the seams. I work in East Nowra and see the beautiful young children in families that cannot give them the love, guidance and stability they need. One of the great distortions in all this, is that *‘Loving Gay couples can provide love and stability etc that many heterosexual couples cannot.’* It is a neat argument but based on a wrong foundation.

There is increasing strain on our society through - struggling single mums – children having children – men remaining immature and not meeting their obligations as fathers – grandparents being parents twice as a middle generation is virtually absent: These issues are not helped *in any way* by further tearing at the fabric of marriage.

These issues aside – I strongly believe any society is as strong as the heritage it defends. Bad practices must be exposed and eliminated but what is good in a nation should be protected and maintained. In the case of marriage it transcends even that; is more than a national issue it is a global, God given, building block of society. We change it at our peril.

I would also like to add that although manipulated polls, the Greens, media and celebrities like to convey redefining marriage as ‘inevitable’ due to its ‘overwhelming support’ – the picture may not be so clear. People often will state agreement with things their hearts feel differently about. Issues such as this are articulated eloquently by passionate people. However most people are not spontaneously articulate or eloquent and so will often ‘agree’ with propositions when pressed; but their true views remain their own.



Finally I ask that you take a minute to look at the opinions of Christopher Pearson of the Australian. Christopher is a homosexual who is living life authentically based on his strong Christian faith. His views are instructive, as are those of Miranda Devine and Dr David Van Gend.

I sincerely hope that you will defend this most crucial of all human expressions from further dilution and distortion.

Thank you so much for your time.

Blessings to you, and to your family in this coming year.

Yours Faithfully

Lee Dobson

8th Feb 2013

One of the purposes of marriage is to bind them to their spouses and children for the long haul and to give the state's approval to those who enter such a contract and abide by its terms. Another of the purposes of marriage is to affirm that parenthood is a big, and in most cases the primary, contribution a couple can make, both to their own fulfillment and the public good. It follows that societies which want to sustain their population size, let alone increase their fertility level, should positively discriminate in favour of stable, heterosexual relationships and assert the preferability of adolescents making a normal transition to heterosexual adulthood. *[my emphasis]*

It should be obvious to unprejudiced observers that, while there are plenty of well-adjusted gays who manage to lead satisfying and productive lives, rational people do not of their own volition choose to be homosexual.

It should be equally obvious that those who, through whatever mixture of nature and nurture, end up at whatever age identifying as homosexual, bisexual or whatever, need to be protected from any kind of persecution.....

Christopher Pearson The Australian 20/11/2010

We were told last week, for instance, that the majority of Australians, 62 per cent, are in favour of same sex marriage, according to a Galaxy poll of 1050 voters, and that this figure has been rising inexorably over time. But the poll, commissioned by advocacy groups, Australian Marriage Equality and Parents and Friends of Lesbians and Gays, arrived at its conclusion by asking a leading question.

"A number of countries allow same-sex couples to marry. These include Argentina, Canada, the Netherlands, Norway, Portugal, South Africa and Spain, as well as parts of the United States and Mexico. Do you agree or disagree that same-sex couples in Australia should be able to marry?"

Why the preamble? Obviously, asking the question in the way Galaxy did implants the idea that same-sex marriage is so commonplace and widely accepted in reasonable countries that to disagree would be perverse.

Miranda Devine Daily Telegraph 21/11/2010



Far more substantial polling comes from Roy Morgan's Single Source face-to-face surveys, which reach more than 50,000 people each year. His data uses proxy questions: Do you think homosexual activity is immoral and are you in favour of gays getting adoption rights? Attitudes vary widely, of course, between the regions and the inner and outer suburbs, which is why Galaxy's 62 per cent in favour should be treated with caution.

Christopher Pearson The Australian 20/11/2010

A child needs at least the chance of a mum and a dad in his or her life and same-sex marriage makes that impossible. The violation of this fundamental right and profound emotional need of a child means - from the child's perspective - that gay marriage is deprivation, not liberation.

Marriage is a compound right and includes the legal right to children. The normalizing of same-sex marriage would mean that gay couples would have equal standing with male-female couples for adopting children. The "marriage" of two women would deprive an adopted boy of his role model for being a man, and the "marriage" of two men would deprive a growing girl of a mother to learn from and confide in.

The sentimental claptrap that passes for debate on gay marriage would have disgusted even that old atheist philosopher, Bertrand Russell. Russell understood that society has no interest in passing laws about people's private affairs and that the primary reason for the public contract of marriage is to bind the man to the woman for the long task of rearing their children.

As he wrote in *Marriage and Morals*: "*It is through children alone that sexual relations become of importance to society, and worthy to be taken cognisance of by a legal institution.*"

The biological triple-bond of man and woman and child is nature's foundation for human life, not a social fad to be cut to shape according to political whim. It is beyond the power of any parliament to repeal nature and equate same-sex relationships with the inherently male-female project of family formation. Yet inner-city Greens and muddled MPs are so out of touch with nature that they think that abolishing a mother will be of no consequence.

Dr David van Gend GP and committee member of Family Council of Queensland

16/11/2010 The Australian