

## **INQUIRY INTO SAME SEX MARRIAGE LAW IN NSW**

**Name:** Mr & Mrs Donald & Beverley Smallbone

**Date received:** 7/02/2013

---

Members of NSW Legislative Council's Social Issues Committee:  
Dear Members,

We are opposed to the prospect of legalisation of same gender marriage for the following reasons:

1. The union of a man and a woman in a committed relationship has been the stabilising unit of society for the whole of human history. Though instances of infidelity have at times shown the weakness of human capacity to be faithful to this commitment, or demonstrated its capacity to wisely choose a partner is not perfect, 'marriage' has always involved a union of opposites sexually with the potential to reproduce. Because this is so, any proposal otherwise is designed (among other things) to change the meaning of marriage from its intrinsic essence.

2. Arising from that committed relationship, are the roles of mother & father - roles which shape the development of the character of its children. Though instances of adoption display commendable cases of substitution where children are otherwise deprived of parents, and the dereliction of filial duty is lamentable where parents fail to measure up, history has shown conclusively that a balanced upbringing provided by a mother and a father has been the fundamental building block of human society. To plan otherwise is to dilute the value & virtue of 'family'.

3. In our society where consenting adults are largely free to devise alternative lifestyles, people are able to opt for preferences that differ from the norm. However, their choices ought not result in the imposition of their values on those who conform by choice to the norm. To lend 'marriage' and 'family' to those of alternative lifestyle is to impose a reverse discrimination upon those of us who are already intimidated with suggestions of discrimination because we do not give unqualified support for 'alternative lifestyles'.

4. In such circumstances, if any formalisation is given to same sex relationships, the term 'marriage' should not be employed.

5. Any proposal to modify or vary the status or conditions of a legal marriage can only be rightly implemented by our federal parliament and more properly, should be subjected to the vote of all enfranchised subjects in a plebiscite that affirms or changes the terms of the current Australian Constitution - in response to a well informed preparation. Hence any canvassing of opinion within a particular state (as in our Premier's initiative) is without capacity of implementation, requires corresponding concurrence with attitudes within other states, and even then, requires federal legislation for any conjectured modification.

Hence, in our view the matter should be abandoned to leave the meaning and value of marriage unmolested.

Respectfully,

Donald and Beverley Smallbone