

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

**Name:** Mr Terry Flanagan

**Date received:** 8/02/2013

---

1. Defining Marriage is a Federal, not a State issue
2. The argument for "Same Sex Marriage" is based on "equal rights for all who love one another" - to then limit this to "Same Sex Couples who are not closely related" is self defeating / contradictory.
3. Only the current definition of marriage is based on universal principles that exclude all other definitions.

## PUBLIC SUBMISSION TO ADDRESS THE ISSUE OF "SAME SEX MARRIAGE"

To Whom it may concern :

I would like to speak against any proposal to change the current Marriage Act to allow Marriage between people of the same sex.

My reasons include the following :

1. Legally defining Marriage is Constitutionally a Federal, not a State, jurisdiction.
2. For Marriage to include the union of people of the same sex, it would have to be on the basis of a very broad definition of "Marriage" - i.e. a committed love relationship. Those who advocate "Same Sex Marriage" do so on the basis that all people who love one another should have the equal right to "Marry".

Advocates of "Same Sex Marriage" may have no intention that this should open the door to all loving relationships (incestuous heterosexual or homosexual, polygamous, bestial etc). They claim the "opening the door" argument is ridiculous and offensive. But, by protesting so loudly they defeat their own main argument for "Same Sex Marriage" - which is, "Those who love each other have equal rights to marry without discrimination". By objecting they virtually say, "Marriage is a union between people who love each other, AS LONG AS IT'S NOT POLYGAMOUS, NOT INCESTUOUS, NOT ...". The whole "equal rights" and "non discrimination" argument is already being denied by its own advocates. Their only defence is to say "the thin edge of the wedge argument" is unfounded, but they fail to answer what is wrong with all the other "relationships" given their own argumentation.

The point I am making is not that this may lead to the door being opened to all sorts of relationships being included under the umbrella of "Marriage", but that the argument for "Same Sex Marriage" is either valid for any loving relationship or not a valid argument at all . Which leads me to my next point about the inherent uniqueness of "Marriage" as it is currently defined.

3. The current definition of Marriage is based on universal principles, as against the vague idea of "rights for all", which can be used to justify as many definitions and wishes as there are people.

The current definition of Marriage is based on the following absolute principles :-

- whether people like it or not, our Constitution recognises the "Almighty God" of the Bible. That is its starting point for having certainty about how society can actually have absolute standards of morality and government. One of the reasons for our current definition of Marriage is the historic recognition of its Biblical origin.
- Marriage defined as the union of "a man and a woman to the exclusion of all others" has been the basic definition throughout the history of mankind cross culturally.
- Marriage, as currently defined, recognises that only a "Man and a Woman" can produce children. Marriage, currently defined, has strongly been defended on the basis of its connection to family stability.

- Marriage as currently defined recognises that only a “Man and a Woman” can raise their children as a “Father and a Mother”. To try and argue “Some mothers and fathers aren’t good parents” or “What about childless couples?” is to try and argue that exceptions deny the rule.
- The above principles provide the basis for arguing against all the “opening the door” scenarios that the “Same Sex” argument cannot produce.

respectfully submitted,

Terry Flanagan

16 Patherton Place,  
Narellan Vale,  
NSW, 2567  
0425 233 269