

INQUIRY INTO SAME SEX MARRIAGE LAW IN NSW

Name: Mr Rachel Sinclair

Date received: 9/02/2013

10 February 2013

Social Issues Committee
c/- Parliament House
Sydney NSW 2000

To whom it may concern,

I am writing to outline my arguments to assist with the NSW inquiry into Same Sex Marriage.

First and foremost it should be made quite clear that marriage is a federal and not a state issue under the Australian Constitution so any NSW bill relating to amendments to the marriage Act or same sex marriage would be unconstitutional and invalid and should not even be considered at State level.

Having different State marriage laws would lead to a great amount of confusion and uncertainty. Marriage issues should be decided for the whole of Australia in the federal parliament.

Marriage recognises the committed union of a man and a woman to encourage the stable social context needed for resulting children to be raised to responsible adulthood.

There are many more reasons why I believe marriage as we currently know it now between one man and one woman should continue. They are as follows:

- Marriage is a unique relationship between one man and one woman.
- Marriage is the foundation of family, which in turn is the foundation of society.
- If marriage can be redefined to include two people of the same gender, why not three or more people?
- Marriage is deeply held by a large proportion of the population for cultural and religious reasons and this should be respected.
- Redefining marriage has potential serious consequences for religious freedom and freedom of conscience.
- Same-sex marriage sets up a new family model that trashes the truth that gender is vital to a child in family formation.
- Research shows that a child with married, biological mother and father does best.
- Children should be given the chance to start life with both their biological parents, wherever possible.
- Two men or two women cannot of themselves procreate and it was never intended, I believe, that they should. It is intended that the marriage relationship between a man and a woman would create the best possible environment in which to raise children. Outside of this relationship it does not really make sense for two people to publicly promise to stay together for life.
- Marriage is the first step in the establishment of the genetic bonds of family. This is what makes marriage unique. A same sex relationship does not make a marriage.
- If homosexual couples wish to they can register their relationships but it should NOT be called a marriage for the reasons outlined.
- If activists want to change the definition of marriage, they should be targeting the Federal Parliament, not using the NSW Parliament for their campaign.
- There is no discrimination in Australian law against same-sex couples. This is one of the big untruths of the campaign for same-sex marriage. There is no reason to change the definition of marriage.
- If the campaign for same-sex marriage is about 'marriage equality', why is this being denied to people in group relationships, who are now expressing their anger at being left out?
- Same-sex marriage means solidifying the idea that children can have one of their biological parents forcibly excluded from their life before birth. This is not a matter of conscience, it is the duty of Government to always act in the best interest of a child who is voiceless in this decision.

Thank you for the opportunity to present sound argument on this important issue.

Yours sincerely,

Rachel Sinclair