Submission No 508

INQUIRY INTO SAME SEX MARRIAGE LAW IN NSW

Name: Ms Sonya Thompson

Date received: 11/02/2013

I am writing regarding the NSW inquiry into legalising same sex marriage and wish to give the following comments/opinions.

Marriage has always been about the union of a man and a women – in my mind it is integral to the whole and full meaning of marriage.
The union of a man and a woman in turn creates a stable committed environment for raising children of that union.
This gives children role models of both sexes and of marriage the way it is intended to be.

The homosexual marriage debate should not be about what a minority group WANTS but about what children - the product of marriage – NEED. A mother and a father.
I would like to hear more talk about the rights of children than the rights of a very small percentage of the population. From my research I understand the homosexual population to be below 2% whereas public perception would think it to be much higher because of the extreme lobbying of this group.

The following link gives some profound insight into the current situation in France where **1.4 million people recently marched to showed their support of heterosexual marriage**.
Interestingly it details how **many homosexuals also took part in support of the march** – in support of heterosexual marriage. A prominent homosexual spokesman against the bill said in an interview '[T]he most serious study done so far . . . demonstrates quite clearly that a child has trouble being raised by gay parents.'
An adopted Asian French child also speaks against the bill - "If you ask what adoptees want, they will give you only one answer: ONE MOTHER, ONE FATHER. The words 'mommy and daddy' are the first words that an adoptee learns….."

http://www.billmuehlenberg.com/2013/01/20/the-rights-of-children-must-come-first/

Clearly opinion polls are not a true guide to public opinion as questions are often loaded or simplistic. Political correctness has lost sight of commonsense and people no longer have a true understanding of the implications of legalising same sex marriage. A National referendum where both sides of the debate are fully heard and the implications are spelled out - would be much more plausible. I do not agree that each state should have different marriage laws – it should be a national issue for federal parliament to address.

I am not anti homosexual – and I do believe there should be laws for the protection of homosexuals and legal recognition of their commitment as partners – however these should not be in the context or form of marriage which is a sacred institution that has been ordained by God. If anything it should be a separate kind of civil union – allowing for the protection of and right of children. The Bible (and God) speaks clearly against homosexuality – however as much as God is against homosexuality, God still loves the homosexual person as much as he loves the prostitute or the tax collector.

Children have a fundamental right to a mother and a father and I believe that legalising same sex marriage will undermine this most basic of human rights.

Thank you for hearing my submission

Sonya Thompson