

SAME-SEX MARRIAGE IN AUSTRALIA - SOME FACTS AND IMPLICATIONS

Under the Australian Marriage Act 1961 and its subsequent Marriage Amendment Act 2004, marriage is defined as a union between a man and a woman to the exclusion of all others, entered into voluntarily for life. However, advocates of same-sex marriage are now challenging this definition. They are demanding that marriage be redefined in order that same-sex marriage can be legalised. To resolve the issue, the Government would be conducting a plebiscite on this issue of same-sex marriage in the months after the coming Federal Election on July 2nd, provided they are returned to power at the Election. The plebiscite is a democratic measure to provide a chance for every citizen of this country to cast a vote to indicate whether they would support or oppose same-sex marriage.

However, if the Opposition wins the Election, they would legalise same-sex marriage within the first one hundred days of winning government, because same-sex marriage is their party policy. In this case, there would no longer be a plebiscite, and we would therefore have no say in the matter, and they would legalise same-sex marriage accordingly.

In view of the above, it is of the utmost importance that we inform ourselves on this issue of same-sex marriage and its implications on our lives and on our society, so that we can vote wisely in giving support to the appropriate party of your choice in the coming Federal Election. It is the intention of this paper to provide you with this information in assisting you to do that.

The following are some commonly asked questions:

1. Has the legalisation of same-sex marriage been proven to work in other parts of the world?

Same-sex marriage is a completely new idea. The first time same-sex marriage was legislated was in the Netherlands in 2001. It is a new experiment. Its advocates cannot say with certainty how the experiment will end, or whether it will bring positive effects on society.

2. Is same-sex marriage a fundamental human right?

No, it is not. The United Nations Human Rights Committee and the European Court of Human Rights both hold the view that same-sex marriage is not a fundamental human right. Advocates for 'same-sex marriage' reject The Universal Declaration of Human Rights Article 16 that marriage is between a man and a woman. This is a radical shift in thinking.

3. What is the proportion of the homosexual population in Australia?

According to the 2011 Australian Census, the homosexual population was about 1.2% of the total population in this country. This figure was confirmed by a reputable study done by the Australia and New Zealand Public Health 2013. And same-sex couples represented about 1% of all couples in Australia. A survey conducted by Family Voice Australia 2012 found that only 1% of the homosexual population would wish to enter into marriage. In other countries of the world like Sweden, Holland and a few others where marriage has been redefined, the percentage of same sex couples entering into marriage a few years after the legalisation of same-sex marriage varied between 0.6% and 6% of their own population of same-sex couples.

4. What is the level of need for same-sex marriage in Australia?

Since the decriminalisation of homosexuality in Australia between 1972 and-1997 at different times in the various states, gender equality and homosexual unions have been recognised. Their de facto relationships were also legally recognised between 2003 and 2012. Same-sex couples currently enjoy the same legal rights and receive the same welfare benefits as their heterosexual counterparts. They have the right to adopt and foster children. They have the right to register their homosexual relationships and the right to choose their legal gender. Being considered a minority group, they are well protected under the Anti-discrimination Act of 2013. They enjoy popular support from the media and generous endorsements from the corporate world, both local and overseas. Politicians and the legal profession are constantly championing their cause. The annual Mardi Gras is gaining increasing popularity from the community and from overseas as well. Their recent parade was attended by our Prime Minister and the Leader of the Opposition.

Psychologists have found that, in general, most homosexuals stay faithful in their relationship only for the first year or so, and within a few years' time, they would be in a new relationship. Psychologists also found that homosexuals in general are not that keen on marriage as the media and the gay lobby would like to portray. Homosexuals consider marriage as more in the domain of the heterosexual population than theirs. In fact, Dan Altman, an Australian academic and gay activist has openly stated that it is unrealistic and unnatural for a gay man to have only one partner. He added," There may be longstanding gay relationships, but virtually none of the longstanding monogamous relationships.", and that the gay male culture is not a monogamous culture.

Examples and statistics cited above clearly show that legalisation of same-sex marriage is not a pressing issue for most homosexuals. Research conducted in Norway and in Denmark, where same-sex marriage has been legalised, has concluded that the goal of this gay movement for same-sex marriage in their countries was not marriage, but the social approval and status recognition of homosexuality in their societies. In Australia, the homosexual population is receiving widespread support and recognition from the government and community at large, as pointed out earlier. So what is the goal of this gay marriage movement in this country? Perhaps this remark made by the lesbian

activist Masha Gessen in the Sydney Writers' Festival 2012 would throw some light on one aspect of the goal of their movement. She said, "The institution of marriage is going to change and it should change, and again I don't think it should exist."

Some media commentators and religious leaders have made the observation that, given the fact that homosexuals have achieved equal rights as their heterosexual counterparts as mentioned earlier, and "marriage" for them is in fact not a pressing need as society is led to believe, this issue of same-sex marriage is actually used as a means to shape society and to perpetuate the normalisation of homosexual values. They want to show that they have the power to topple the thinking of the world. Could this be the hidden agenda of this genderless marriage movement?

5. What are the consequences of redefining marriage on marriage itself ?

Once marriage is redefined, the law would decree that traditional marriage and same-sex marriage are equivalent, each enjoying equal status and rights. The values and uniqueness of traditional marriage would be watered down and amended to make way to for new rules and regulations introduced by the Government in accommodating gay values and practices. This change would be a most confronting to supporters of traditional marriage.

Traditional marriage would be considered as just one equal option among many to get "married". The long-held and values of marriage of one man and one woman married for life, and the natural and procreation function of marriage would be challenged and considered as dispensable, under the imposition of all these new rules and regulations Traditional marriage would lose its significant role in society. Supporters of traditional marriage would be less and less tolerated. They would be discriminated against, ridiculed, ostracised and would even face prosecutions because of their stand on supporting traditional marriage. In Scotland, where same-sex marriage has been legalised, a Presbyterian church group was refused service at a hotel because of their support for traditional marriage. Similarly, a Christian couple who owned a cake shop business in Ireland were prosecuted for refusing to make a wedding cake for a gay couple because of their belief in traditional marriage. In Australia at the moment, anyone making a stand on opposing gay marriage would automatically be labelled as homophobic and bigotry, and such incidences would receive great publicity in the media. If gay marriage is legalised, suppression on dissenting voices would become more and more active and aggressive. The respect for marriage and the status of traditional marriage would decline. Traditional marriage would be marginalised, devalued and deconstructed. Over time, it would lose its relevance in society.

Traditional marriage has its unique core purpose of committing men and women to one another and to their children. By redefining marriage, this unique role of the traditional marriage of binding children with their natural parents would no longer be a goal of

either marriage or society. In short, same-sex marriage will utterly transform the most pro-child of all social institutions into something else.

Redefining marriage also means that the family would be radically redefined. The family would no longer be solely made up of a father and a mother and their naturally conceived child. There would be another version of “family” which would be made up of two males or two females and their child produced through surrogacy. This reproductive manipulation would result in the child being cut off from his biological father or mother, by design, leaving the child with irreparable psychological and emotional damage. (More of this later in Section 8).

If marriage law changes in this country, it effectively takes the mother out of the picture. Declaring that a family should no longer be founded by a dad and a mum, says that as a society, we believe that no longer do mothers matter. Two dads can replace her and create the same ideal. She is redundant and superfluous. Mother’s Day becomes an affront to genderless families. It might be abolished in due course. Mother’s unique role in the family would be lost forever.

From overseas experiences, a son-in-law would be a woman and a daughter-in-law a man. The family would be considered as a social unit where the father would be called Parent 1 and the mother Parent 2. There would also no longer be a Father’s Day or a Mother’s Day, but a Parent’s Day.

The respect for the time-honoured values of traditional marriage would be eroded and would accordingly weaken its standing in society. Families would no longer be able to aspire to inspirations drawn from traditional marriage to guide their marriage relationships and their family life. This would be a sad loss to society, and would be especially be felt by cultural groups in our society where tradition is revered.

6. How does the legalisation of same-sex marriage affect our human rights?

When more rights are granted to the homosexual community, the rest of the general community would logically be accorded less freedom.. Experience overseas has shown how the legalisation of same-sex marriage has resulted in curtailing certain human rights, in particular, freedom of speech, freedom of conscience and freedom of religion. Citizens holding opposing views on same-sex marriage have been sued, prosecuted, fined, jailed and even sent to a mental institution. In the “gay cake” case in Belfast, Ireland, the owners of Asher’s Bakery were fined 500 pounds for refusing to bake a wedding cake for a gay couple because of their Christian belief in upholding traditional marriage.. In fact there have been, conservatively speaking, over a dozen of similar cases of wedding vendors in USA under attack for their differing stand on gay marriage. A florist, owner of Arlene’s Flowers in Washington, USA, refused to cater wedding flowers for a gay wedding because of their opposing view on gay marriage, and was duly sued

and fined. A Christian printer in Ireland landed in court for refusing to print a gay magazine. In Scotland, a Presbyterian Church group was turned away from a hotel because of their support for traditional marriage. In New Zealand, a charity was de-registered for holding opposing view on gay marriage. In Scotland, a Christian preacher was fined 1,000 pounds for preaching that homosexuality is a sin according to the Bible. In the United Kingdom, a couple's application for adoption was rejected because they held views opposing same-sex marriage. In USA, a navy chaplain was suspended from duty for voicing negative views on homosexuality. A high school teacher in USA was sacked for posting anti-same-sex marriage remarks on his face book. In Marquette University in USA, a professor was suspended very recently for backing a student who tried to defend man-woman marriage, when a leftist teacher shut the student down.

In Canada, where same sex marriage has been legalised for eleven years, the law societies of British Columbia and a few other provinces are currently challenging the Trinity Western University's plan to establish a law school in this current year, because the university is a Christian university and as such cannot accept homosexual views.. This legal battle is still in progress, and if the law societies win, this would mean that all lawyers in British Columbia must support same-sex marriage in order to be employable or to run their practices. There is also a case in Canada where the Toronto city council voted to remove the nomination of a Catholic school trustee to the city's Board of Health because the trustee had a history of voting in line with Catholic teaching which would mean opposing the presence of gay activists in schools, a practice permitted inside all publicly funded schools, including Catholic schools. This school trustee has taken his case to the Human Rights Commission and proceedings are still on-going. Again in Canada, different professions have set up their own professional networks supporting same-sex marriage. Non-membership to these groups would mean the loss of career prospects. This trend is particularly strong in the legal profession. Christian lawyers would be the worst affected. Indeed, same-sex marriage is more complicated than we think. It affects our livelihood too.

We can go on and on with this list of prosecutions and persecutions on individuals and groups holding dissenting views on same=sex marriage. This number would keep on growing as the global gay marriage movement grows stronger and more powerful in the years to come. At the moment, a conservative estimate of this list number between 250 and 300.

In Australia, the Anti-discrimination Act became law in 2013. Amongst other things, this Act restricts free speech that might offend minority groups. These groups would naturally include the homosexual, bisexual, transgender and the other inter-sex groups. The Act also restricts our freedom to conduct our business according to our values and beliefs. The average citizen can unsuspectingly be sued and charged under this Act by the authorities, political activists, our neighbours or even the man on the street, for voicing opinions that minority groups feel that they are discriminated against. We have

certainly witnessed citizens of this country falling victim to this Act as recently as last year in Tasmania, when the Catholic Archbishop of Hobart sent a letter to all his parishioners to explain why the Catholic church was opposed to changing the legal definition of marriage. A transgender activist and a Greens Party candidate were offended by this letter. They complained to the Anti-discrimination Commission and the Archbishop was asked to answer his case at several Commission hearings, outcome of which is still not known. Several months ago, a Christian street evangelist was charged by the police in Brisbane for preaching that homosexuality is a sin. Yes, even in Australia, the threat to our human rights is very real and alive. It is actually happening right under our nose.

A new political party called the Australian Equality Party was recently formed to specifically promote same-sex marriage in the lead up to the plebiscite. Their main party policy is unequivocally stated as “to take away free speech from those who oppose same-sex marriage”. Their goal is to win their fight in re-defining marriage and to establish the legal status of gay marriage at all cost. The gay lobby have also recently recruited a gay marriage campaigner and consultant from Ireland to lead them in winning the up and coming plebiscite. It is quite obvious that this gay marriage movement is extremely well prepared.

The print and social media in general in this country have played, and are still undeniably playing an active and powerful role in promoting gay rights and gay marriage. In contrast, they are silent on reporting opposing views on the issue, except for “The Australian” newspaper. In fact, TV stations have so far flatly refused airtime requested by advocates of traditional marriage in promoting their cause..

At the moment, the silent heterosexual majority is definitely being left out of this debate because every dissenting view they express on same-sex marriage is being stifled by immediate retaliatory accusations of homophobia or bigotry. Very often these views are not being reported by the media at all. Most recently, gay activists ferociously attacked the office of Senator Cory Bernadi, who is a Catholic and a staunch supporter of traditional marriage.

In fact, there has not been any proper public debate in the community on the issue of same-sex marriage. The silence on this issue is puzzling. Is it because the community is not sufficiently informed on the ramifications and gravity of same-sex marriage on our society, or can it be because they fear being prosecuted by gay activists if they make themselves heard, under the anti-discrimination laws? This is a very abnormal phenomenon in a democratic society like Australia.

The anti-discriminating laws claim their purpose is to prevent discrimination on minority groups, but it is most apparent that these laws are in fact discriminating against the silent heterosexual majority. The voice of this silent, and less vocal group is deliberately stifled under the guise of anti-discrimination.

7. How is the legalisation of same-sex marriage harmful to society?

If same-sex marriage is legalised, .it would become law for all citizens of the land to follow all the new rules and regulations put forth by the Government in accommodating homosexual values and practices. Homosexual life style would become the new trend and the new norm. Homosexual culture would flourish, most effectively amongst the young. Society would be obsessed with sex and gender issues, distracting both Government and citizens from issues of humanity and good governance. It would become one driven by conflicts, division, unpredictability, insecurity, anxiety and animosity. Religious groups which hold opposing views on same-sex marriage would be targeted for prosecutions. Moral values, especially upheld by Christian churches would be under attack and would eventually be thrown out the window... .

Legalised same-sex marriage would send the message to society that we can practically marry anyone, as long as we can declare our love to that person. It would become logical in the eyes of other gender groups like the bi-sexual group, the transgender group , the inter-sexual group and the “queer” group to demand for the same right to “marry” as long as they find someone to “love”. This would encourage the emergence of sexual experimentations of all kinds, which the young from our society would be most vulnerable to.. Before long, the incestuous, the polygamous and the polyarmorous groups would follow suit and would likewise demand that marriage should be redefined again in a way that would legalise their sexual practices as a “marriage”. In fact, in the United Kingdom and Canada, where same-sex marriage has been legalised, homosexual groups have actually started demanding the legal recognition of homosexual polyarmorous (sexual relationships amongst three persons) “ marriages”. All these sexual experimentations and exploits would bring about monumental genetic complications and complexities, uncontrollable sexual diseases, psychological and emotional harm, irresolvable legal minefields and other as yet unknown phenomena. And how would we know that in due course, bestiality (sex with animals) would not be legally defined as another form of “marriage”? We would find ourselves living in a world that is dominated and distracted by sexual matters, predisposing our society to be used by ideological groups for political causes that are harmful to democracy, shaping society to an unrecognisable state. The whole of society would be turned upside down. It would be an out-of-control world.

Under all this chaos, confusion, moral corruption and the loss of our cherished family and social values, the social structure of our society would equally come crumbling down under our very eyes. This powerful pervading homosexual culture would be left to reshape our society, almost unchecked.

Legalisation of same-sex marriage would also be likely to usher in the legal acceptance of Islamic marriages. As mentioned earlier, many gay activists overseas are actually already calling for the legal recognition of marriage of three or more sexual partners i.e.,

the” polyarmorous marriage”. This will fit in very well with the Islamic doctrine on polygamy. Gay activists are also calling for the age of consent to be lowered to 16 years. The Islamic community actually practises marrying twelve-year old girls with adult men. They boast that the most perfect man ever lived had actually married a six year old girl.

.At school, children would be taught homosexual values and life styles, and that homosexuality is normal. They would be assured that changing their gender is also normal, and they would be encouraged to experiment with the sexual practices of the various gender groups. They would be taught that the traditional father-mother model of marriage would no longer be the only norm in society and that the new norm would be gay marriage and gay parenting. Children would be at odds with their parents because these sexual and gender diversity views taught at school are in conflict with values held at home. They would be confused. Outside the home, they would be discriminated against, ridiculed and ostracised..

Sex education would be taken out of the hands of the parents. It would be controlled by the school. In Massachusetts, USA, after same-sex marriage was legalized in 2003, school libraries were required by law to stock same-sex literature. Primary children were given homosexual fairy stories and high school students were given an explicit manual of homosexual practices. Parents who objected were told by the court that they had no right to withdraw their child from a class being addressed by homosexual advocates.

In fact, in Australia, the “Safe School Coalition Programme”, introduced in 2013 by the then Labour Government , has already begun subjecting our schoolchildren as young as 7 year olds, along similar lines. The Programme teaches that one’s gender is fluid and limitless, that they can change their gender and sexual orientation according to how they feel, and that their gender does not have to depend on the gender they are born with. They are given a handbook called “Gender Identity” which lists twelve genders that they can adapt to. The Programme is disguised as an anti-bullying programme, in spite of the fact that sexual orientation does not even rate among the top seven causes of bullying. In fact, it was disclosed only recently through a secret video recording , but publicly circulated currently, that Roz Ward, architect of this Programme, was found admitting to the fact that the said Programme she designed was in fact not about bullying, but that it was about promoting sexual flexibility and gender diversity. She has also conceded that the Safe School Coalition Programme is part of a broader Marxist strategy to change society. In this Programme, students are given graphic illustrations on the sexual techniques of gays and lesbians, but the Programme makes NO mention of the health risks involved. Students are taught gender-confusing activities, cross-dressing and breast binding. It also encourages boys who are unsure of their sexuality to use girls’ toilets and change rooms (and vice-versa.) The Programme does not require parental approval or even notification to parents. Parents are angry and still aghast at how deceptively and subtly this programme has crept into the 490 schools that have accepted it into their school curriculum. Currently, Sydney Boys’ High and Sydney Girls’ High in Sydney have accepted this programme into their school

curriculum. The Labour Government of Victoria is considering to make it mandatory for all schools in that state to adapt it into their school curriculum. The recent 14,000 signature-strong petition by parents from all over this country has convinced the Prime Minister to order a review of the programme. Parents consider this programme as a dangerous programme ,brainwashing their children to adopt devious sexual values and practices that are not acceptable to their own family and moral values. The want to put a stop to this programme altogether . It is still not too late to sign in your protest to this Programme so that your voice can be added to this petition. Look up some relevant websites through googling.

Legalisation of same-sex marriage would have harmful effects on many other facets of our life, some of which are as follows:

1. Fighting court cases over anti-discrimination and human rights issues will involve huge costs and emotional stress. This can cast a toll on many lives.
2. When gay marriage becomes law, homosexual values would be normalised and would flourish unchecked in society. This would encourage sexual experimentation of all kinds and would consequently result in increase in HIV/Aids and other sexual diseases. The youth sector of the community would be most vulnerable to these health risks. Health costs would automatically rise..Government funds would be further drained.
3. Legalisation of same-sex marriage means having values of the minority forced upon the majority. The majority would be left in a perpetual frustrating and helpless state. The intimidating nature of anti-discrimination laws would make matters worse for them.
4. The weakening of traditional marriage and the church would bring about erosion of moral values. This would encourage the condoning of sexually abusive behaviours like paedophilia, pornography, prostitution and sex trafficking.
5. This enforced change would also affect the spiritual well-being of people with a religious faith. The loss of religious liberty would have a profound effect on their emotional well-being.
6. By law, homosexual values would be included in all school curriculum. The Safe School Coalition Programme as mentioned earlier shows that this type of sex education was adopted by schools without parental knowledge or approval. Parents need to be vigilantly informed of politicians and political parties that support homosexuality and same-sex marriage.
7. Gay marriage supporters can cause emotional harm to their opponents by labelling them as “bigots”, “homophobic”, “moral dinosaurs” “hate mongers” etc before any open conversation or debate is given the chance to take place.. There was a case in USA where a pastor had condoms thrown at him at a church service by gay activists, calling him a bigot..

As illustrated above, same-sex marriage brings an enormous amount of anxiety, tension, animosity, aggression, feelings of isolation, helplessness, as well as a host of other forms of emotional harm to society. It also causes discord and division. The

sad part of it all is a lot of this harm would be quite irreversible and long-term. Same-sex marriage is without a doubt detrimental to society.

As citizens of this country, we need to be informed and be vigilant about issues that affect our lives, and be prepared to take action to protect values that we believe in. At the same time, we should also find ways to contribute positively to the Australian society.

8. How will the legalisation of same-sex marriage affect the needs and rights of children?

The United Nations Declaration on the Rights of The Child affirms that a child must not, “save in the most exceptional circumstances, be separated from his mother “, and yet “marriage” of two men and the subsequent surrogacy will do exactly that, separating the child from its mother, from birth, in a deliberate and premeditation fashion.

Advocates of same-sex marriage dwell only on the wishes and desires of the same sex couples and routinely ignore mentioning the needs of the child they wish to “produce” through various reproductive manipulations. We have to understand that gay marriage means gay surrogacy and gay adoption. The reproductive manipulation required by gay couples to “produce” a child invariably abolishes the biological father or the biological mother from the life of the child. These advocates are intentionally silent on this controversial aspect of gay marriage. Their slogan is to fight for “marriage equality” for the adults, however they never ponder to think, where is the equality for the child? If equality for the adults means inequality for the child and the destruction of the love between the child and its biological mother or father, there is no justice for the child. Is it equality if they force children to miss out on their father or their mother in this deliberate way?

In the transaction of ensuring the child is legally their child, the same-sex couples would require the biological parent of the child removed from the child’s birth certificate and replaced with the names of the same-sex “parents”. This would remove the right of the child to know who his birth father and, or his birth mother are. To the child, this will mean the loss of his self-identity as well as the loss of his genetic identity.

The notion of equality is non-existent in same-sex marriage. It is essentially one of narcissism on the part of the adults. It focuses solely on the love and romance of the couple and nothing on the needs and rights of the child. They forget that it is the adults and society at large that should be responsible in protecting our children. This slogan of “marriage equality” is grossly dishonest, hypocritical, shameful and totally irresponsible.

Australian ethicist Professor Margaret Somerville writes this against same-sex marriage, "It is one matter for children not to know their genetic identity as a result of unintended circumstances. It is quite another matter to deliberately destroy children's links to their biological parents and especially for society to be complicit in this destruction."

This intentional destruction of the child's biological link with his natural mother or natural father can be argued as a form of child abuse, and should be punishable by law.

There is in fact a large body of evidence from child developmental studies world-wide that support the view that children are best raised by their own father and mother. This is not a new concept. Psychologists and paediatricians have affirmed the fact that children develop best, both physically and emotionally, when they are raised in a stable, heterosexual mum and dad family. They believe it is inappropriate, potentially hazardous to children and dangerously irresponsible, to allow same-sex parenting, whether through adoption, foster care, or reproductive manipulations. This position, they claim, is rooted in the best available sciences.

In fact, this need of the child for the care and nurturing of his biological father and mother is basic and instinctual. The father and the mother each provide different gender specific types of care and nurturing at specific stages of the child's growth. By virtue of its biological limitations, same-sex parenting is unable to achieve this for the child. It actually deprives the child of this particular type of relevant quality care.

Educational experts have long argued the importance of children being taught by both male and female teachers in the classroom, that this balance of genders can provide good models for children to follow and is conducive to effective learning. Many schools strive to achieve this model of balance. However, same-sex parenting, which prides itself on one gender care of the child, goes contrary to this model of gender balance. This contrast in views highlights the inconsistency and hypocrisy of government and the segments in society who support this idea of same-sex marriage.

Increasingly, adult children who have been raised up in same-sex households have openly spoken out how much they longed for the presence of a parent of the missing sex whilst growing up, that this has brought a lot of pain to them and has created a void in their heart throughout their life, which can never be filled. Child development studies have found that the father's absence from the home can have detrimental effects on the development of a female child. These effects include low self-esteem, behavioural problems, poor academic performance and inappropriate sexual behaviour. These adult children also expressed the view that the traditional home, where there is a biological father and a biological mother, provides the best environment for children to grow up in.

In an open letter submitted to a US High Court judge in 2015, Kathy Faust, an adult child who has grown up with two lesbian parents in U.S.A., states her many objections to same-sex marriage. She, and a group of other adult children who have been brought up under similar same-sex parenting situations, have made public statements objecting to same-sex marriage. These points, as quoted, are as follows:

- “Same-sex marriage institutionalises the stripping of a child’s natural right to a mother and a father in order to validate the emotions of adults.
- We long for a parent who we are told is unnecessary.
- The “daily deprivation” of one or both of our natural parents is a painful experience. This loss, when unacknowledged, will add further pain, anger and confusion.
- What is unique in same-sex parenting is encouraging an alternative parenting structure guaranteed to deny a child’s right to a biological parent. In no other situation does society promote such a loss”.
- Children have the right to be loved by their Mother and Father.
- We are at the mercy of loud, organised well-funded adults who have nearly everyone in this country running scared”.
- This debate about same-sex marriage should be about children.
- Same-sex couples and opposite-sex couples are wholly unequal when it comes to procreation and child rearing, and should be treated differently for the sake of children.
- The onus must be on adults to conform to the needs of children, not the other way round.
- Same-sex marriage encourages Fatherlessness and Motherlessness.
- As a society, our laws must uphold and encourage the family structure that best protects children’s rights.
- These children were created with the intent to deny them a relationship with one natural parent.
- My resistance to same-sex marriage stems from the self-evident truth that mother and father are irreplaceable in a child’s life. Kids long for and deserve both.
-
- Today, all over the world where same-sex parenting is practised, thousands of children raised in these households are suffering in silence, lost in their pain, confusion and helplessness. They are the forgotten ones, a defenceless bi- product of this narcissistic and cruel “genderless marriage”.

Same-sex couples are welcome to celebrate their feelings for each other, that is their right. But the rights of adults must end where the best interests of a child begin. Marriage isn’t (just) for you, it’s also for them.

-

- In this same-sex marriage debate, it is important that we do not lose sight of the plight of these children. They are too precious to be treated as social guinea pigs to appease the demands of a tiny, if vocal, minority.

Conclusion:

Why do human beings come in two varieties of gender and not one? The continuation of the human race, from generation to generation depends on procreation and nurturing from a member of each gender. Ideally this role is performed by a biological father and a biological mother, committing to a permanent relationship with each other and the children they conceive. This is called marriage. Two persons of the same gender cannot fulfil this role. It is an impossibility of our nature and bodies.

What is the benefit to society of initiating such an experiment of unnatural alternatives, contrary to how we are made, and of reaping such profound consequence to humanity? The answer is clearly none. The benefits of marriage, on the other hand, are innumerable. The cornerstone of family life is, and has always been, the traditional marriage between a man and a woman, and the children they naturally ensue. It sets moral standards that inspire and guide. Through marriage, society derives a sense of order and structure. It has been so for millenniums, and it still is. It has been the natural procreation role of traditional marriage between a man and a woman that has been responsible for the continuity of the human race. In short, all the good it does to societies and civilisations can hardly be over-estimated. Traditional marriage therefore should not be meddled with, be trampled on and be discarded, if society is to be preserved at all.

Same-sex union, by definition, is against the law of nature. The union between two men and two women denies the self-evident biological, physiological, and psychological differences between men and women. This denial has demonstrated the many destructive effects on society, especially on the children who are involved in this union. Thus, from the stand points of logic, natural law and humanity, this kind of union would not meet the criteria of a "marriage". Naming it a "same-sex contract" would be more appropriate.

The increase in the divorce rate in this country is a clear sign to us that marriage needs strengthening. The role and responsibility of Government should be to empower marriage and not allow it to be weakened and devalued by introducing the legalisation of same-sex marriage. Government should formulate policies that will foster sound family values that build up strong marriage and family. They should also allocate more funding for research and support services to strengthen families in practical ways.

It was our Almighty God who ordained marriage. In Genesis 1, we read that God gave dominion to male and female as a union. That dominion was not given to two males or

two females in union. Therefore God's dominion over the earth is not complete without male and female union. We must use our authority in our God ordained relationships to petition our God to restore this world to His original purpose. He has given us that authority.

Marriage between a man and a woman is God's gift to all mankind. Man's wish to redefine and destroy it is a monumental affront to Christendom. All Christians should be alarmed and take this threat and attack on God's creation very seriously. We should all be burdened to stand up and take action to defend this institution of marriage for Him. We need to have faith and pray to God to show us how we can fight this fight against Satan and win in the end. We need to fast for our cause. We need to cry out to our Almighty God to give us a miracle in winning the coming plebiscite. We need to ask God to take away our complacency, our doubts and our fear. We need to be encouraged by David's victory over Goliath.

Let us pray ceaselessly with zeal and fervour and encourage one another to do the same. Let us make it our mission to win this battle for our loving Heavenly Father because of our love for Him. If ever there was a time to stand up and take action for His sake, it is now!!.

Here are some ideas on how we can take action:

- Spread the word around to our family, our friends and neighbours by word of mouth, through facebook, whatsapp, tweeter and other social media networks. Quote helpful passages from articles or leaflets you have read or just share your own view and conviction to encourage others.
- Handing out leaflets at train stations, market stalls, parks and other suitable spots.
- Hold a house meeting with your family, friends and neighbours. (The Australian Family Association provides volunteers who can come to these meetings to assist you with information on the topic as well as on voting. A few people can make up a meeting. It is a free service. Please contact me for details of the contact person for this service. If language interpretation is required, attempts can be made to work this out).
- Door knocking with a friend or with one of the volunteers as mentioned above. Bring leaflets along.
- Offer your help to friends or church members to show them how to vote. It can be a complex and overwhelming procedure for them, especially the aged.
- Attend training to be one of these volunteers
- Donate .

There is an ample supply of leaflets for your use. Please be involved in this one-off opportunity to serve. Depending on the outcome of the coming election, there might not be any other opportunity for us to take action to defend the institution of marriage for Our Lord and for our society.

Sources (website):

Australian Family Association

Australian Marriage Forum

Australian Marriage Alliance

Family Voice Australia

Australian Christian Lobby

Australian Prayer Network

Unity Australia

Saltshakers Incorporated

The Witherspoon Institute, USA

Canberra Declaration

Bible Society

Iona Institute, Ireland

Christian Apologetics and Research Ministry (CARM)

The Australian (newspaper)

Theresa Tokura

18.5.2016