We The People Program 267 September 18, 2017 We the People 267 Homosexual Marriage



Good Day to you. Some thoughts on a timely question about homosexual 'marriage' or as some euphemistically put it, "marriage equality". Many have serious concerns about this matter given less than 2 percent of the Australian population claim to be homosexual so how on earth has their voice become so influential and how and why has this matter taken on such prominence. In part its because of lethargy amongst the voting populace who don't seem to care about much at all unless it directly affects them by which time its too late. I do not deny homosexuals the right to their beliefs and practices but I resent being told their life style is normal and therefore should be fostered and further normalised by adopting the covenant of marriage specifically designed and ordained between a man and a woman. The question should have been put to the High Court to determine what the Australian Constitution's base assumption was when referring to marriage. In the year 1901, I believe the assumption by the founding fathers was that marriage was between a man and a woman and this could make any change to the definition of marriage unconstitutional. So called 'marriage equality' is a questionable movement in my view.

So the truth is that marriage is not so much about love for our partner as much as **love for the children we hope to bring into the world**. Men and women are anatomically and psychologically designed to be together and this is how new life is created and thus, the miracle of miracles is not to be treated lightly. The promise extends to providing the child with a **father and a mother** and that's a promise the so called 'gay' community cannot deliver. It's the promise of new life that makes marriage an important marker in society and by this definition should not be assigned to any other than the union between a man and a woman. This whole issue is not about 'marriage equality' at all because you can't have equality where one party loses something and in this case the overwhelming majority lose the unique union symbol of marriage between a man and a woman. So the question is, why is it so important in the eyes of many homosexuals but not all, to gain the title and status of marriage. Some will argue dignity and some will argue equality while others who are mischief makers just desire the disruption. In any case same sex unions such as Civil Unions and Domestic Partnerships are already available in most States and Territories and are treated as de-facto unions under Federal Law.

Just for a moment conjure up the vision and the Gormoric displays at the Sydney gay and lesbian Mardi Gras. This is not what children should be exposed to yet they're encouraged to attend. I find it disgusting and a display of blatant sexual debauchery that should not be allowed on our streets, much less televised. Doing such things and then claiming normality is a bridge too far in my view. So we look to the many startling and challenging symbols of the homosexual community so we can measure off if we choose to allow them to use marriage as a right. I say they don't qualify even though some do not want marriage as such because they realise it's not appropriate. For some, homosexuality is not a choice and for others it is but it's the former for whom I have empathy as surely **no one would willingly adopt such a lifestyle knowing the consequences**.

Normalising marriage between same gender people also ignores the increased health issues as a consequence of this life style and I don't want that acceptance in our children. Redefining marriage could lead to profound and adverse affects on free speech and goodness knows we are already so restricted as to often be robbed of the right to express our view. Marriage is the foundation of all societies and to change the definition and the meaning of marriage is unlike any other piece of legislation to come before parliament. It would dramatically and irrevocably change the nature of Australian society over time and not for the better in my view. The potential consequences for freedom of religion, speech and conscience and the family are profound. Amidst all this talk and all these diversions and amidst all the problems Australia and the world face the last thing we need is to further threaten the normal family genesis structure. Why is it that the minority voices have so programmed this debate that if we even mention we may vote **no**, then we are pilloried and ostracized. I will **vote 'no'** in the coming weeks and do so with the future of Australia and my grandchildren in mind. However let's leave the last word to the creator who said "....*he who made them from the beginning made them male and female,' and said, 'For this reason a man shall leave his father and mother and be joined to his wife, and the two shall become one"*

Until next time this is Kent Bayley

