

## MARRIAGE IS FOUNDATIONAL

Throughout history and in virtually all human societies, marriage has always been a union between men and women. Marriage predates both the organised church and the state. The State should not presume to re-engineer a natural human institution.

## BIOLOGY, NOT BIGOTRY

Marriage combines the complementary characteristics of men and women as defined by nature. Nature is exclusive and discriminatory in that only the union of a man and a woman can produce another life. It makes sense to treat something so unique in a unique way.

## FOR MARRIAGE, NOT AGAINST PEOPLE

This debate is not a discussion about whether homosexuals are good people or not. Every human being should be treated with dignity and respect. However, many people in the homosexual community also do not agree with same-sex marriage. They are not 'homophobic' or 'bigoted'. Everyone has a right to love whom they choose, but nobody has a right to redefine marriage.

## DEFINITION, NOT DISCRIMINATION

It is perfectly possible to support natural marriage while also recognising and respecting the rights of others. Changing the law so that marriage includes same-sex unions is a massive change to what marriage means. The issue is one of definition, not discrimination.

## EQUALITY IS NOT SAMENESS

Equality is not sameness, and difference is not inequality. As popular NZ Herald columnist Jim Hopkins wrote: "(Discrimination) happens all the time. If equality was Parliament's objective, there'd be no minimum drinking age, no ban on bigamy or specified drugs, no requirement to pass a test to get a driver's licence and no Maori seats either."

## THE 'RIGHT' TO MARRY?

Marriage rightly discriminates. A 14-year-old cannot get married. Three or four people cannot get married to each other. A person who is currently married cannot marry another person. A father cannot marry his adult daughter. A mother cannot marry her adult son. Even those wanting 'equality' believe there should be restrictions – which shows that even they believe that marriage is not an absolute right for everybody or every type of romantic relationship.



## SPECIAL RIGHTS?

In 2004, the government introduced civil unions and changed over 150 pieces of legislation to provide legal recognition and protection for same-sex relationships in NZ. There was no discrimination in the law against same-sex couples.

## WHAT ABOUT THE RIGHTS OF OTHERS?

For many, marriage is more than just a legal agreement or social contract. We must consider the rights of people who have deliberately chosen marriage because of its historical, cultural or religious meaning and value. By changing its meaning, we are trampling on the rights of many New Zealanders who hold, and should be allowed to hold, such views and ideals.

## HOW DOES IT AFFECT YOUR MARRIAGE?

We need to be concerned with more than what merely affects us personally. Redefining marriage isn't just a simple change in the wording of a current law. It is the complete redefinition of an institution as it has existed for thousands of years.

## DEFINITIONS MATTER

Changing the definition of something changes the way society and future generations view it and the important role it plays. We would not accept a law that changes the definition of a father to include mothers. By doing so, we would cover up reality. Definitions matter.



## MUM AND DAD MATTER

Marriage between a man and a woman says to a child that mum and dad who made you will also be there to love and raise you. Although death and divorce may prevent it, the evidence shows that children do best with their biological mother and father who are married. The differences between men and women - mothers and fathers - really do matter.

## GENDER MATTERS

One of the outcomes of redefining marriage is that same-sex couples are able to adopt non-related babies and children. Two men might individually be good fathers, but neither can be a mum. Two women might individually be good mothers, but neither can be a dad. While a compassionate society should always come to the aid of motherless and fatherless families, a wise and loving society should never intentionally create fatherless or motherless families. Deliberately depriving a child of a loving mum or a dad is not in the child's best interests.

## SAME AS BANNING INTER-RACIAL MARRIAGE?

No - these bans were unjust, and were designed to keep races apart. Marriage is grounded in bringing the genders together. Overturning the ban on inter-racial marriage did not mean a redefinition of marriage but an affirmation of it.

## BUT NOT ALL COUPLES HAVE CHILDREN

We agree, not all married couples have children - but every child ever born has a mum and a dad. Having babies is not a requirement for marriage - but it is a natural outcome. Marriage

is a unique union that can lead to procreation. It is for this reason that the State became interested in marriage in the first place. We do not disqualify couples from marrying based on exceptions. Older people marrying is the exception also, not the norm. Every man and woman who marry are capable of giving any child they create (or adopt) a mother and a father.

## SAME-SEX MARRIAGE COULD STRENGTHEN THE INSTITUTION OF MARRIAGE?

Marriage does not thrive under the inclusive banner of "the more the merrier." A marriage culture, which is essential to a healthy society, is nourished when we are faithful to, and honour, its time-tested definition, and understand its important purpose. Extending the definition of marriage to include polygamy and group marriage would also not strengthen marriage just because more people could get married.

## AN IDEOLOGY FORCED ON ALL

When marriage is redefined, everyone is subject to the new definition. Anyone who disagrees with it is at odds with the law. This directly affects ministers, faith-based organisations and schools, and marriage celebrants, amongst others. If same-sex marriage is seen as a fundamental 'human right', then all will be forced to recognise it. You can't be selective about which groups will recognise fundamental 'human rights'. The author of the law change, Labour MP Louisa Wall, promised that the new definition of marriage would not require any person or church to carry out a marriage if it does not fit with the beliefs of the celebrant or the religious interpretation a church has. The evidence shows that this assurance has not been realised (see examples below).

## CONSEQUENCES OF REDEFINING MARRIAGE

**UNITED KINGDOM:** In 2006 Archbishop Mario Conti, then Roman Catholic Archbishop of Glasgow, was reported to the police because he spoke up for traditional marriage in a sermon. Sarah Mbyui, a nursery worker, lost her job in 2014 because she gave the 'wrong' answer to a question from a colleague about whether she believed in same-sex marriage. Felix Ngole was removed from his university social work course in 2016 after he made comments on his personal Facebook page in support of traditional marriage. Housing manager Adrian Smith was demoted and had his pay cut by 40 per cent in 2011 because he said on his Facebook page that gay weddings in churches were "an equality too far". The McArthur family, who own and run Ashers bakery, were pursued through the courts by the Equality Commission for Northern Ireland for alleged breach of anti-discrimination law in 2014 after they refused to bake a cake celebrating a same-sex marriage campaign. They won in the Supreme Court.



**AUSTRALIA:** In 2017, Wallabies superstar Israel Folau sparked a Twitter backlash by revealing he would not support the push for same-sex marriage. Folau tweeted: "I love and respect all people for who they are and their opinions. but personally, I will not support gay marriage." From this point on he became a target by both the media and same-sex activists which ultimately led to the termination of his rugby contract.

Tennis great Margaret Court came under attack when she expressed opposition to same-sex marriage early in 2012. Court was accused by same-sex marriage activists of spreading "hateful comments" and "inciting the bigots out there".

During the same-sex marriage debate in Australia, Roman Catholic Archbishop of Hobart Julian Porteous - at the urging of leaders of the same-sex marriage campaign - was dragged before the Tasmanian Anti-Discrimination Commission for circulating Catholic teaching on marriage to Catholics.

**CANADA:** In 2011, a respected Canadian sports anchor was fired after expressing support for the traditional definition of marriage on his Twitter account.

**USA:** In 2011, dual gold-medallist Peter Vidmar was chosen to be chef de mission for the United States team at the 2012 London Olympics but was pressured to resign simply because he had supported Proposition 8, the measure which defined marriage as between a man and a woman in California.

**NEW ZEALAND: Marriage Celebrants Rejected For Personal Beliefs** – People applying to be marriage celebrants are having their applications rejected if they do not want to officiate at same-sex 'weddings' due to their personal beliefs or convictions, despite assurances by politicians that this would not occur.

**Bakers, Photographers, Florists** – In 2018, Warkworth baker Kath received a request to bake a cake for a same-sex wedding. Due

to her personal beliefs, and because she wanted to follow the integrity of her heart, she politely refused. What followed was a couple of days of intense media coverage and "hate speech" messages on her social media accounts and website which were personal and nasty. Some of the threats were physical and her home address was published.

**Charities Promoting Traditional Marriage Targeted** – The Charities Board which oversees charitable organisations in NZ is still attempting to deregister Family First NZ, arguing that their views about natural marriage and the traditional family "cannot be determined to be for the public benefit in a way previously accepted as charitable". Other charities attempting to be registered and who promote traditional marriage have been warned that their views will affect their ability to be registered.

**Venues Either Withdraw Or Are Pressured to Change Policy** – A number of churches no longer make their venue available to the general public because of the risk of litigation. Some venues have had no choice but to change their policy after media inquiries or complaints to the Human Rights Commission.

**Misrepresented / Threatened For View of Marriage** – The principal of a Catholic College in New Zealand who wrote comments in the school newsletter opposing the bill to redefine marriage (consistent with Catholic teaching) was slammed in a current events programme on the state broadcaster TVNZ. The programme was subsequently found to be unfair and inaccurate in its coverage of the issue by the Broadcasting Standards Authority (BSA). Labour MP Louisa Wall made a disturbing comment: 'I don't think in these days of integrated schools and given this school does receive some form of state funding, that advocating against equality and non-discrimination and supporting discriminatory laws is what schools and a principal should be promoting.' This is clearly a veiled threat to integrated and faith-based schools.



## WHAT NEXT?

If marriage is redefined once, what is to stop it being redefined again? Allowing only same-sex marriage on the basis of love and commitment would then open the door for polygamous, polyamory (group), and consensual adult incest-type marriages. Why would discrimination against these loving adults be ok? They may be illegal now, but it wasn't that long ago that same-sex marriage was illegal also.

In 2019, the American Psychological Association's (APA) created its "Consensual Non-Monogamy Task Force", formed to destigmatise such relationships and explore changes in public policy.

**CANADA:** A British Columbia Supreme Court judge ordered that all three members of a polyamorous "triad" should be registered as parents of the two-and-a-half-year-old boy they are raising together as a family.

**NEW YORK:** A New Yorker who wants to marry their own adult offspring is suing to overturn laws barring the incestuous practice, calling it a matter of "individual autonomy" and claiming it would "diminish their humanity" if they couldn't.

**CALIFORNIA:** The first polyamorous family in California made legal history in 2017 when a judge agreed to put all three 'dads' on the birth certificate of their 'daughter' paving the way for other polyamorous families to gain greater legal recognition in the US.

**MASSACHUSETTS:** The city of Somerville has broadened the definition of domestic partnership to include relationships between three or more adults, expanding access to health care.

**NEW ZEALAND:** In 2020, six 'brides' married themselves at Tahunanui Beach in a ceremony of self-acceptance. The media report said that while the ceremony was similar to a regular wedding in many ways, with a marriage celebrant and vows, there were no grooms to be seen.

In 2014, Auckland ratepayers subsidised an event promoting polyamory for those who want to 'relate to more than one partner' and non-monogamous marriages, entitled "Poly Panel, Discussions around Queer Polyamory - A one day event exploring a framework of ethical, healthy polyamory relationships."



## DESTROYING THE NUCLEAR FAMILY

In 2018 the Department of Internal Affairs removed the need for fathers to be recorded on birth certificates, ignoring biological reality, and rendering birth certificates as manipulated and misleading. There were also attempts to remove the terms 'husband' and 'wife' from marriage certificates during the same-sex marriage debate back in 2013 but the decision was reversed after an outcry.

The Government is now explicitly amending the law around birth certificates. The proposed law provides for each parent who is notifying the birth of a child to specify whether they wish to appear on the child's birth certificate as the child's "mother", "father", or "parent". It seems you'll be able to choose your own gender as a parent.

And birth certificates will also be based on the choice of the person, including the fact that no medical evidence is required for the change of sex which is recorded. By choosing your own gender in your birth certificate, the certificates will become an object of unscientific gender ideology and effectively tell medical professionals that they got it wrong at time of birth.

Overseas, midwives at two National Health Service hospitals in Britain — Brighton and Sussex — have been told to avoid using the word "mothers" on its own and have been given a list of alternative terms to use when addressing patients including "mothers or birthing parents", "breast/chestfeeding" and "maternal and parental". Instead of saying "breastmilk", they can choose from "human milk" or "breast/chestmilk" or "milk from the feeding mother or parent".

The Centres for Disease Control and Prevention, the leading US health bureaucracy, uses the term "pregnant persons" instead of pregnant women.