How would you characterise your views on the Bill in general?

In opposition

I think the bill is unnecessary. I believe its aim is to further the normalisation and full acceptance of homosexual practice. One Danish church minister wrote: “But now that we have given them the opportunity to get married, we have lifted the level of equality to a whole new level compared to 1989. Couples of the same sex will be put on the same footing as couples of different sex and that is a huge change.”

http://cphpost.dk/news/national/gay-marriage-legalised This would the true in the UK as well; marriage is society’s ‘crown’ upon a relationship. Consequently, this bill will further normalise homosexual practice, and further demonise any who may, for whatever reason, not condone such behaviour. Secondly, I question whether the full ramifications have been thought through. Writing about the Argentinian experience Dr Ursula Basset for the Pontificia Universidad Católica Argentina wrote: “It quickly became clear that legalising same-sex marriage required a revolution to our internal law. It impacted laws regulating public order, identity, gender, rules of kinship, filiation, marriage, names, marital property arrangements, divorce, alimony, parental rights, succession, domestic violence, adoption, artificial reproductive techniques, surrogate motherhood, liberty of conscience, criminal law, tax law and employment law, among other topics. All of these subjects would need to be attuned to the gender-neutral paradigm ... same sex marriage law in Argentina has turned the law upside down—no stone has remained unturned.”

How would you characterise your views on the introduction of same sex marriage, so that same sex couples can marry each other?

In opposition

The Scottish Government is either knowingly or unknowingly being led down a radical, social path. Legalising same-sex marriage will be a fundamental change in the fabric of society and, as has been the experience elsewhere, will lead to marriage itself being devalued. Speaking of this agenda, Peter Tatchell (a prominent voice in the debate said): “Whereas mainstream society saw homosexuality as a problem, we said the problem was homophobia. Straight supremacism was, to us, the equivalent of white supremacism. Our vision was a new sexual democracy, without homophobia and misogyny. Erotic shame and guilt would be banished, together with socially enforced monogamy and male and female gender roles. There would be sexual freedom and human rights for everyone” queer and straight. Our message was "innovate, don’t assimilate". GLF never called for equality. The demand was liberation. We wanted to change society, not conform to it.

http://www.guardian.co.uk/commentisfree/2009/jun/26/gay-lgbt-victimhood-stonewall Those pushing for SSM want to do away with the definition of a ‘normal, nuclear family’ and pave the way towards a brave new world. The Scottish Government appears to be quite comfortable with this radical social engineering (and that at a
time when almost half of marriages breakdown with untold of emotional and psychological damage)

**How would you characterise your views on putting belief celebrants on the same footing as religious celebrants?**

In opposition

I notice the Supreme Court in the U.S. consider Humanism a religion, does this mean that they would not be considered a 'belief' celebrant? Secondly, where will the lines be drawn. In the 2001 census, almost 400 000 British citizens described their religion as Jedi; will it be long before we have Jedi weddings on the shore of Loch Lomond?

**How would you characterise your views on the arrangements for authorising celebrants to solemnise opposite sex and same sex marriage (including the opt-in procedures)?**

In opposition

**How would you characterise your views on civil partnerships changing to marriages?**

Neither

Although one wonders how many would change. Since their introduction, the number of civil partnerships in Scotland has been steadily falling each year (1047 in 2006 to 465 in 2010).

According to Stonewall estimates, â€“ no-one knows how many gay people there are in Britainâ€™
http://www.stonewall.org.uk/what_we_do/research_and_policy/2880.asp Based on their estimates, they approximate 3.04 million, meaning just over 3% have had a civil partnership. The ONS Integrated household survey (2010) suggests 0.9% were homosexual, suggesting 19% had a civil partnership. The â€“ take-upâ€™ rate has been modest. Recent surveys have suggested that the uptake for same-sex marriage would be about the same.
http://www.rnw.nl/english/bulletin/dutch-gay-couples-marry-far-less

**How would you characterise your views on allowing civil marriage ceremonies to take place anywhere, other than religious premises, agreed between the couple and registrar?**

In opposition

Once again, this would simply highlight the failure of the bill to deliver 'equal marriage'. At the Pride rally in Edinburgh last Saturday (29/06), Tom French of the
Equality Network said, “We want to send a clear message to the Scottish Government; LGBT people deserve equal rights and will settle for nothing less.”

http://www.pinknews.co.uk/2012/07/02/edinburgh-pride-marchers-demand-marriage-equality/ If SSM can take place anywhere EXCEPT in religious premises, will the 'inequality' not be even more stark and will it be only a matter of time before the pressure mounts to allow these weddings to take place in churches etc?

**How would you characterise your views on allowing the religious and belief registration of civil partnerships?**

In opposition

**How would you characterise your views on allowing transgender persons to stay married when obtaining a full Gender Recognition Certificate, which provides legal recognition in the acquired gender?**

Neither

**Would you like to comment on the wider issue of protections for those in society who may have concerns about same sex marriage?**

Writing in the National Review, Michael Coren studied the Canadian experience. He argued, “Once gay marriage becomes law, critics are often silenced by the force of the lawâ€”itâ€™s estimated that, in less than five years, there have been between 200 and 300 proceedings â€” in courts, human-rights commissions, and employment boards â€” against critics and opponents of same-sex marriage.

https://www.nationalreview.com/nrd/articles/300942/canadian-crackdown The Mayor of Arcangues faced a five year prison sentence and a colossal fine if he refused to marry a same sex couple:

http://www.nydailynews.com/news/world/french-mayor-faces-jail-time-refusing-conduct-gay-couple-wedding-article-1.1383456 An Essex couple are planning to sure the CoE to allow them to be married in one of their churches:

http://www.telegraph.co.uk/news/religion/10219802/First-couple-consider-legal-challenge-to-Churchs-gay-marriage-opt-out.html It is clear to everyone who wishes to see that if SSM is legalised, legal challenges will be brought against churches which refuse to marry them, registrars who do not wish to conduct ceremonies, teachers who do not condone resources aimed at children, public service Chaplains that voice a different opinion.

**Would you like to comment on the wider issue of freedom of speech?**

It is fair to say that those who have opposed legislation have face a lot of abuse. â€” Out of touchâ€”, â€” intolerantâ€”, â€” bigotsâ€”, â€” no better than racistsâ€”, â€” homophobesâ€”, â€” stuck in the dark agesâ€” are just some of the terms being slung. Moreover, those who uphold traditional marriage have suffered in their workplaces. Gordon Wilson was voted off Dundee City Council for holding certain opinions.


http://www.enfieldindependent.co.uk/news/localnews/9541941.David_Burrowes_chal
Lenged_by_campaigners_on_anti_gay_marriage_views/  A Newly-wed couple who delivered a petition supporting traditional marriage to Downing street were bombarded with hate mail.  http://www.telegraph.co.uk/news/politics/9349353/Gay-marriage-newlywed-couple-bombarded-with-internet-hate-mail.html  John Sentamu, Archbishop of York, received racial abuse  http://www.telegraph.co.uk/news/politics/9270941/Dr-John-Sentamu-gay-marriage-plans-are-for-emotional-need-not-righting-injustice.html  Lord Carey, Former Archbishop of Canterbury, has also been vilified.  http://www.telegraph.co.uk/news/religion/9338188/Lord-Carey-opponents-of-gay-marriage-treated-like-bigots.html  Others have suffered loss of their earnings: The Bulls in Cornwall, the registrar Lillian Ladele, the housing officer Adrian Smith (who had a 40% payout after employers objected to comments on his personal facebook page).  All of this creates a frightening Orwellian picture of a society where one cannot challenge (for whatever reason) the dogma that homosexual relationships are entirely natural and equally valid as heterosexual marriage. It seems that liberals become illiberal in this issue and anyone who speaks out is demonised. We fear that, should the government lean toward legalising same-sex marriage, those who uphold traditional marriage will not only be demonised, but even potentially criminalised for homophobic speech (so called).  It is interesting to notice that the Gay Policeman's Association complained (with the support of UNISON) about Bibles being given to officers. They believed the force should not 'endorse a book containing text which condemns homosexuality'. The Book which all those in our courts must swear upon is now beginning to be considered, by some within the police, as 'condemning homosexuality'. Anyone, therefore, who reads or speaks about such things may be accused of homophobia, or worse a hate-crime.

Would you like to comment on any other wider issues in relation to the Bill that are not mentioned above?

This bill is being touted as an example of how 'progressive' Scotland is in the eyes of the world.  It is, in fact, regressive - taking us back to the classical world where all sorts of marriages were permitted. The grassroots desire for this is small, the public opposition is large; it will lead to all sorts of legal gymnastics and no shortage of litigation. Might we not be better off dealing with the other inequalities in society; the difference in lifespan between the East and West of Glasgow, the rich-poor divide-than playing to the gallery and trying to present ourselves as 'tolerant and enlightened'.
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