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

In opposition

Re-defining marriage is not required. LGBT people already have equal rights through civil partnerships. Marriage is not possible between 2 people of the same sex as they cannot procreate.

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

In opposition

Same sex couples will not gain any more advantages than they already have through Civil Partnerships. If you start to alter the traditional view on marriage because of a vociferous minority, then that will not be the end of the matter. Other equally vociferous minority groups will appear a few years down the line trying to move the goalposts further. IT could be polygamy, or sexual relations and marriage with under 16s or marriage for animals. Who knows. Traditional marriage between 1 man and 1 woman has stood the test of time down through the millennia. Why do you need to force this change through undemocratically? It has not been requested by the majority of subjects in this realm.

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

Neither

I'm not sure what you mean by this question. If you mean "Belief" celebrants are civil registrars and humanist society etc., then they should be able to opt out of performing same sex ceremonies if it is against their private and personal beliefs.

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

I'm against same sex marriage, therefore against Celebrants performing such ceremonies. If same sex marriage were to become legal, then celebrants must have an opt-out option on grounds of personal faith or belief (similar to abortion law within the medical profession).

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

In opposition
I'm against same sex marriage, therefore no to civil partnerships becoming civil marriages.

**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 support

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

In opposition

I am opposed to religious celebrants performing civil partnership ceremonies. Religious celebrants should be confined to performing existing religious ceremonies (i.e. marriage). Civil celebrants only, should be allowed to perform civil partnerships.

**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?**

In opposition

If the result is 2 people of the same sex remaining married, then that is not acceptable and they should be divorced.

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

I do NOT believe under current legislation that any safeguards worthy of the name, can be given to anyone who opposes same sex relationships and same sex marriage. Various people have already lost their jobs through opposition, and it is becoming increasingly difficult to oppose the state in this matter. It smacks of King Henry VIII v Sir Thomas More. No freedom of conscience allowed. So I do not believe the state when it says there will be protection for all who oppose this matter and who openly state their opposition.

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

Freedom of speech is in great danger. It's a bit ironic that an 18th century French Republican - Voltaire - said "I do not agree with what you have to say, but I'll defend to the death your right to say it." This Scottish government and this United Kingdom government are gradually removing freedoms of speech. It matters not if what I say is offensive to others. It's how it is said and arguing your case on your beliefs that is of vital importance.

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

Do NOT proceed with this bill.
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a private individual
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