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

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

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

The privilege of religious celebrants, and religious groups in general, is long overdue a reassessment in an increasingly multi-cultural and secular society. Putting belief celebrants on an equal footing goes some way to reducing discrimination against people with no religious belief or beliefs not represented by mainstream institutions.

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)?
Neither

All celebrants working outside of religious institutions should be required to solemnise any marriage which is legally valid. Allowing employees of the state to opt-out (or not opt-in) is to sanction discrimination on the basis of sexual orientation. We would not tolerate racial discrimination like this, even if the celebrant claimed that his or her religion disapproved of such unions.

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

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 support
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 support

This should be a matter for individuals and not the state. The idea that the state could force a couple to divorce under such circumstances is disgusting.

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

We do not legislate to protect the interests of racists. We do not tolerate sexual discrimination although many mainstream religions are mired in misogynistic teachings. We should not protect those who hold out dated and bigoted opinions based on sexual orientation because to do so suggests that there is validity to their prejudice. Plenty of people had "concerns" about inter-racial marriage in the 1960s. This was racism dressed up as a valid concern. The "concerns" about same-sex marriage now are no different. We should not pander to prejudice.

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

Freedom of speech is important and must be preserved. However, attempting to foist one's prejudices on others is not freedom of speech. People should be free to express whatever bigotry and prejudices they will, however ugly it may be, but they should not be able to halt equality by doing so. No one is forced to enter into a same-sex marriage. No one should be prevented from doing so because those who oppose it are loud.

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

True equality would allow mixed-sex couples to enter into civil partnerships if they want to.

Are you responding as...

a private individual
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