IN DEFENSE OF TRADITIONAL MARRIAGE

Marriage has been defined by nature as a union between a man and a woman with the potential for natural procreation. Neither State nor Church has the power to change this reality, however well meaning the intention may be.

Up until a few decades ago, both civil and religious authorities protected and regulated the institution of Marriage with wisdom in the knowledge that it is the bedrock of society. Every individual is free to enter this time honoured institution; and it requires remarkably low qualifications to do so.

The recent introduction of civil partnerships means that we now have three entities – co-habitation, civil partnership and Marriage, and the straightforward thing to do is have a clear distinction in nomenclature as there is a clear distinction in the nature and purpose of these partnerships.

Despite modern trends, traditional marriage is proving that it is the best environment, (with fewer breakdowns,) in which children can have a stable upbringing enjoying the benefits of the complementary qualities which a mother and father.

Legislation must ensure that traditional Marriage is encouraged and strengthened to encourage an organic growth in population able to support the economy and our ageing population in future years.

The legal rights of couples in civil partnerships are so similar to marriage that the electorate will come to question why so much time and effort is being spent to satisfy the wishes of a tiny vocal minority within a minority who have a same sex attraction. The electorate will come to realise that what we have here is a Bill which does not address real needs within our society and endangers the most important institution in society.

The Bill as read now, appears to recognise that the notion of same sex marriage violates the beliefs of a majority, particularly among the Judeo-Christian and Moslem communities, and attempts to offer some protection to individuals and celebrants. But, if enshrined in law, it is inevitable that litigation will follow and individual career prospects of those opposed to or have concerns about same sex marriage will be blighted.

On the introduction of civil partnerships, legislators failed to protect the rights of individuals and institutions who believe that traditional marriage is the best vehicle for a stable family and for the long term well being of society. This gives cause to believe that any expression of disapproval of the notion of same sex marriage will result in some form of punishment by way of career prospects and loss of charitable status. Put another way – plain, honest speaking will be seen as a violation of equality laws. There will be questions in the voter’s mind:

In the drive for equality why were heterosexual couples excluded from civil partnerships?

Given that there was a far greater response to the consultative process for the redefinition of marriage than that for independence (the great majority against change) – why were their wishes ignored?

If legislators have concerns about the future of individuals and institutions who disapprove of same sex marriage and civil partnerships – why is there no provision for a conscience clause?
In conclusion, there are no discernable differences in the legal, fiscal and financial benefits between civil partnerships and marriages, so one is forced to the conclusion that there is some other agenda at play. The legislation does not address equality issues, but rather is an attempt to make everyone the same. Definitions of parenthood and familial bonds will be blurred, and in the long term deemed as undesirable and unnecessary. Although I do not profess to see round corners, I do see that this proposed legislation brings no benefits to society and has the potential to do great harm.
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