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

In opposition

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

In opposition

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

In opposition

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?

In opposition

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

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?

In opposition

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

Protection is vital

Would you like to comment on the wider issue of freedom of speech?
vital as long as not generally offensive or violent

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

It does not offer any further equality or civil rights. The only thing hoped for by those who wish to redefine marriage is that someday the sexual acts of some homosexuals will be considered normal or natural, which can never be, and never result in a natural outcome, i.e. children. This prospect of the acceptance of normality is the only real objective expressed in an article by Peter Tatchell, gay rights activist.

**Are you responding as...**

an academic  
a private individual  
A believer in the Bible without convenient interpretation.

John Scott  
14 August 2013