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

In opposition

Marriage is between one man and one woman, for the purpose of begetting and bringing up children. For a marriage to be valid, the couple need to obviously a man and a woman, the marriage is open to the potential of bearing children-which destroys the nonsense of the age argument-they need to be free to marry, ie not married to someone else, they need to be mature enough to know what they are doing, and they commit to be faithful to one another come what may unconditionally, and to support one another and their children, ie to accept the responsibilities of marriage. Same sex relationships therefore can never be classed as marriage and they are inherently closed to the begetting of children. Whatever the claimed intention of this bill, it will clearly undermine marriage itself

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 marriage focuses on the desires of adults, falsely claimed to be "rights". This is at the expense of the rest of society, and especially children, who are entitled to a father and a mother. Already the law is being pre-empted, and adoption agencies have been put under pressure to comply with the new state imposed orthodoxy or close. In the debate in the HoL we have heard some very strange and alarming views expressed about marriage, such as fidelity in marriage is not necessary, only if it is important to the couple themselves. For the vast majority of folk fidelity is an absolute necessity in marriage, both because it is right and for their own and their children's and their spouses security. What do you think a child goes through if one of their parents goes off with another person?

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

In opposition

The agenda driving this legislation appears to be spearheaded by an appeal to homosexual "rights" (wants would be a more truthful word) but is also being quietly orchestrated by those who wish to drive religion and its practice right out of civil life. This question makes that quite clear

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)?

Note that the celebrant is there as a witness to the marriage on behalf of the church and in Scotland, the state. The actual ministers of marriage are the couple, one to
another, but for the marriage to be valid, the conditions I have already mentioned must be met. Marriage is something the couple actively commit to, and accept their responsibilities, not a service the state provides to a passive accepting couple. So far as the Church is concerned it is against moral, never mind canon, law for its ministers to preside over a same sex so called wedding

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

In opposition

Civil partnerships are a means of giving homosexual couples legal rights akin to marriage. The reason why marriage attracts certain rights and privileges is because they are required to carry out the duties and responsibilities of marriage, the most significant of which is the raising of children. In the case of same sex civil partnerships, these couples have been granted rights and privileges without the corresponding duties.

**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?**

Neither

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

In opposition

The church recognises marriage as a special state, meeting the conditions as previously stated. Friendship is obviously a good thing, but is not the same thing as marriage. Sexual relations outside of marriage, whether heterosexual or homosexual.

**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?**

If a person is validly married then they remain married, even if they go under surgery to change sex. However, it is possible that in some cases the marriage may have not been entered into with the intention of committing for life, eg to test if they really were a particular sex. In that case, one of the validity conditions has not been fulfilled and the marriage therefore has never existed. Not saying this is their fault, but if they were confused as to what they really wanted, then this may well be the case.

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

This is a huge issue. Already people and organisations who stand up for real marriage, families and children have been vilified and been removed from jobs and appointments. There is no debate, basically a tirade of abuse from the liberal and metropolitan elite. St Margaret's Families and Children's Society has come under
attack over its charitable status, despite the good work it has done over many years, and even the support of the Scottish Govt. There will be legal attacks on the Church (despite the so called protections) over its inability to take part in this travesty, and its position in defence of the family, marriage and children. Same sex marriage will be taught in schools as a state requirement, and teachers who object to it will be disciplined, and parents not allowed to withdraw their children from it. Imagine the feelings of a child from a normal family being taught that same sex couples have as god a relationship as their own parents. Expressing an opinion against same sex marriage will become a "hate crime", liable to legal penalties as well as a tirade of abuse. Conscience will go for nothing, all must comply with the new legislation. Councils will use the Public Sector Equality Act to over enforce the new orthodoxy, and to discriminate against those of their employees who do not accept it. In effect, the whole thing becomes a secular Test Act, under which a person is forced to demonstrate blind loyalty to the state, and its leaders rather than to religion and informed conscience.

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

See response to 12

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

Are you responding as...

a faith/belief local group or congregation
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