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

In opposition

I think I'm thick but I see obvious differences between a male and female union and a same sex union. I am wondering if I am the only one to notice this though. As there are differences it is only but right that the differences are acknowledged. We call men men and women women because they are different. We call children children and adults adults because they are different. We call conservatives conservative and nationalists nationalists because they are different. All of these have similarities but that does not mean we call them the same thing. So why is this bill proposing to call two things which are similar but clearly different by only one name? I believe that there is legislation to ensure that male and female are treated equally but that legislation does not say we have to call them the same thing. I believe that the same principle should be used for this bill. By all means treat people equally but that does mean that things which have differences should be given the same name. If we are to continue down that road I suggest that at the next election we don't show any party differences but simply put the candidates name on the voting slip and state politician next to it rather than their chosen party, after they should all be treated equally.

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

In opposition

As above I am not saying my views are better than anyone else's and if same sex couples wan to have a relationship they can but as there are obvious differences these should be acknowledged. We are apparently a multi cultural society and we can embrace differences so if we can do that for culture we should be able to do it for relationships but we still give different cultures different names and that could easily be done in to this bill without meaning someone will be discriminated against. It strikes me that if someone wants to discriminate against a same sex couple they will do so whether the union is called a marriage or a same-age so this bill will not remove discrimination. Same sex couples can already have a civil partnership and the government assured us when these were introduced that it wouldn't lead to same sex marriage but that clearly wasn't true so why should I believe the government now when they say freedom of speech will, be protected?

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

In support
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

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

Neither

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?

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?

Neither

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

Any assurances being given by the government are totally worthless. As mentioned earlier the government said when civil partnerships were introduced that it would not lead to same sex marriage. Well that has turned out to be a lie so any assurances being given now are worthless. Even if so called protections are included I feel that some of the militant groups who oppose freedom of religion will take cases to the European court to challenge them. From looking at the replies to the original consultation there are some groups out there who feel anyone with a religious objection to same sex marriage should be silenced.

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

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 private individual
Why is this question even on here? It seems to me that groups get more of a hearing than an individual and that is wrong as my opinion is equally as valid as someone seemingly responding on behalf of a group no matter if everyone in the group has given their view or not.
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