CONSULTATION QUESTIONS

The registration of civil partnerships

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question 1  ( Paragraphs 2.12 and 2.13)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Do you agree that legislation should be changed so that civil partnerships could be registered through religious ceremonies?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don't know</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Please give reasons for your answer.

Comment

We condemn in principle and out of conscience the legislation already enacted respecting Civil Partnerships. Legislation permitting Civil Partnership registration in religious premises would over time, like most permissive legislation, become a right to demand, which is intolerable.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question 2  ( Paragraphs 2.14 to 2.19)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Do you think that the proposals in England and Wales on registration of civil partnerships in religious premises would be appropriate for Scotland?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don't know</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

If you have answered no, please explain what elements of the proposals in England and Wales you consider inappropriate for Scotland.

Comment

No legislation however used in other countries, including England and Wales, can ever be appropriate to Scotland on this question because in principle Civil Partnerships promote and legitimise sinful practices.
Question 3  (Paragraphs 2.20 to 2.24)

Do you agree with allowing religious celebrants to register civil partnerships in religious premises?

Yes  [ ]
No  [✓]
Don't know  [ ]

Please give reasons for your answer

Comments
No Christian religious celebrant can legitimately condone or promote by registering in a religious way what is forbidden by the law of God. Civil Partnerships as presently defined, enacted and practiced are contrary to the law of God. Therefore it would incur great shame on the name and honour of Christ to be associated with it.
(see also comments to question 1.2)

Question 4  (Paragraphs 2.20 to 2.24)

Do you agree with allowing religious celebrants to register civil partnerships in other places agreed between the celebrant and the couple?

Yes  [ ]
No  [✓]
Don't know  [ ]

Please give reasons for your answer

Comments
Permissive legislation over time becomes a basis for those seeking sinful licence to claim a right. This in turn would eventually infringe on bodies responsible for registering such practices. Human choice is not a safe guide for any legislation in this important area. Civil Partnership legislation ought to be repealed.
Question 5  (Paragraph 2.25) 
Do you agree that religious bodies should not be required to register civil partnerships?
Yes  [ ]
No   [X]
Don’t know [ ]

Please give reasons for your answer

Comments
It is intolerance of the highest order to think otherwise. Furthermore, no religious body is at present obliged to perform a marriage or register it. The nature of this question strongly suggests that this possibility is already exercising the minds of lobby groups responsible for this vigorous consultation and propaganda.

Question 6  (Paragraphs 2.26 and 2.27)
Do you consider that religious celebrants should not be allowed to register civil partnerships if their religious body has decided against registering civil partnerships?
Yes  [ ]
No   [X]
Don’t know [ ]

Please give reasons for your answer

Comments
We have no concern or interest in what may be the structures of authority in religious bodies which the Bible identifies as false religions. For ourselves we have only one authority – the Bible – and not civil power can ever claim precedence over it. For legislation to interfere in the least with this is intolerable.
Question 7 (Paragraphs 2.28 to 2.30)
Do you agree that individual religious celebrants should not be required to register civil partnerships?
Yes [ ]
No [ ]
Don't know [ ]
Please give reasons for your answer

Comments
We do not believe in totalitarianism!! Any such measure would be destructive of religious liberty, bought at such a heavy cost in the 17th century. We utterly reject the reference behind this question that any state could potentially coerce a church body so to act.

Question 8 (Paragraphs 2.31 to 2.35)
Which of the options do you favour to ensure that religious bodies and celebrants do not have to register civil partnerships against their will?

Do you favour:
Option 1 [ ]
Option 2 [ ]
Neither [ ]
If you have another option, please describe it.

Comments
This interference with the Christian Church has very weighty constitutional implications and legislation either way would have very serious repercussions. It is a contradiction in terms to demand refusal to register civil partnerships as non-discriminatory. Some discrimination is right!
Question 9  (Paragraphs 2.36 to 2.40)

Religious bodies may not wish their premises to be used to register civil partnerships. Do you agree that no legislative provision is required to ensure religious premises cannot be used against the wishes of the relevant religious body?

Yes ☑
No ☐
Don’t know ☐

Please give reasons for your answer

Comments
No legislative provision should ever be contemplated in this area. The question (assumes a right of the State to make the decision or not) we utterly reject this right.
### Question 10  ( Paragraphs 3.11 and 3.12 )

Do you agree that the law in Scotland should be changed to allow same sex marriage?

- Yes  
- No   [ ]
- Don't know [ ]

Please give reasons for your answer

### Comments

Whatever such a union might be called it is most emphatically not marriage and no human legislation can ever make it so. We vehemently protest at the suggestion and solemnly warn against any move to this despicable and corrupting law-making.

### Question 11  (Paragraph 3.13)

Do you agree that religious bodies and celebrants should not be required to solemnise same sex marriage?

- Yes  [ ]
- No   [ ]
- Don't know [ ]

Please give reasons for your answer

### Comments

Again this implies that the state by legislation could potentially force the Church to do act. We consider this to be unconstitutional and therefore illegal and are concerned that such ideology could, over time, erode in a most damaging way, our precious liberties.
Question 12  (Paragraphs 3.14 to 3.18)

Do you agree with the introduction of same-sex civil marriage only?

Yes  □
No    □
Don’t know  □

Please give reasons for your answer

Comments

Same-sex "marriage" is sinful and cannot ever be legitimized by the state. This possibility would infringe most unjustly on the conscience of every Christian registrar, as the present migidous civil partnership legislation already does.

Question 13  (Paragraph 3.19)

Do you agree with the introduction of same-sex marriage, both religious and civil?

Yes  □
No    □
Don’t know  □

Please give reasons for your answer

Comments

See above answers.
Question 14 (Paragraphs 3.23 and 3.24)
Do you agree that religious bodies should not be required to solemnise same sex marriage?
Yes [✓]  
No [ ]  
Don't know [ ]
Please give reasons for your answer

Comments
see answers above (question 7).

Question 15 (Paragraphs 3.25 and 3.26)
Do you consider that religious celebrants should not be allowed to solemnise same sex marriages if their religious body has decided against solemnising same sex marriage?
Yes [ ]  
No [ ]  
Don't know [ ]
Please give reasons for your answer

Comments
see above.
Question 16 (Paragraphs 3.27 and 3.28)
Do you agree that individual religious celebrants should not be required to solemnise same sex marriage?
Yes ☑
No ☐
Don’t know ☐
Please give reasons for your answer

Comments

see above.

Question 17 (Paragraphs 3.29 to 3.33)
Which of the options do you favour to ensure that religious bodies and celebrants do not have to solemnise same sex marriage against their will?
Do you favour:
Option 1 ☐
Option 2 ☐
Neither ☑
Don’t know ☐
Please give reasons for your answer and if you have another option, please describe it.

Comments
Neither option truly protects from the unconstitutional assumption that a right to obtain religious registration could be used to enforce an ideology behind this question and whole process is essentially illiberal
Question 18 (Paragraphs 3.34 to 3.39)

Religious bodies may not wish their premises to be used to solemnise same sex marriage. Do you agree that no legislative provision is required to ensure religious premises cannot be used against the wishes of the relevant religious body?

Yes ☐
No ☐
Don't know ☐

Please give reasons for your answer

Comments

see earlier answer

Question 19  (Paragraph 3.41)

If Scotland should introduce same-sex marriage, do you consider that civil partnerships should remain available?

Yes ☐
No ☐
Don't know ☐

Please give reasons for your answer

Comments

Neither are valid in our eyes because both are condemned by the law of God. We continue to protest against any laws, consultation or process to legitimise them. No law can legitimise what is itself unlawful.
We are particularly interested in your views on:

- potential implications of the proposals for transgender people (paragraph 3.42)
- possible transitional arrangements (paragraphs 3.43 and 3.44);
- recognition of Scottish same sex marriages elsewhere (paragraphs 3.45 to 3.49);
- any comments on forced marriage (paragraphs 3.51 and 3.52)
- any comments on sham marriage (paragraph 3.53)
- potential financial implications (paragraphs 4.01 to 4.08);
- potential equality implications (paragraphs 4.09 to 4.14).

Comments

Same-sex "marriage" is a sham marriage and cannot ever be justified. 

We have no comment whatever on arrangements to bring about this legislation beyond what we have submitted in response to questions and with the protest of our appended protest against the process. The implications are so serious that we are certain that civil peace could be disturbed from the forcing through of this legislation against the Word of God and constitutional laws. The Government has succumbed to the pressure of minority lobby groups with a perverted agenda which under the light of true religion. We protest vehemently.
Scottish Government Consultation on the Registration of Civil Partnerships and on Same Sex Marriage

The Free Presbyterian Church of Scotland received the above Consultation paper and we enclose our response to the appended questions. The responsibility of providing an answer to this consultation is given to the Religion and Morals Committee of the Church. This additional response is a statement of our most decided opposition both to the consultation process and to the proposals which are being consulted on. We wish to make it absolutely clear that in answering some of the questions in this consultation, we are not in any way to be taken as approving or endorsing the process. We consider this consultation to be repugnant and offensive to public decency and morals and we wish to be disassociated from having any part in bringing about any legislation resulting from it.

We regard the Scottish Government’s stated wish to go forward to legislating on this subject extremely dangerous and subversive of Christian morality and harmful to the foundations of our society which are so intimately bound up with the divinely ordained institution of marriage. We remind the Scottish Government that we have protested against previous decisions relating to Civil Partnerships as also to legislation passed by the Scottish Parliament permitting the advocacy of homosexuality in Schools and other public bodies. We further remind the Scottish Government that we are under oath to preach and declare the whole counsel of God which specifically condemns homosexuality which this consultation process pretends to legitimise. Our authority in such matters is only the Word of God and we refer the Scottish Government to its plain statements condemning homosexuality. (Genesis 13:13; 18:20, 21; 19:4 – 7, 24, 25; Leviticus 18:22; 20:13; Isaiah 3:9; Romans 1:24 – 27; 1 Corinthians 6:9, 10; 2 Peter 2:6 – 10; Jude 7, 8)

We reject utterly the legal right of any government to redefine marriage as it pleases or even as it may please the democratic majority of the people. As a matter of conscience and principle we will oppose and condemn any such move as an iniquity and public shame. No law or public opprobrium will prevent our ministers from publically preaching against the sins of sodomy and unnatural union which this consultation process seeks to promote. We therefore herewith warn and solemnly
protest to the Scottish Government that they desist forthwith from what would, if enacted, tend to erode the institution of marriage. We exhort all concerned in this process to beware of inviting the deserved judgement of God on our nation by such actions and decisions as would pretend to validate what God has condemned as abomination and wickedness.

We herewith declare that if legislation is eventually passed, based on this consultation, or by any other means, we will consider it our duty and calling as officers in the Church of God, not only to treat any such legislation as invalid and unconstitutional, but that we shall continue to preach publically against it as that which the Word of God condemns. We consider any such legislation as necessarily bringing all Christian ministers who are guided by the Bible, into direct conflict with the civil authorities and as such to be extremely hurtful to the public peace of the nation. Furthermore, spiritual privileges such as the sacraments, as also office in the Church would be forbidden any who entered into such a relation as is envisaged in the consultation. The confusion which civil partnerships and the so-called marriage of homosexuals would inevitably produce will be impossible to remove and reform without great trouble and pain to those involved.

As is detailed in our responses to the consultation questions, we regard the inference of some questions deeply disturbing. It is utterly inconsistent with our constitutional liberties and with justice and equity to consider the possibility (as may be inferred from some questions) that the state could force religious bodies to act against conscience and the Word of God. We consider it insulting to be asked our opinion on this and repudiate the suggestion that it could at any time be feasible for the Scottish Government to coerce the Christian Church to supply religious ordinances or to give its blessing to anyone, far less to “solemnise” a perversion which the Word of God describes as an abomination. Interference in the freedoms of the Church of God in Scotland, which were secured at such great cost, and which are legislated for in the Treaty of Union, would be catastrophic to the peace and liberty of Scotland.

In such weighty and important matters we esteem it our duty to follow the example of the Apostles of Christ to obey God rather than men. We will count it our continued duty to the Scottish Government, as well as to those whom the Lord has called us to
minister to in his Word, to expose and condemn homosexuality as a sin against God and those unnatural homosexual unions forged by men as an abomination to him. We must continue to do this until the land is more fully purged of these evils by repentance and public reformation.

In light of the very serious nature of this consultation, the Free Presbyterian Church would be very willing to take up the invitation of the Justice Directorate to meet with your representative to discuss the issues arising from the consultation.