



Please forward on to a friend

June 9 2013

Same Sex Marriage Bill

www.annasoubry.org.uk

Hello again,

As you might imagine I have received many hundreds of emails about the Same Sex Marriage Bill. As much as I can I have tried to reply to everyone individually - this special email newsletter is so everyone gets a reply which I hope answers all points. I also intend to provide information about the passage of the Bill through Parliament, access to the debates in both the Lords and Commons, an explanation as to why I voted against the most contentious amendments at Third Reading and links to two organisations campaigning on the issue.

I am grateful to everyone who has emailed me, though some constituents have been, to put it mildly rather fierce in their opposition to my support of same sex marriage! It is an issue that has provoked strong emotions from both sides of the debate and that sometimes results in intemperate language. I am bound to say I have been told in no uncertain terms by some constituents that they will never vote for me again. My response is that I am more than happy for my political tomb stone to read "She lost because she stood up for what she believed in".

However, I have also come to the conclusion that we - namely the Government, should have begun with a debate about marriage. It is an institution I believe in, but we have a high divorce rate, many couples chose to have their children before marrying, many others chose not to marry at all. A general debate on marriage (including whether to recognise marriage in the tax system) would have been a valuable debate and out of it would have come the matter of enabling couples of the same sex to marry.

As you will see the House of Lords voted this week in favour of the Bill which now moves to the Committee Stage. Follow the progress of the Bill and get access to the various links to get full details of the Bill, amendments and supporting documents by clicking [here](#) and scroll down to Kate Green's speech and please read on!

Lords vote to back equal marriage

Beeston's own Baroness, Tina Stowell moved the Same Sex Marriage Bill in the House of Lords. After two days of debate the Lords voted in favour of the Bill which now moves on to the Committee Stage. You can read Monday's debate by clicking [here](#) and Tuesday's debate by clicking [here](#).

Why I voted in favour of same sex marriage

When the Bill was debated in the House of Commons before then moving to the House of Lords a number of amendments were proposed. A number were particularly contentious. They sought to provide specific "protection" for teachers and other workers that they would not be in any discriminated against should they give their own view of marriage - in effect their view that marriage is between a man and a woman. Special protection was sought for for faith schools for the same reasons and another would have allowed Registrars who do not believe in same sex marriage to exempt themselves from conducting those marriages.

These amendments were proposed by my colleague David Burrowes MP. Please click [here](#) to read the clauses he proposed. David's speech then follows in Hansard. I was able to spend a considerable amount of time in the chamber listening to the debate. I chose not to support the amendments he put forward.

I was particularly struck by the speech of Chris Bryant which you can read by clicking [here](#). The thrust of Chris's argument that the Education Act already provides precisely the protection that it was said was needed. I have to say I did not realise the extent of our current law to ensure that children from a particular religious or cultural background are respected.

The 1966 Act specifically states

“The Secretary of State must issue guidance designed to secure that when sex education is given to registered pupils at maintained schools...they learn the nature of marriage and its importance for family life and the bringing up of children”.

“protected from teaching and materials which are inappropriate having regard to the age and the religious and cultural background of the pupils concerned.”

Given the existing law I took the view no further legislation is needed so I voted accordingly against David's proposed amendments.

For the Government Hugh Robertson gave a good speech which you can read by clicking [here](#). He too explained the power of existing laws to prevent religious discrimination and that teachers are not expected to promote or endorse any particular view of marriage. There are undoubtedly teachers who do not believe in marriage and yet they are expected to explain what it is and make sure children

“learn the nature of marriage and its importance for family life and the bringing up of children,”

However, Hugh did undertake to consult further with various faith leaders to make sure the law does provide the right level of protection for teachers and indeed other people who do not believe in same sex marriage.

Finally, I thought the Secretary of State, Maria Miller gave a powerful speech on Same Sex Marriage in summing up on the Bill which I hope you will read by clicking [here](#).

So, in short, I listened to the various arguments and was persuaded there was no need to change the existing laws and regulations which protect the views of people of all faiths and religions.

In relation to Registrars I do not believe they should be able to pick and chose who to marry. If the Bill succeeds then it will allow same sex couples to marry under civil law in Registry Offices. In my opinion Registrars are obliged to uphold the law which would mean an end to discrimination against same sex couples who seek to marry.

There was also a debate on changing the law in relation to civil partnerships to allow heterosexual couples to enter a civil partnership. I did not support the amendment primarily because it would have considerably delayed the Same Sex Marriage Bill. the arguments for and against were well advanced and can be read by clicking [here](#)

Humanist Marriages

Thank you to everyone who emailed me asking me to vote in favour of allowing Humanist Marriages. The original amendment had been debated at the Committee stage and almost won through.

The Attorney General then considered the amendment which raised an important matter of law and he concluded that should the amendment be successful it would be incompatible with the European convention on human rights. In short it would mean the Bill could not proceed to the House of Lords. On that basis and with an assurance from the Government that they would review the matter, the amendment was withdrawn.

Please click [here](#) to read the part of the debate which dealt with Humanist marriage.

Get all the arguments



Arguments in favour of the Bill

Click [here](#) for the Stonewall web site



Arguments against the Bill

Click [here](#) for the Coalition for Marriage web site

Anna Soubry MP
Barton House
High Road,
Chilwell
NG9 4AJ
0115 9436507

[Unsubscribe from this newsletter](#)



Please forward on to a friend

June 9 2013

Same Sex Marriage Bill

www.annasoubry.org.uk

Hello again,

As you might imagine I have received many hundreds of emails about the Same Sex Marriage Bill. As much as I can I have tried to reply to everyone individually - this special email newsletter is so everyone gets a reply which I hope answers all points. I also intend to provide information about the passage of the Bill through Parliament, access to the debates in both the Lords and Commons, an explanation as to why I voted against the most contentious amendments at Third Reading and links to two organisations campaigning on the issue.

I am grateful to everyone who has emailed me, though some constituents have been, to put it mildly rather fierce in their opposition to my support of same sex marriage! It is an issue that has provoked strong emotions from both sides of the debate and that sometimes results in intemperate language. I am bound to say I have been told in no uncertain terms by some constituents that they will never vote for me again. My response is that I am more than happy for

my political tomb stone to read “She lost because she stood up for what she believed in”.

However, I have also come to the conclusion that we - namely the Government, should have begun with a debate about marriage. It is an institution I believe in, but we have a high divorce rate, many couples chose to have their children before marrying, many others chose not to marry at all. A general debate on marriage (including whether to recognise marriage in the tax system) would have been a valuable debate and out of it would have come the matter of enabling couples of the same sex to marry.

As you will see the House of Lords voted this week in favour of the Bill which now moves to the Committee Stage. Follow the progress of the Bill and get access to the various links to get full details of the Bill, amendments and supporting documents by clicking [here](#) and scroll down to Kate Green's speech and please read on!

Lords vote to back equal marriage

Beeston's own Baroness, Tina Stowell moved the Same Sex Marriage Bill in the House of Lords. After two days of debate the Lords voted in favour of the Bill which now moves on to the Committee Stage. You can read Monday's debate by clicking [here](#) and Tuesday's debate by clicking [here](#).

Why I voted in favour of same sex marriage

When the Bill was debated in the House of Commons before then moving to the House of Lords a number of amendments were proposed. A number were particularly contentious. They sought to provide specific “protection” for teachers and other workers that they would not be in any discriminated against should they give their own view of marriage - in effect their view that marriage is between a man and a woman. Special protection was sought for for faith schools for the same reasons and another would have allowed Registrars who do not believe in same sex marriage to exempt themselves from conducting those marriages.

These amendments were proposed by my colleague David Burrowes MP. Please click [here](#) to read the clauses he proposed. David's speech then follows in Hansard. I was able to spend a considerable amount of time in the chamber listening to the debate. I chose not to support the amendments he put forward.

I was particularly struck by the speech of Chris Bryant which you can read by clicking [here](#). The thrust of Chris's argument that the Education Act already provides precisely the protection that it was said was needed. I have to say I did not realise the extent of our current law to ensure that children from a particular religious or cultural background are respected.

The 1966 Act specifically states

“The Secretary of State must issue guidance designed to secure that when sex education is given to registered pupils at maintained schools...they learn the nature of marriage and its importance for family life and the bringing up of children”.

“protected from teaching and materials which are inappropriate having regard to the age and the religious and cultural background of the pupils concerned.”

Given the existing law I took the view no further legislation is needed so I voted accordingly against David's proposed amendments.

For the Government Hugh Robertson gave a good speech which you can read by clicking [here](#) He too explained the power of existing laws to prevent religious discrimination and that teachers are not expected to promote or endorse any particular view of marriage. There are undoubtedly teachers who do not believe in marriage and yet they are expected to explain what it is and make sure children

“learn the nature of marriage and its importance for family life and the bringing up of children,”

However, Hugh did undertake to consult further with various faith leaders to make sure the law does provide the right level of protection for teachers and indeed other people who do not believe in same sex marriage.

Finally, I thought the Secretary of State, Maria Miller gave a powerful speech on Same Sex Marriage in summing up on the Bill which I hope you will read by clicking [here](#).

So, in short, I listened to the various arguments and was persuaded there was no need to change the existing laws and regulations which protect the views of people of all faiths and religions.

In relation to Registrars I do not believe they should be able to pick and chose who to marry. If the Bill succeeds then it will allow same sex couples to marry under civil law in Registry Offices. In my opinion Registrars are obliged to uphold the law which would mean an end to discrimination against same sex couples who seek to marry.

There was also a debate on changing the law in relation to civil partnerships to allow heterosexual couples to enter a civil partnership. I did not support the amendment primarily because it would have considerably delayed the Same Sex Marriage Bill. the arguments for and against were well advanced and can be read by clicking [here](#)

Humanist Marriages

Thank you to everyone who emailed me asking me to vote in favour of allowing Humanist Marriages. The original amendment had been debated at the Committee stage and almost won through.

The Attorney General then considered the amendment which raised an important matter of law and he concluded that should the amendment be successful it would be incompatible with the European convention on human rights. In short it would mean the Bill could not proceed to the House of Lords. On that basis and with an assurance from the Government that they would review the matter, the amendemnt was withdrawn.

Please click [here](#) to read the part of the debate which dealt with Humanist marriage.

Get all the arguments



Arguments in favour of the Bill

Click [here](#) for the Stonewall web site



Arguments against the Bill

Click [here](#) for the Coalition for Marriage web site

Anna Soubry MP
Barton House
High Road,
Chilwell
NG9 4AJ
0115 9436507

[Unsubscribe from this newsletter](#)



Please forward on to a friend

June 9 2013

Same Sex Marriage Bill

www.annasoubry.org.uk

Hello again,

As you might imagine I have received many hundreds of emails about the Same Sex Marriage Bill. As much as I can I have tried to reply to everyone individually - this special email newsletter is so everyone gets a reply which I hope answers all points. I also intend to provide information about the passage of the Bill through Parliament, access to the debates in both the Lords and Commons, an explanation as to why I voted against the most contentious amendments at Third Reading and links to two organisations campaigning on the issue.

I am grateful to everyone who has emailed me, though some constituents have been, to put it mildly rather fierce in their opposition to my support of same sex marriage! It is an issue that has provoked strong emotions from both sides of the debate and that sometimes results in intemperate language. I am bound to say I have been told in no uncertain terms by some constituents that they will never vote for me again. My response is that I am more than happy for my political tomb stone to read "She lost because she stood up for what she believed in".

However, I have also come to the conclusion that we - namely the Government, should have begun with a debate about marriage. It is an institution I believe in, but we have a high divorce rate, many couples chose to have their children before marrying, many others chose not to marry at all. A general debate on marriage (including whether to recognise marriage in the tax system) would have been a valuable debate and out of it would have come the matter of enabling couples of the same sex to marry.

As you will see the House of Lords voted this week in favour of the Bill which now moves to the Committee Stage. Follow the progress of the Bill and get access to the various links to get full details of the Bill, amendments and supporting documents by clicking [here](#) and scroll down to Kate Green's speech and please read on!

Lords vote to back equal marriage

Beeston's own Baroness, Tina Stowell moved the Same Sex Marriage Bill in the House of Lords. After two days of debate the Lords voted in favour of the Bill which now moves on to the Committee Stage. You can read Monday's debate by clicking [here](#) and Tuesday's debate by

clicking [here](#).

Why I voted in favour of same sex marriage

When the Bill was debated in the House of Commons before then moving to the House of Lords a number of amendments were proposed. A number were particularly contentious. They sought to provide specific “protection” for teachers and other workers that they would not be in any discriminated against should they give their own view of marriage - in effect their view that marriage is between a man and a woman. Special protection was sought for for faith schools for the same reasons and another would have allowed Registrars who do not believe in same sex marriage to exempt themselves from conducting those marriages.

These amendments were proposed by my colleague David Burrowes MP. Please click [here](#) to read the clauses he proposed. David’s speech then follows in Hansard. I was able to spend a considerable amount of time in the chamber listening to the debate. I chose not to support the amendments he put forward.

I was particularly struck by the speech of Chris Bryant which you can read by clicking [here](#). The thrust of Chris’s argument that the Education Act already provides precisely the protection that it was said was needed. I have to say I did not realise the extent of our current law to ensure that children from a particular religious or cultural background are respected.

The 1966 Act specifically states

“The Secretary of State must issue guidance designed to secure that when sex education is given to registered pupils at maintained schools...they learn the nature of marriage and its importance for family life and the bringing up of children”.

“protected from teaching and materials which are inappropriate having regard to the age and the religious and cultural background of the pupils concerned.”

Given the existing law I took the view no further legislation is needed so I voted accordingly against David’s proposed amendments.

For the Government Hugh Robertson gave a good speech which you can read by clicking [here](#) He too explained the power of existing laws to prevent religious discrimination and that teachers are not expected to promote or endorse any particular view of marriage. There are undoubtedly teachers who do not believe in marriage and yet they are expected to explain what it is and make sure children

“learn the nature of marriage and its importance for family life and the bringing up of children,”

However, Hugh did undertake to consult further with various faith leaders to make sure the law does provide the right level of protection for teachers and indeed other people who do not believe in same sex marriage.

Finally, I thought the Secretary of State, Maria Miller gave a powerful speech on Same Sex Marriage in summing up on the Bill which I hope you will read by clicking [here](#).

So, in short, I listened to the various arguments and was persuaded there was no need to change the existing laws and regulations which protect the views of people of all faiths and religions.

In relation to Registrars I do not believe they should be able to pick and chose who to marry. If

the Bill succeeds then it will allow same sex couples to marry under civil law in Registry Offices. In my opinion Registrars are obliged to uphold the law which would mean an end to discrimination against same sex couples who seek to marry.

There was also a debate on changing the law in relation to civil partnerships to allow heterosexual couples to enter a civil partnership. I did not support the amendment primarily because it would have considerably delayed the Same Sex Marriage Bill. the arguments for and against were well advanced and can be read by clicking [here](#)

Humanist Marriages

Thank you to everyone who emailed me asking me to vote in favour of allowing Humanist Marriages. The original amendment had been debated at the Committee stage and almost won through.

The Attorney General then considered the amendment which raised an important matter of law and he concluded that should the amendment be successful it would be incompatible with the European convention on human rights. In short it would mean the Bill could not proceed to the House of Lords. On that basis and with an assurance from the Government that they would review the matter, the amendment was withdrawn.

Please click [here](#) to read the part of the debate which dealt with Humanist marriage.

Get all the arguments



Arguments in favour of the Bill

Click [here](#) for the Stonewall web site



Arguments against the Bill

Click [here](#) for the Coalition for Marriage web site

Anna Soubry MP
Barton House
High Road,
Chilwell
NG9 4AJ
0115 9436507

[Unsubscribe from this newsletter](#)



Please forward on to a friend

June 9 2013

Same Sex Marriage Bill

www.annasoubry.org.uk

Hello again,

As you might imagine I have received many hundreds of emails about the Same Sex Marriage Bill. As much as I can I have tried to reply to everyone individually - this special email newsletter is so

everyone gets a reply which I hope answers all points. I also intend to provide information about the passage of the Bill through Parliament, access to the debates in both the Lords and Commons, an explanation as to why I voted against the most contentious amendments at Third Reading and links to two organisations campaigning on the issue.

I am grateful to everyone who has emailed me, though some constituents have been, to put it mildly rather fierce in their opposition to my support of same sex marriage! It is an issue that has provoked strong emotions from both sides of the debate and that sometimes results in intemperate language. I am bound to say I have been told in no uncertain terms by some constituents that they will never vote for me again. My response is that I am more than happy for my political tomb stone to read "She lost because she stood up for what she believed in".

However, I have also come to the conclusion that we - namely the Government, should have begun with a debate about marriage. It is an institution I believe in, but we have a high divorce rate, many couples chose to have their children before marrying, many others chose not to marry at all. A general debate on marriage (including whether to recognise marriage in the tax system) would have been a valuable debate and out of it would have come the matter of enabling couples of the same sex to marry.

As you will see the House of Lords voted this week in favour of the Bill which now moves to the Committee Stage. Follow the progress of the Bill and get access to the various links to get full details of the Bill, amendments and supporting documents by clicking [here](#) and scroll down to Kate Green's speech and please read on!

Lords vote to back equal marriage

Beeston's own Baroness, Tina Stowell moved the Same Sex Marriage Bill in the House of Lords. After two days of debate the Lords voted in favour of the Bill which now moves on to the Committee Stage. You can read Monday's debate by clicking [here](#) and Tuesday's debate by clicking [here](#).

Why I voted in favour of same sex marriage

When the Bill was debated in the House of Commons before then moving to the House of Lords a number of amendments were proposed. A number were particularly contentious. They sought to provide specific "protection" for teachers and other workers that they would not be in any discriminated against should they give their own view of marriage - in effect their view that marriage is between a man and a woman. Special protection was sought for faith schools for the same reasons and another would have allowed Registrars who do not believe in same sex marriage to exempt themselves from conducting those marriages.

These amendments were proposed by my colleague David Burrowes MP. Please click [here](#) to read the clauses he proposed. David's speech then follows in Hansard. I was able to spend a considerable amount of time in the chamber listening to the debate. I chose not to support the amendments he put forward.

I was particularly struck by the speech of Chris Bryant which you can read by clicking [here](#). The thrust of Chris's argument that the Education Act already provides precisely the protection that it was said was needed. I have to say I did not realise the extent of our current law to ensure that children from a particular religious or cultural background are respected.

The 1966 Act specifically states

"The Secretary of State must issue guidance designed to secure that when sex education is

given to registered pupils at maintained schools...they learn the nature of marriage and its importance for family life and the bringing up of children”.

“protected from teaching and materials which are inappropriate having regard to the age and the religious and cultural background of the pupils concerned.”

Given the existing law I took the view no further legislation is needed so I voted accordingly against David’s proposed amendments.

For the Government Hugh Robertson gave a good speech which you can read by clicking [here](#) He too explained the power of existing laws to prevent religious discrimination and that teachers are not expected to promote or endorse any particular view of marriage. There are undoubtedly teachers who do not believe in marriage and yet they are expected to explain what it is and make sure children

“learn the nature of marriage and its importance for family life and the bringing up of children,”

However, Hugh did undertake to consult further with various faith leaders to make sure the law does provide the right level of protection for teachers and indeed other people who do not believe in same sex marriage.

Finally, I thought the Secretary of State, Maria Miller gave a powerful speech on Same Sex Marriage in summing up on the Bill which I hope you will read by clicking [here](#).

So, in short, I listened to the various arguments and was persuaded there was no need to change the existing laws and regulations which protect the views of people of all faiths and religions.

In relation to Registrars I do not believe they should be able to pick and chose who to marry. If the Bill succeeds then it will allow same sex couples to marry under civil law in Registry Offices. In my opinion Registrars are obliged to uphold the law which would mean an end to discrimination against same sex couples who seek to marry.

There was also a debate on changing the law in relation to civil partnerships to allow hetrosexual couples to enter a civil partnership. I did not support the amendment primarily because it would have considerably delayed the Same Sex Marriage Bill. the arguments for and against were well advanced and can be read by clicking [here](#)

Humanist Marriages

Thank you to everyone who emailed me asking me to vote in favour of allowing Humanist Marriages. The original amendment had been debated at the Committee stage and almost won through.

The Attorney General then considered the amendment which raised an important matter of law and he concluded that should the amendment be sucessful it would be incompatible with the European convention on human rights. In short it would mean the Bill could not proceed to the House of Lords. On that basis and with an assurance from the Government that they would review the matter, the amendemnt was withdrawn.

Please click [here](#) to read the part of the debate which dealt with Humanist marriage.

[Get all the arguments](#)



Arguments in favour of the Bill

Click [here](#) for the Stonewall web site



Arguments against the Bill

Click [here](#) for the Coalition for Marriage web site

Anna Soubry MP
Barton House
High Road,
Chilwell
NG9 4AJ
0115 9436507

[Unsubscribe from this newsletter](#)



Please forward on to a friend

June 9 2013

Same Sex Marriage Bill

www.annasoubry.org.uk

Hello again,

As you might imagine I have received many hundreds of emails about the Same Sex Marriage Bill. As much as I can I have tried to reply to everyone individually - this special email newsletter is so everyone gets a reply which I hope answers all points. I also intend to provide information about the passage of the Bill through Parliament, access to the debates in both the Lords and Commons, an explanation as to why I voted against the most contentious amendments at Third Reading and links to two organisations campaigning on the issue.

I am grateful to everyone who has emailed me, though some constituents have been, to put it mildly rather fierce in their opposition to my support of same sex marriage! It is an issue that has provoked strong emotions from both sides of the debate and that sometimes results in intemperate language. I am bound to say I have been told in no uncertain terms by some constituents that they will never vote for me again. My response is that I am more than happy for my political tomb stone to read "She lost because she stood up for what she believed in".

However, I have also come to the conclusion that we - namely the Government, should have begun with a debate about marriage. It is an institution I believe in, but we have a high divorce rate, many couples chose to have their children before marrying, many others chose not to marry at all. A general debate on marriage (including whether to recognise marriage in the tax system) would have been a valuable debate and out of it would have come the matter of enabling couples of the same sex to marry.

As you will see the House of Lords voted this week in favour of the Bill which now moves to the Committee Stage. Follow the progress of the Bill and get access to the various links to get full details of the Bill, amendments and supporting documents by clicking [here](#) and scroll down to Kate Green's speech and please read on!

Lords vote to back equal marriage

Beeston's own Baroness, Tina Stowell moved the Same Sex Marriage Bill in the House of Lords. After two days of debate the Lords voted in favour of the Bill which now moves on to the Committee Stage. You can read Monday's debate by clicking [here](#) and Tuesday's debate by clicking [here](#).

Why I voted in favour of same sex marriage

When the Bill was debated in the House of Commons before then moving to the House of Lords a number of amendments were proposed. A number were particularly contentious. They sought to provide specific "protection" for teachers and other workers that they would not be in any discriminated against should they give their own view of marriage - in effect their view that marriage is between a man and a woman. Special protection was sought for faith schools for the same reasons and another would have allowed Registrars who do not believe in same sex marriage to exempt themselves from conducting those marriages.

These amendments were proposed by my colleague David Burrowes MP. Please click [here](#) to read the clauses he proposed. David's speech then follows in Hansard. I was able to spend a considerable amount of time in the chamber listening to the debate. I chose not to support the amendments he put forward.

I was particularly struck by the speech of Chris Bryant which you can read by clicking [here](#). The thrust of Chris's argument that the Education Act already provides precisely the protection that it was said was needed. I have to say I did not realise the extent of our current law to ensure that children from a particular religious or cultural background are respected.

The 1966 Act specifically states

"The Secretary of State must issue guidance designed to secure that when sex education is given to registered pupils at maintained schools...they learn the nature of marriage and its importance for family life and the bringing up of children".

"protected from teaching and materials which are inappropriate having regard to the age and the religious and cultural background of the pupils concerned."

Given the existing law I took the view no further legislation is needed so I voted accordingly against David's proposed amendments.

For the Government Hugh Robertson gave a good speech which you can read by clicking [here](#). He too explained the power of existing laws to prevent religious discrimination and that teachers are not expected to promote or endorse any particular view of marriage. There are undoubtedly teachers who do not believe in marriage and yet they are expected to explain what it is and make sure children

"learn the nature of marriage and its importance for family life and the bringing up of children,"

However, Hugh did undertake to consult further with various faith leaders to make sure the law does provide the right level of protection for teachers and indeed other people who do not believe in same sex marriage.

Finally, I thought the Secretary of State, Maria Miller gave a powerful speech on Same Sex

Marriage in summing up on the Bill which I hope you will read by clicking [here](#).

So, in short, I listened to the various arguments and was persuaded there was no need to change the existing laws and regulations which protect the views of people of all faiths and religions.

In relation to Registrars I do not believe they should be able to pick and chose who to marry. If the Bill succeeds then it will allow same sex couples to marry under civil law in Registry Offices. In my opinion Registrars are obliged to uphold the law which would mean an end to discrimination against same sex couples who seek to marry.

There was also a debate on changing the law in relation to civil partnerships to allow heterosexual couples to enter a civil partnership. I did not support the amendment primarily because it would have considerably delayed the Same Sex Marriage Bill. the arguments for and against were well advanced and can be read by clicking [here](#)

Humanist Marriages

Thank you to everyone who emailed me asking me to vote in favour of allowing Humanist Marriages. The original amendment had been debated at the Committee stage and almost won through.

The Attorney General then considered the amendment which raised an important matter of law and he concluded that should the amendment be successful it would be incompatible with the European convention on human rights. In short it would mean the Bill could not proceed to the House of Lords. On that basis and with an assurance from the Government that they would review the matter, the amendemnt was withdrawn.

Please click [here](#) to read the part of the debate which dealt with Humanist marriage.

Get all the arguments



Arguments in favour of the Bill

Click [here](#) for the Stonewall web site



Arguments against the Bill

Click [here](#) for the Coalition for Marriage web site

Anna Soubry MP
Barton House
High Road,
Chilwell
NG9 4AJ
0115 9436507

[Unsubscribe from this newsletter](#)