

Let's start with the current constitutional question. The US Constitution contains no definition or laws pertaining to marriage. The Tenth Amendment makes it abundantly evident that the states and the people retain any authority not specifically granted to the federal government. These limits were crossed by the Supreme Court's Obergefell decision, which denied states the authority to choose their own marriage laws. Even worse, it disregarded citizens' inherent rights and changed liberty from an unalienable right bestowed by God to a luxury bestowed by the state.

The idea that same-sex "marriage" is a right is one of the main defenses of it. In actuality, nobody has the right to wed anybody. A woman has the right to decline my request for her hand in marriage. Additionally, those opposed to this resolution will argue that, similar to the Jim Crow South's racial segregation laws, prohibiting two people of the same sex from getting married is an example of invidious discrimination. It couldn't be further from the reality. People are born white, black, Hispanic, or belonging to a certain ethnic group. Nonetheless, there is no proof that people are born gay.

Actually, there are now major public health issues as a result of same-sex relationships becoming more common. Guys who have sexual relations with other guys have disproportionately high rates of HIV, STDs, and mental health issues, according to CDC data. These problems are caused by the inherent dangers of homosexual activity rather than by so-called discrimination. The medical evidence contradicts attempts to portray these worries as merely societal stigma.

This choice was unethical in addition to having legal issues. Justices Ginsburg and Kagan, who decided in Obergefell's favor, had conducted same-sex marriages before. Their failure to recuse themselves raises serious concerns about judicial bias. If they had, the decision would have probably been 4-3 against same-sex marriage, relegating the issue to the democratic process.

Redefining marriage has had serious societal repercussions in addition to constitutional issues. Both common law and natural law have long acknowledged marriage as a commitment between a single man and a single woman.

Following Obergefell, we have also witnessed a concerning decline in free speech and religious freedom. For merely declining to take part in same-sex weddings, business owners like bakers, florists, and photographers have been subject to crippling penalties and legal action.

Some would contend that we have more urgent issues and that this is a settled issue. However, all other policies—economic, legal, and cultural—rest on shifting sand if we permit the basis of marriage and family to deteriorate. A strong nation is built on strong families. We cannot prioritize America at the expense of American children.

You have the chance to stand up for the Constitution, natural law, and truth today, committee members. The mistake was Obergefell. It's time for states to take back their legitimate power, defend religious freedom, and reinstate marriage's natural order.

Support HCR 3013, please.

Glenn Robinson