



Western PA Freedom to Marry Coalition

Marriage Announcements

July-August, 1996

Volume 1 Issue 3

House Passes Anti-Marriage Legislation

State Legislature rushes ahead with anti-marriage amendment by 177-16 vote

On the last day of the legislative session before their summer recess, the Pennsylvania Legislature amended a Senate bill with anti-marriage language. The bill, SB434 makes it easier for grandparents to adopt their grandchildren, if such an adoption becomes necessary. Allen Egolf, sponsor of a bill currently being considered by the judiciary committee, proposed his anti-marriage bill as an amendment to the adoption bill. The amendment passed by a vote of 177-16.

Four Western Pennsylvania representatives voted against the amendment: Ivan Itkin, Tom Michlovich, Frank Pistella and Joseph Preston. Alan Kuchovich abstained from the vote, and Elaine Farmer and Herman Mihalich were absent. Other area representatives voted for the anti-marriage language.

Important Dates

- * Tuesday, **August 13** 7PM Monthly Meeting. Pat and Stacey's -- 1067 Flemington
- * Tuesday, **September 10**, 7PM Monthly meeting (TBA); Baehr v Mikke goes to trial in Hawaii and will be broadcast on Court TV
- * Sunday, **September 15**, 2PM Speaker's Bureau Training. Call 441-0356 to register or for information.
- * Wednesday, **September 25**, Rally for Marriage Rights in Harrisburg

Chris Young of Pennsylvania's League of Gay and Lesbian Voters recommends that constituents contact their Legislators to thank our supporters and explain their dissatisfaction with those who voted against equality in marriage rights. Your legislator's name and address can be found on the next page.

Analysis: The Legislature is not interested in making good law, they are interested only in gay bashing. The original anti-marriage bill is still pending in the Judiciary Committee where it has yet to receive a hearing or any consideration. Instead of following the normal legislative process, an amendment is rushed onto a related bill during the final hours before they recess. The debate on the amendment focused on gay and lesbian stereotypes, with Ron Gamble commenting that he's glad to be returning home to Oakdale, where men are men and women are women. The amendment passed by overwhelming numbers because of political fears related to this election-year hot-button issue.

In May, the Supreme Court ruled that the Federal Constitution requires states to have a rational basis for denying citizens of civil rights. Animosity toward a group was not a rational basis according to the Court. Apparently, the Pennsylvania Legislature was not listening.

House passes DOMA

(NGLTF) Washington, D.C. July 12, 1996....The National Gay and Lesbian Task Force (NGLTF) denounced today's House vote in support of the ill-named Defense of Marriage Act (DOMA); the vote was 342 in favor of DOMA and 67 opposed. This legislation is unnecessary, discriminatory and probably unconstitutional.

DOMA (1) attempts to give states the power to deny legal recognition to public acts, records, or proceedings of any other state regarding same-gender marriages that may, in the future, be legally sanctioned in another state - in apparent violation of the Full Faith and Credit Clause of the U.S. Constitution - and (2) tells the states that even if they choose to legalize same gender marriages within their own borders, couples considered legally married within their state will not be considered legally married by the federal government and, thus, will be denied all the federal rights and responsibilities now extended to heterosexual married couples.

The following statement from NGLTF on the House adoption of DOMA is attributable to its Executive Director, Melinda Paras:

"It is a sad day indeed when the House of Representatives can so easily vote in favor of legislation whose only goal is to pit its citizens against each other. By adopting this legislation, the House of Representatives is

continued

Your donation to the Western PA Freedom to Marry Coalition

helps us educate our community about the marriage for same-sex couples! Please help by sending donations to WPaFtMC, PO Box 81253, Pittsburgh PA 15217-4253. Donations are not tax deductible

Name: _____

Address: _____

City: _____, Pennsylvania Zip: _____

Phone: _____

___ Check if you would like more information about volunteer opportunities

Your Representatives and how to contact them

bold face indicates support for marriage rights; *italics* opposes; and, underline unknown or didn't vote.

Urge President Clinton to oppose and veto the Defense of Marriage Act

President William Clinton

The White House
1600 Pennsylvania Ave
Washington DC 20500
(202) 456-1414

Urge the Senators to oppose S1740, the Defense of Marriage Act

Senator Arlen Specter

530 Hart Senate Building
Washington DC 20510-4254
(202) 224-4254
(412) 644-3400

Senator Rick Santorum

120 Russell Building
Washington DC 20510-3804
(202) 224-6324
(412) 562-0533

How they voted on H.R. 3396, the Defense of Marriage Act

Washington DC 20515
Pittsburgh: **Rep. William Coyne**
2455 Rayburn House Office Bldg

Penn Hills: *Rep. Michael Doyle*
1218 Longworth House Office Bldg

North Huntingdon: *Rep. Ron Klink*
125 Cannon House Office Bldg

Fayette: *Rep. Frank Mascara*
1531 Longworth House Office Bldg

HOW THEY VOTED!

Write your representative and let them know what you think of their vote!!

c/o House Box 202020
Harrisburg PA 17120-2020

Pittsburgh Area Legislators:

Ronald Cowell, Wilkinsburg

Pat Carone, Cranberry

Anthony DeLuca, Penn Hills

Frank Dermody, Cheswick

Greg Fajt, Mt Lebanon

Elaine Farmer, Richland

Ron Gamble, Oakdale

Frank Gigliotti, South Side

Jeffrey Habay, Glenshaw

Ivan Itkin, Squirrel Hill

Ralph Kaiser, Whitehall

Alan Kukovich, North Huntingdon

Susan Laughlin, NW Allegheny

David Levdansky, Elizabeth

David Mayernick, Ross Twp

Thomas Michlovich, Bradock

Herman Mihalich, Monesson

Richard Olasz, West Mifflin

Joseph Petrarca, Vandergrift

Frank Pistella, Bloomfield

Joe Preston, East Liberty

Harry Readshaw, Baldwin

William Robinson, Oakland

Jess Stairs, Acme

Thomas Tangretti, Greensburg

Fred Trello, Stowe

Terry Van Horne, Arnold

Don Walko, North Side

Urge your state senator to oppose the House version of SB434.

c/o Senate Post Office, Main Capitol, Harrisburg PA 17120

Pittsburgh Area Legislators:

Gibson Armstrong, Lancaster

Albert Belan, West Mifflin

Leonard Bodack, Wilkinsburg

Jay Costa Jr, East End/Homestead

Michael Fisher, South Hills

Mellisa Hart, North Hills

Richard Kasunic, Dunbar

Gerald LaValle, Rochester

Eugene Porterfield, Greensburg

Robert Robbins, Greenville

Tim Shaffer, Butler

Patrick Stapleton, Indiana

Barry Stout, Eighty Four

Jack Wagner, Pittsburgh

NGLTF STATEMENT ON DOMA

caving in to the emotional arguments raised by Right-wing extremists, for whom DOMA stands as the centerpiece of their 1996 political agenda. These extremists seek to isolate and demonize the gay, lesbian, bisexual and transgendered communities and are using the marriage issue toward that end.

"DOMA is bogus legislation. It neither strengthens American families nor marriages between men and women. Instead, it draws a circle around gays, lesbians, bisexuals and transgendered individuals and proclaims that our families do not deserve recognition. In the hands of the Right-wing political extremists "family" serves as both a symbol and a weapon: a symbol of an imaginary past when everything was fine, and a weapon to divide society into good people and bad, the moral and the immoral, the productive citizen and the social parasite.

"Gay, lesbian, bisexual and transgender family issues are here to stay because they speak to the aspirations of same-gender couples, just as they do for all committed couples. Most importantly, however, they reflect the real circumstances of our lives. Passage of DOMA will not change this and right-wing extremists know that. This is why DOMA is just one piece of their larger agenda to attack and undermine millions of American families, including gay and lesbian families, who do not meet the narrow definition of family put forth by a small group of political extremists.

"Unfortunately the majority of the House of Representatives was not willing to stand up for the principles for which this country stands: tolerance, compassion and fairness. Instead, they fell into the trap set by the political extremists and their supporters in Congress. These extremists raised a false issue - same gender marriage, which

is NOT legal in any state - in order to scare elected officials into endorsing their election year agenda. And, the majority of Representatives were not courageous enough to stand up and be counted in the fight against discrimination and intolerance, as their counterparts were in 17 states where this same issue was considered - - and defeated.

"We will not stand by silently and be used as scapegoats in this election year."

Unitarian Universalist Resolution Supporting Marriage Rights

This resolution was introduced by Mike Drayton and adopted by the General Assembly of the Unitarian Universalist Ministries in June.

RESOLUTION OF IMMEDIATE WITNESS In Support Of the Right to Marry For Same-Sex Couples

BECAUSE Unitarian Universalists affirm the inherent worth and dignity of every person; and

BECAUSE marriage is held in honor among the blessings of life; and

WHEREAS many states, the Congress, and the President of the United States are acting to void the recognition of same-sex marriages and to deny "full faith and credit" to such marriages formalized in Hawaii or any other state;

WHEREAS debate about extending legally recognized marriage to same-sex couples has focused on the objections of certain religious communities, while the Unitarian Universalist Association has adopted numerous resolutions over the last twenty-six years supporting equal rights for gay, lesbian, bisexual, and transgendered persons, including support for Ceremonies of Union between members of the same sex; and

THANK YOU

A very special Thank You to COPA (Couple's of the Pittsburgh Area) for their donation to get this coalition started

Thanks to Liz Schooley for designing and building our beautiful banner. Her time and effort is greatly appreciated, and we will be using the banner at all our events.

Thanks to Donny Thinnes and the Tavern Guild for supporting the WPafTMC during the July 7 boat ride. Patty and Stacey were able to get the word out to many people on this cruise of Pittsburgh's three rivers.

Thanks to Scott Noxon from Pittsburgh's Eagle for his donation.

Thanks to everyone else we forgot for all your time and effort working toward the cause of the freedom to marry.

WHEREAS the Unitarian Universalists Association Board of Trustees and the Unitarian Universalists Ministers Association have voted their support for the right to marry for same-sex couples;

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that the 1996 General Assembly of the Unitarian Universalist Association adopts a position of support of legal recognition for marriage between members of the same sex;

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the 1996 General Assembly urges the Unitarian Universalist Association to make this position known through the media; and

BE IT FINALLY RESOLVED that 1996 General Assembly of the Unitarian Universalist Association urges the member congregations to proclaim the worth marriage between any two committed persons, and to make this position known in their home communities. *Adopted June 25, 1996*

Copyright © 1996
Western Pa Freedom to Marry Coalition.
PO Box 81253
Pittsburgh PA 15217-4253
(412) 362-4685.
<http://www.cs.cmu.edu/afs/cs/user/scotts/wpaf2mc>
Edited by Scott Safier

Congressional Debate on DOMA

The text below is a brief excerpt from the hundred pages of debate that was recorded in the House of Representatives on July 11 and 12. Supporters of marriage rights are in **bold** and those opposed are in *italics*.

Mr. MOAKLEY: Mr. Speaker, this is a very difficult, very emotional issue and, my personal opinions aside, I do not believe it belongs on the floor of the House of Representatives today.

This issue makes a tremendous amount of people extremely uncomfortable; it divides our country when we should be brought together; and frankly, it appears to be a political attempt to sling arrows at President Clinton.

Mr. McINNIS. The gentleman from Massachusetts says that this Protection of Marriage Act is not what this country wants. I take issue with that. I think this is exactly what this country wants. This country is demanding that the tradition of marriage be upheld. What this country does not want is for one State out of 50 States, that is, specifically the State of Hawaii, to be able to mandate its wishes upon every other State in the Union.

Mrs. SCHROEDER. I want to say I think that this bill and bringing it up today is an absolute outrage. If my colleagues think there is not enough hate and polarization in America, then they are going to love this bill because this just trying to throw some more gasoline on political fires people are trying to light this year, and that is not what we need. The State of Hawaii is years away from taking final action. Meanwhile the gentleman from Massachusetts is right: We cannot drink the water in the capital city of this great Nation.

So we got to deal today with something that might, might, happen years from now, but we cannot deal with the water issue today? Now, something is wrong with that.

We are also saying what this bill basically says is that there is a tremendous threat to marriage if two people of the same sex stand up and vow commitment to each other, that if they do that, then my marriage is being threatened. I do not think so. I belong in the marriage hall of fame. I have been married for 34 years. I have never felt threatened by that issue.

In over 200 years this Congress has never gotten into the definition of marriage because we have left it to the States. What we are saying today is even if States vote unanimously to allow this type of marriage, the Federal Government will not recognize it. This is unique, this is different, and I really am troubled by that.

Mr. Frank of Massachusetts: This is the most preposterous assertion of all, that marriage is under attack. I have asked and I have asked and I have asked and I guess I will die, I hope many years from now, unanswered: How does the fact that I love another man and live in a committed relationship with him threaten your marriage? Are your relations with your spouses of such fragility that the fact that I have a committed, loving relationship with another man jeopardizes them? What is attacking you? You have an emotional commitment to another man or another woman. You want to live with that person. You want to commit yourselves legally.

I say I do not share that commitment. I do not know why. That is how I was born. That is how I grew up. I find that kind of satisfaction in committing myself and being responsible for another human being who happens to be a man, and this threatens you? My God, what do you do when the lights go out, sit with the covers over your head? Are you that timid? Are you that frightened?

I will yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma if he will tell me what threatens his marriage.

Mr. LARGENT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. LARGENT. Absolutely. I would just submit, Mr. Speaker, that the relationship of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. Frank] with another man does not threaten my marriage whatsoever, my marriage of 21 years with the same woman.

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, whose marriage does it threaten?

Mr. LARGENT. It threatens the institution of marriage the gentleman is trying to re-define.

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. It does not threaten the gentleman's marriage. It does not threaten anybody's marriage. It

threatens the institution of marriage; that argument ought to be made by someone in an institution because it has no logical basis whatsoever.

Mr. CANADY of Florida: It appears that gay rights lawyers are soon likely to win the right for homosexuals to marry in Hawaii, and that they will attempt to 'nationalize' that anticipated victory under force of the Full Faith and Credit Clause of the U.S. Constitution. I do not believe that other States would necessarily be required, under a proper interpretation of that Clause and the 'public policy' exception to it, to give effect to a Hawaiian same-sex marriage license.

But here is the situation we confront: Gay rights lawyers have made plain their intention to invoke the Full Faith and Credit Clause to persuade judges in the other 49 States to ignore the public policy of those States and to recognize a Hawaiian same-sex marriage license. This strategy is no secret; it is well documented. I would hope that judges would reject this strategy. But we all know that some courts will go the other way. That explains why, as we learned at our hearing, over 30 States are busily trying to enact legislation that will assist their efforts to fend off the impending assault on their marriage laws. There is, in short, disquiet in the States over how this legal scenario will play out.

The strategy the gay rights groups are pursuing is profoundly undemocratic, and it is surely an abuse of the Full Faith and Credit Clause. Indeed, I cannot imagine a more appropriate occasion for invoking our constitutional authority to define the States' obligations under the Full Faith and Credit Clause. As Representative Torrance Tom from Hawaii testified before the Subcommittee: 'If inaction by the Congress runs the risk that a single Judge in Hawaii may re-define the scope of legislation throughout the other forty-nine states, [then] failure to act is a dereliction of the responsibilities [we] were invested with by the voters.'

Mr. KENNEDY of Rhode Island. Mr. Chairman, this debate really is about a simple question, a question of equal rights. Marriage is a basic right. It is a basic human right. Love and commitment are essential pillars of marriage. They are quali-

Congressional Debate Continued...

ties that do not discriminate on account of gender. It is not right for this Congress to step in and to intrude into the private relationships and the most personal decisions of our constituencies. Love and commitment can exist between a man and a woman and it can and does exist between men and between women.

Proponents of this curiously titled bill say that we need legislation to protect the family. Nothing could be further from the truth. Families are not threatened when two adults who love each other make a lifelong commitment to one another. Families will not fall apart if gay men and women are allowed to marry, if they are allowed the same basic legal right to marry that is already enjoyed by heterosexuals.

This is not about defending marriage. It is about finding an enemy. It is not about marital union. It is about disunion, about dividing one group of Americans against another. This bill is unconstitutional, this bill is unfair, and the spirit behind this bill further fans the flames of prejudice and bigotry that this 104th Congress has done a pretty good job at fanning thus far.

Ms. PELOSI. Let me tell you about two very special constituents of mine who have lived together for over 25 years. Their commitment, their love and their happiness are a source of strength to all who know them. Their relationship—I hold this up so you can all see—is not a threat to anyone's marriage. This is Phyllis Lyons and Dell Martin. Phyllis has two grandchildren. Phyllis and Dell have been leaders in our community and command the respect of all who know them. Why should they not be able to share each other's health and bereavement benefits? Why should they not be able to visit each other in the hospital in case of accident or in case of illness? I know people will say, you can sign up in advance and tell the doctor before you go in for the operation. That does not happen is you are in an accident. Why should they not be able to share a financial relationship inheritance, immigration, the list goes on and on.

Mr. LARGENT. Homosexuals have the same rights as I do. They have the ability to marry right now, today. However, when they get married, they must marry a person of the opposite sex, the same as me.

That is the same right that I have. Now, I would also say that, just like a homosexual, I do not have the right to marry somebody of the same sex. It is the same for them as it is for me. There is no disparate between this rights issue.

Further, I would say that marriage is not a right in the first place. It is a privilege. That really brings me to another subject, when we talk about this bill defining for Federal purposes what constitutes a marriage, one man and one woman. There is, as I said, a radical element, a homosexual agenda that wants to redefine what marriage is. They want to say that a marriage not only is one man and one woman but it is two men or it is two women.

Mr. LEWIS of Georgia. Let me say to the gentleman that when I was growing up in the south during the 1940s and the 1950s, the great majority of the people in that region believed that black people should not be able to enter places of public accommodation, and they felt that black people should not be able to register to vote, and many people felt that was right but that was wrong. I think as politicians, as elected officials, we should not only follow but we must lead, lead our districts, not put our fingers into the wind to see which way the air is blowing but be leaders.

Mr. Chairman, this is a mean bill. It is cruel. This bill seeks to divide our nation, turn Americans against Americans, sew the seeds of fear, hatred and intolerance. Let us remember the Preamble of the Declaration of Independence: We hold these truths self-evident that all people are endowed by their creator with certain inalienable rights. Among these are life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness.

This bill is a slap in the face of the Declaration of Independence. It denies gay men and women the right to liberty and the pursuit of happiness. Marriage is a basic human right. You cannot tell people they cannot fall in love. Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr. used to say when people talked about interracial marriage and I quote, 'Races do not fall in love and get married. Individuals fall in love and get married.'

Why do you not want your fellow men and women, your fellow Americans to be happy? Why do you attack them? Why do you want to destroy the love they hold in their hearts? Why do you want to crush their hopes, their dreams, their longings, their aspirations?

We are talking about human beings, people like you, people who want to get married, buy a house, and spend their lives with the one they love. They have done no wrong.

I will not turn my back on another American. I will not oppress my fellow human being. I have fought too hard and too long against discrimination based on race and color not to stand up against discrimination based on sexual orientation.

Mr. Chairman, I have know racism. I have known bigotry. This bill stinks of the same fear, hatred and intolerance. It should not be called the Defense of Marriage Act. It should be called the defense of mean-spirited bigots act.

I urge my colleagues to oppose this bill, to have the courage to do what is right. This bill appeals to our worst fears and emotions. It encourages hatred of our fellow Americans for political advantage. Every word, every purpose, every message is wrong. It is not the right thing to do, to divide Americans. We are moving toward the 21st century. Let us come together and create one nation, one people, one family, one house, the American house, the American family, the American nation.

Mr. ABERCROMBIE. Historically, States have the primary authority to regulate marriage based upon the 10th amendment of the Constitution. The Supreme Court has supported this constitutional right. In *Aukenbrandt versus Richards*, 1992, the Court rules that 'without exception, domestic relations has been a matter of state, not federal concern and control since the founding of the Republic.'

It is also interesting to note that questions concerning the validity of an out-of-state marriage are generally resolved without reference to the 'full faith and credit' clause of the U.S. Constitution. States traditionally recognize out-of-state marriages unless they have statutes prohibiting such a union. For example, polygamy is illegal in all States, and in most states certain incestuous marriages are illegal too. States can declare an out-of-state marriage void if it is against the state's public policy or if entered into with the intent to evade the law of the State.

Congress has invoked the 'full faith and credit' clause only five times since the founding of the Republic. The three most recent instances have required each State to give child custody, child support, and

Congressional Debate Continued...

protection orders of other States the same faith and credit it gives its own such orders. The Defense of Marriage Act differs in one critical aspect from the legislative enactment passed by the Congress under it full faith and credit power: H.R. 3396 permits sister States to give no effect to the laws of other States.

This is a novel and unconstitutional interpretation of the clause. According to a leading constitutional law scholar, Laurence H. Tribe, 'the Constitution delegates to the United States no power to create categorical exceptions to the Full Faith and Credit Clause.'

Mr. STUDDS. Mr. Chairman, earlier this morning, I think somewhere around a quarter of two, I observed with some sadness that there was an imbalance between the two aisles in this debate.

Words have been thrown around. Although they have not been taken down or requested to be taken down, today I wrote down so far promiscuity, perversion, hedonism, narcissism, well, that may be in this House, depravity and sin. All, I regret to say, from the same side of the aisle.

I also thought for a moment I was in some kind of a revival meeting and was about to be preached at from Leviticus. The particular chapter which was implicitly cited from Leviticus is not very popular in my district because the next verse forbids the eating of shellfish, and I would caution people in citing that.

Although I have no doubt, I do not think anybody in this room has any doubt, about the outcome of the vote today, I have equally no doubt about the final resolution of this chapter. We are going to prevail, Mr. Chairman. And we are going to prevail just as every other component of the civil rights movement in this country has prevailed. In the words of the great Dr. King, as echoed so eloquently last night by the distinguished gentleman from Georgia, this country is going to rise up and live out the true meaning of its creed.

There is nothing any of us can do today to stop that. We can embrace it warmly, as some of us do; we can resist it bitterly, as some of us do; but there is no power on earth that can stop it.

Mr. GUNDERSON. Mr. Chairman, I am a traditionalist. My entire life's environment and upbringing have created within

me a respect for traditional values. Theology interprets marriage as a union between one man and one woman. Random House Dictionary defines marriage as a union between man and woman.

Accordingly, tho I am a gay man in a 13-year relationship, I was fully prepared to reach out to my colleagues in reaffirming the institution of marriage as we know and understand it. Throughout these discussions, I have suggested to my gay and lesbian friends that we should not resort to some semantic debate about the word 'marriage.'

As this issue evolved, I went to Chairman Hyde and to Speaker Gingrich. I said to them, 'I am willing to join with you in reaffirming the definition of marriage, tho I am a gay man. All I ask in return is that you remove the 'meanness, prejudice, and hatred' surrounding this issue.'

I went further.

The debate fails to recognize the painful reality thrown on many innocent people who happen to be in long-term relationships outside of marriage. For example, if I should get sick, should not my partner have automatic visitation rights? Should he not have automatic consultation rights with the attending physician? I think most would say 'yes.' But I have letters from many people in my office indicating that from cancer to AIDS, they have been denied this basic right.

Second, a close friend of ours recently lost his partner of 16 years to AIDS. While the hospital in Washington respected the relationship and gave him visitation—something worse happened after his partner's death. The funeral home would not allow him to sign any of the documents or arrangement forms.

Third, I have a 13-year relationship with my partner. Yet, while some of my congressional colleagues are in their second or third marriage—their spouse receives the benefits of their health insurance, and automatically receives their survivor benefits should that occur. Why should they be given these benefits, when my partner—in a relationship much longer than theirs—is denied the same?

Many corporations would like to extend such benefits to the domestic partners of their employees. The problem is that there is no agreement on a civil process to recognize legitimate long-term relationships from those who would simply seek to fraud

the system.

These are just some of the basic questions that our society must and should ask. If we seek civility, mutual respect, and the promotion of long-term relationships—in marriage or otherwise—then we have no choice.

Mr. HYDE. Mr. Chairman, I can tell you this is one of the most uncomfortable issues I can think of to debate. It is something I really shrink from because there is no gentle easy way, if we are to be honest and candid, to discuss the objections to same-sex marriage, the disapprobation of homosexual conduct, without offending and affronting an ever-widening group of people who have come to accept homosexual conduct.

The gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. Studds] said that the unfinished business of the civil rights movement is homosexual acceptability. There is no power on Earth to stop it. Maybe and maybe not. He has something, when I look around and see the entertainment stars in our country are Michael Johnson and Madonna, he could be right. The homosexual movement has been very successful in intimidating the psychiatric profession. Now people who object to sodomy, to two men penetrating each other are homophobic. They have the phobia, not the people doing this act. That is a magnificent accomplishment for public relations.

Let us talk about this bill. This is the most delicate and limited measure that Congress could possibly produce on this subject. First of all, as to defining marriage in the Federal code, who else should define it except this Congress, the Federal legislature. Not the courts, the courts are usurping legislative functions. It is appropriate that Congress define marriage. You may not like the definition the majority of us want, but most people do not approve of homosexual conduct. They do not approve of incest. They do not approve of polygamy, and they express their disapprobation through the law. It is that simple. It is not mean spirited. It is not bigoted. It is the way it is, the only way possible to express this disapprobation.

Now, two men loving each other does not hurt anybody else's marriage, but it demeans, it lowers the concept of marriage by making it something that it should not be and is not, celebrating conduct that is not approved by the majority of the people.