

in the hospital, who inherits their property, and who is granted a power of attorney. The amendment simply protects the definition of marriage in our state constitution.



- **Marriage is about love. Why do you want to deny two mature adults in a loving, committed relationship the right to marry one another?**

Response: Society's fundamental interest in marriage is providing the optimal environment for raising children, which is with a mother and a father—not affirming two people's commitment to one another. There are a lot of committed, loving relationships other than homosexual unions, e.g., two siblings, parent and children, grandchild and grandparent, longtime friends. These relationships don't constitute a marriage any more than gay or lesbian unions do. There is a unique benefit provided to society by marriage, which the state has an interest in protecting and promoting.

- **What right do you have to impose your religious views of marriage on the rest of society?**

Response: Marriage is both a religious

and social institution. The importance and benefits of marriage to children, men, and women is true for all people, religious or not. Implying that people of faith can't bring their deeply held convictions into the public square is a denial of free speech and a form of religious bigotry. That would be like telling Martin Luther King not to speak out on civil rights issues because he was motivated by his religious convictions.

- **If the state's primary interest in marriage is procreation and raising of children, why do we then allow infertile or elderly heterosexual couples to marry?**

Response: First, sterile or elderly couples can still be parents through adoption and foster care. Second, childless married couples affirm marriage by modeling the man-woman relationship to others in society. And third, though sterile couples may be the exception to the rule, they do not conflict with the fundamental definition of marriage that includes a man and a woman. Same-sex unions are not only inherently sterile but guarantee that either a mother or a father is absent.



Prepared and paid for by
The Minnesota Family Council
Marriage Protection Fund,
2855 Anthony Lane South, Suite 150,
Minneapolis, MN 55418,
in support of the
Minnesota Marriage Protection Amendment.

© Copyright 2011
Minnesota Family Council

Answering Objections to the Minnesota Marriage Protection Amendment



Common Objections to the Marriage Protection Amendment

- **How would allowing gay and lesbian couples to marry harm anyone's marriage?**

Response: Nobody claims it's going to harm anyone's marriage. What it will do is radically redefine the institution of marriage, and that will impact all of society. It's not about allowing a handful of gay couples to marry, but rather imposing on all of society a genderless definition of marriage. This new definition of marriage will be imposed on businesses, schools, adoption and foster care providers, and religious organizations, just to name a few. The "how will it harm your marriage" question is a red herring used to deflect attention away from the enormous impact redefining marriage will have on all of society.

- **We don't need the amendment. Minnesota's marriage laws are strong and therefore make a constitutional amendment unnecessary.**

Response: Any state law can be struck down by any state judge on constitutional grounds. It doesn't matter how "strong" a law is. Numerous states have seen their marriage laws ruled unconstitutional by state judges, and Minnesota's marriage law is currently facing a court challenge. The only way to ensure that judges don't overstep their bounds is a state constitutional amendment.

The institution of marriage is also vulnerable in our legislative process. During the 2010 legislative session, five bills seeking to

redefine marriage received hearings in the Minnesota Legislature.

- **Why do you want to deny marriage equality to gays and lesbians?**

Response: The term "marriage equality" presumes a redefinition of marriage. Marriage, however, has always been the union of a man and a woman for good reason. It's the optimal environment for raising children and recognizes the unique, complementary relationship of a man and a woman. Marriage between a man and a woman is given special status and recognition in society because of the enormous importance it plays in society.

- **Adopting a constitutional amendment on marriage would write discrimination into our state constitution. The constitution is for expanding people's rights, not limiting them.**

Response: Traditional marriage does not discriminate against persons based on their sexual orientation. Nobody is asked what their sexual orientation is before they are granted a marriage license. What advocates of same-sex "marriage" seek is a fundamental redefinition of marriage, not access to marriage. The constitution protects fundamental rights of individuals. There is no institution more fundamental to the well-being of society than the institution of marriage. And marriage in turn protects the right of children to be raised by their mother and father.

- **A marriage amendment doesn't belong in the Minnesota Constitution. It's a moral issue.**

Response: The Constitution is a legitimate place for protecting fundamental concerns of people. The Minnesota Constitution says that the object of government is the "security,



benefit and protection of the people in whom all political power is inherent, together with the right to alter, modify or reform government whenever the public good may require it." The institution of marriage provides critical protection to children, wives, and husbands. It's responsible and even prudent to protect the "public good" of marriage in our Minnesota Constitution.

- **Opposition to gay and lesbian couples marrying is bigotry, just like laws that banned inter-racial marriage.**

Response: Comparing racial discrimination to same-sex "marriage" is a faulty analogy at best. Bans on inter-racial marriage were anti-marriage because they artificially kept men and women apart because of their skin color, while attempts to redefine marriage are anti-marriage, because they eliminate the very essence of the man-and-woman union.

- **Why do you want to take away rights and benefits from gays and lesbians?**

Response: The Minnesota Marriage Amendment would deny no rights or benefits that homosexual persons currently enjoy. The amendment maintains the status quo regarding marriage in Minnesota. Individuals will still have the right to decide who visits them