



February 24, 2004

For Additional Information Contact: Neil Bradley, x6-9717

## President Bush Endorses Federal Marriage Amendment

This morning, President Bush endorsed a Constitutional Amendment to ensure that marriage in the United States would remain the union between one man and one woman and to ensure that legislatures, not courts, would have the right to define any other type of relationship.

The President clearly described H.J.Res. 56, introduced by Rep. Musgrave and currently cosponsored by 112 Members. Indeed, press reports already indicate that President Bush believes that the Musgrave text meets the principles he laid out:

“[White House press secretary Scott McClellan] said Bush believes that legislation for such an amendment, submitted by Rep. **Marilyn Musgrave** R-Colo., ‘meets his principles’ in protecting the ‘sanctity of marriage’ between men and women.” *Fox News Report, February 24, 2004*

H.J.Res 56 would amend the Constitution by adding the following Article of Amendment:

“Marriage in the United States shall consist only of the union of a man and a woman. Neither this Constitution or the constitution of any State, nor state or federal law, shall be construed to require that marital status or the legal incidents thereof be conferred upon unmarried couples or groups.”

A companion measure has been introduced in the Senate by Senator Allard.

A list of current cosponsors can be found by calling up H.J.Res. 56 on Thomas:

<http://thomas.loc.gov/bss/d108query.html>

Members who would like to cosponsor this amendment should have their staff contact John Headley with Rep. Musgrave at [john.headley@mail.house.gov](mailto:john.headley@mail.house.gov)

The Senate Republican Policy Committee has recently released several important reports regarding the assault on marriage by the Courts. Those studies can be found at:

<http://rpc.senate.gov/files/Feb1104Marriage2SD.pdf>

<http://rpc.senate.gov/files/CIVILsd090403.pdf>

Below is the text of the President's comments endorsing the Federal Marriage Amendment:

THE WHITE HOUSE

Office of the Press Secretary

---

For Immediate Release

February 24, 2004

REMARKS BY THE PRESIDENT

The Roosevelt Room

THE PRESIDENT: Good morning. Eight years ago, Congress passed, and President Clinton signed, the Defense of Marriage Act, which defined marriage for purposes of federal law as the legal union between one man and one woman as husband and wife.

The Act passed the House of Representatives by a vote of 342 to 67, and the Senate by a vote of 85 to 14. Those congressional votes and the passage of similar defensive marriage laws in 38 states express an overwhelming consensus in our country for protecting the institution of marriage.

In recent months, however, some activist judges and local officials have made an aggressive attempt to redefine marriage. In Massachusetts, four judges on the highest court have indicated they will order the issuance of marriage licenses to applicants of the same gender in May of this year. In San Francisco, city officials have issued thousands of marriage licenses to people of the same gender, contrary to the California family code. That code, which clearly defines marriage as the union of a man and a woman, was approved overwhelmingly by the voters of California. A county in New Mexico has also issued marriage licenses to applicants of the same gender. And unless action is taken, we can expect more arbitrary court decisions, more litigation, more defiance of the law by local officials, all of which adds to uncertainty.

After more than two centuries of American jurisprudence, and millennia of human experience, a few judges and local authorities are presuming to change the most fundamental

institution of civilization. Their actions have created confusion on an issue that requires clarity.

On a matter of such importance, the voice of the people must be heard. Activist courts have left the people with one recourse. If we are to prevent the meaning of marriage from being changed forever, our nation must enact a constitutional amendment to protect marriage in America. Decisive and democratic action is needed, because attempts to redefine marriage in a single state or city could have serious consequences throughout the country.

The Constitution says that full faith and credit shall be given in each state to the public acts and records and judicial proceedings of every other state. Those who want to change the meaning of marriage will claim that this provision requires all states and cities to recognize same-sex marriages performed anywhere in America. Congress attempted to address this problem in the Defense of Marriage Act, by declaring that no state must accept another state's definition of marriage. My administration will vigorously defend this act of Congress.

Yet there is no assurance that the Defense of Marriage Act will not, itself, be struck down by activist courts. In that event, every state would be forced to recognize any relationship that judges in Boston or officials in San Francisco choose to call a marriage. Furthermore, even if the Defense of Marriage Act is upheld, the law does not protect marriage within any state or city.

For all these reasons, the Defense of Marriage requires a constitutional amendment. An amendment to the Constitution is never to be undertaken lightly. The amendment process has addressed many serious matters of national concern. And the preservation of marriage rises to this level of national importance. The union of a man and woman is the most enduring human institution, honoring -- honored and encouraged in all cultures and by every religious faith. Ages of experience have taught humanity that the commitment of a husband and wife to love and to serve one another promotes the welfare of children and the stability of society.

Marriage cannot be severed from its cultural, religious and natural roots without weakening the good influence of society. Government, by recognizing and protecting marriage, serves the interests of all. Today I call upon the Congress to promptly pass, and to send to the states for ratification, an amendment

to our Constitution defining and protecting marriage as a union of man and woman as husband and wife. The amendment should fully protect marriage, while leaving the state legislatures free to make their own choices in defining legal arrangements other than marriage.

America is a free society, which limits the role of government in the lives of our citizens. This commitment of freedom, however, does not require the redefinition of one of our most basic social institutions. Our government should respect every person, and protect the institution of marriage. There is no contradiction between these responsibilities. We should also conduct this difficult debate in a manner worthy of our country, without bitterness or anger.

In all that lies ahead, let us match strong convictions with kindness and goodwill and decency.

Thank you very much.

END