

I am opposed to the proposed amendment to the state constitution. With regards to taking away the previous policy regarding marriage, it is worth noting that the current constitutional definition of marriage is the one that has been in place around the globe for thousands of years. The family is the most basic unit of society, and there is no natural way for humanity to continue to reproduce apart from the union between a man and a woman. Additionally, studies have shown that children who grow up in a household with their married, biological parents are less likely to be abused, less likely to commit violent crimes, and more likely to succeed educationally than children in other types of family living situations. Beyond this, there is a moral and historical reason to support confining legal marriage to one man and one woman. The laws of our country have historically been based on Judeo-Christian morals. The Bible explains that marriage was designed to be between one man and one woman, a restriction put in place for the good of humanity. These things were recognized even recently by a majority of the voters of the state of Oregon, as this section of the constitution was only added in 2004, less than 20 years ago.

The other reason I am opposed to this amendment is because it greatly expands section 46. One way it does this is by inserting a prohibition on discrimination without well-defining what is meant by discrimination. This is concerning because the definition of discrimination has changed in recent times, and there is no guarantee that what is considered discrimination now won't be considered discrimination in the future, and vice-versa.

The proposed changes to section 46 include inserting "Pregnancy, pregnancy outcomes or related health decisions... Gender identity or related health decisions... Sexual orientation; or Gender" as part of the definition of sexual discrimination. Each of these warrants being examined individually.

First, I understand that it is currently against the law to discriminate against someone because of her current state of pregnancy or non-pregnancy, so it seems unnecessary to add this to the constitution. The addition of "pregnancy outcomes or related health decisions" appears to reference induced abortion. Induced abortion is already legal in the state of Oregon with no restrictions, an appalling thing when one considers that induced abortion is never medically necessary, and that Oregon is on the same page with communist China and North Korea in the area of induced abortion. Additionally, it is a tragedy that induced abortion is promoted and celebrated in a state where there are many families who would be excited to adopt the children of those who are unable, or unwilling, to raise children themselves.

With regards to gender identity and related health decisions, that obviously references transgenderism and the medical procedures performed to try to make someone appear to be the opposite gender rather than the gender they were born. This is not related to sex at all, but rather to how a person feels about their body and the interventions they are taking to satisfy their feelings. Part of the concern with this provision is that it would make worse the challenges currently being experienced in many areas of our state today. There are some places, such as prisons, homeless shelters, and women's shelters, that have sex-specific housing for the safety of the occupants. Some of them have been forced to house men who identify as women in their women's housing, endangering women and traumatizing some who have a history of sexual

abuse. To include this section in the proposed amendment would increase these incidents and further decrease the number of places women, especially those with a history of abuse, can feel safe.

Including sexual orientation in this section of the constitution would negatively impact organizations whose policies require hiring based on their religious beliefs. There have already been lawsuits where religious institutions were sued for refusing to hire, or for letting go, someone who refused to abide by the written statement of faith or conduct. To accuse these organizations of discriminating against someone based on their sexual orientation is unfair, because in these situations it would be a violation of their first amendment rights to practice their religious beliefs for them to employ that person.

Finally, including gender under this section is redundant, and therefore unnecessary. Historically, gender and sex have been synonymous, and dictionaries today still typically include the one word in the definition of the other.