

The San Francisco honeymoon is over

The Campanil: Mills College

May 25, 2020 Monday

University Wire

Copyright 2020 UWIRE via U-Wire All Rights Reserved

Section: NEWS; Pg. 1

Length: 413 words

Byline: Tracy Clark-Flory

Body

The California Supreme Court ordered San Francisco's county clerk to immediately halt same-sex marriages on March 11.

Following the court's decision, more than 200 protesters marched from the Castro to the California Supreme Court and at least six same-sex couples filed a lawsuit against the state.

On Thursday of last week, state Attorney General Bill Lockyer stated that neither Newsom nor the city clerk "have the power to determine the constitutionality of state statutes, nor do they have the power to enact a new system of marriage in California."

The court plans to rule this summer on whether Mayor Gavin Newsom had the right to go against **Prop. 22**, a law restricting same-sex marriage. The state's Supreme Court refused requests from the city's lawyers to address whether California's law prohibiting same-sex marriage is constitutional.

The court's ruling, which followed Lockyer's push for a stay, does not invalidate the 4,037 marriages performed since Feb. 12. However, if the court rules against Newsom's actions, they will be nullified.

"They're definitely not going to legalize it for a long time," said Cameron Holly, sophomore. "There will be many other appeals

The San Francisco honeymoon is over

but [the marriages in San Francisco] were a good break. It stirred things up that needed to be stirred."

Meanwhile, the Senate Judiciary Committee began hearings on March 23 on a proposed constitutional amendment banning same-sex marriage. The proposal was rephrased, March 22, by removing a reference to state and federal law. The revised section of the amendment reads, "Neither this Constitution, nor the Constitution of any State, shall be construed to require that marriage or the legal incidents thereof be conferred upon any union other than the union of a man and a woman."

"Numerous critics have propounded the false notion that we have far greater restrictions in mind and it is my hope that our technical changes will serve to clear the air of this charge," said Sen. Wayne Allard, R-Colo., a sponsor of the amendment. "The policy goal has been and will continue to be to define and preserve the historic and cultural definition of marriage, while leaving other questions to the respective state legislatures."

Christopher E. Anders, an American Civil Liberties Union Legislative Counsel, called the revision of the proposal, "a desperate political move."

"The sponsors of the amendment realized that they did not even have a simple fifty percent majority, much less a two-thirds majority in either house of Congress," said Anders.

Load-Date: May 25, 2020