

**SJR7 and the proposed Federal Marriage Amendment (FMA)
A Comparison of Texts/Changes**

Before 2004 the second section of the proposed FMA said:

Neither this Constitution, nor 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*.

Note the close/exact parallels to the corresponding part of SJR7:

This Constitution or *any other Indiana law* may not be construed to require that marital status or the legal incidents of marriage be conferred upon *unmarried couples or groups*.

In mid-2004 the FMA proponents *changed* it to read:

Neither this Constitution, nor the constitution of any state, [*deletion here*] 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*.

The FMA change was NOT reflected in SJR7