

DON WILLETT ON LGBTQ RIGHTS

Highlights:

- Don Willett was anti-LGBTQ
 - Willett attended an event held by the Texas Restoration Project whose speakers were said to “gay-bash.”
 - Willett was in the majority in a court case that ruled city employees who were married in other states did not have any automatic rights to benefits in the state of Texas.

Willett Was Anti-LGBTQ

WILLETT ATTENDED AN EVENT HELD BY THE TEXAS RESTORATION PROJECT WHOSE SPEAKERS WERE SAID TO “GAY-BASH”

The Texas Restoration Project Sponsored An Event Attended By Hundreds Of Texas Ministers And Their Spouses

The Texas Restoration Project Sponsored An Event Attended By Hundreds Of Texas Ministers And Their Spouses. According to the Austin Chronicle, “Politics and religion worked together in mysterious ways last week, as several hundred Texas ministers and their spouses were treated to upscale banquet fare, an overnight stay at the Austin Hilton, musical entertainment, and a chance to hear Gov. Rick Perry reiterate his support for legislating morality [...] The Texas Restoration Project, a fledgling but well-oiled group of conservative religious leaders, sponsored the event, the second in a series of briefings planned throughout the state, but the TRP says only that ‘private funds’ make the events possible. The Texas Restoration Project does not appear to be registered as a nonprofit group or as a political action committee, which would be required to disclose campaign finance activity to the Texas Ethics Commission.” [Austin Chronicle, [9/2/05](#)]

The Texas Restoration Project Was Credited As Being “Instrumental In Passage Of The State Constitutional Amendment Banning Gay Marriage”

The Texas Restoration Project Was Credited As Being “Instrumental In Passage Of The State Constitutional Amendment Banning Gay Marriage.” According to My Plainview, “The Texas Restoration Project, which also was instrumental in passage of the state constitutional amendment banning gay marriage, at the time would not divulge the source of its money.” [My Plainview, [1/9/08](#)]

Willett Attended The Event Sponsored By The Texas Restoration Project

Willett Attended The Event. According to the Austin Chronicle, “Kelly Shackelford, who heads the Plano-based Free Market Foundation, may have stolen Perry's thunder in being the first to announce the governor's choice to fill the vacancy on the Texas Supreme Court – Don Willett, who was seated in the audience.” [Austin Chronicle, [9/2/05](#)]

Austin Chronicle: “Though The Audiotape Is Of Poor Quality, There Is No Mistaking The Fever-Pitched Gay-Bashing Theme Of Most Of The Speeches”

Austin Chronicle: “Though The Audiotape Is Of Poor Quality, There Is No Mistaking The Fever-Pitched Gay-Bashing Theme Of Most Of The Speeches.” According to the Austin Chronicle, “Though the audiotape is of poor quality, there is no mistaking the fever-pitched gay-bashing theme of most of the speeches.” [Austin Chronicle, [9/2/05](#)]

WILLETT JOINED THE MAJORITY IN RULING THAT CITY EMPLOYEES WHO WERE MARRIED IN OTHER STATES DID NOT HAVE ANY AUTOMATIC RIGHTS TO BENEFITS IN THE STATE OF TEXAS

Willett Ruled With The Majority In Pidgeon v. Turner

Willett Ruled With The Majority In Pidgeon v. Turner. According to the Leadership Conference on Civil and Human Rights, “Justice Willett was part of a Texas Supreme Court majority in Pidgeon v. Turner that held in June 2017 that city employees who were married in other states did not have any automatic rights to benefits, despite the U.S. Supreme Court’s 2015 holding in Obergefell v. Hodges.” [Leadership Conference on Civil and Human Rights, [11/14/17](#)]

The Texas Supreme Court Decided In Pidgeon v. Turner That Houston City Employees Who Were Married To Someone Of The Same Sex In Other States Did Not Have Any Automatic Rights To Benefits In The State Of Texas

The Texas Supreme Court Decided In Pidgeon v. Turner That Houston City Employees Who Were Married To Someone Of The Same Sex In Other States Did Not Have Any Automatic Rights To Benefits In The State Of Texas. According to Justia, “In 2013, the Mayor of Houston directed that same-sex spouses of employees who have been legally married in another jurisdiction be afforded the same benefits as spouses of a heterosexual marriage. Plaintiffs, Houston taxpayers and voters, filed suit against the City and its Mayor challenging the Mayor’s directive authorizing expenditures and the City’s provision of benefits pursuant to that directive. Specifically, Plaintiffs argued that the Mayor’s directive authorizing the expenditures violated Texas’s and the City’s defense of marriage acts. The trial court granted a temporary injunction prohibiting the Mayor from furnishing benefits to persons who were married in other jurisdictions to City employees of the same sex. While Defendants’ interlocutory appeal was pending, the United States Supreme Court held in Obergefell v. Hodges, ___ U.S. ___ (2015) that states may not exclude same sex couples from civil marriage on the same terms and conditions as opposite sex couples. The court of appeals subsequently reversed the temporary injunction and remanded the case. The Supreme Court reversed the court of appeals’ judgment, vacated the trial court’s orders and remanded, holding that the court’s opinion and judgment imposed greater restrictions on remand the Obergefell and this court’s precedent required.” [Justia, accessed [6/26/24](#)]