

Stephen F. Cardone  
450 Erwin Street  
Trumbull, CT 06611

Judiciary Committee Hearing regarding HB-5925 March 17, 2008

My name is Steve Cardone and I live in Trumbull. I am married and have 3 children. I have come to testify against recognizing same sex marriages from other states via HB-5925.

First of all, my God commands me to love Him and to love other people. If a homosexual asked for my help or if I came across a homosexual person in danger, I would go by their side to protect them or help them. Period.

I say that as a foundation for saying this: I am opposed to same sex marriage, but it is not because I don't like homosexuals or think of them as anything but first class citizens. My opposition is one of common sense, not one of hatred.

1. Look around you. There are men and there are women. Go to the local maternity ward. Every minute of every day there are 2 types of people born – male and female. It is the most undeniable, indisputable, observable fact in the world that there is man and there is woman. The 2 sexes have been marrying for thousands of years before Connecticut became a state and before any government officially recognized it. By the 2 sexes mating and having children, we have the population that exists in the world today. Marriage between 1 man and 1 woman is the sustainable, natural model that pervades the world and it has a proven track record to work the best. Period. It is the only long-term sustainable, natural model that we have. The family unit resulting from same sex marriage does not truly sustain itself. Long term, if all of us entered into same sex marriage, we would be in trouble as a society whereas if all chose heterosexual marriage, there is a sustainability and “innate correctness” that is intuitive to us as humans. The test of long-term sustainability is a common sense test that should be applied to this situation.
2. By recognizing same sex marriage from another state, we in our state are one step closer to same sex marriage. We all know it, so let's come out and say it. If we recognize another state's same sex marriage, we are on our way to recognizing it here. The slippery slope argument in action. The slippery slope argument is valid. Once we lose our marriage standard by taking on that of another state, it will be difficult to stop us from the same definition as that other state. Once we accept same sex marriage, there is no way to stop every other group from wanting marriage. We all know that this could include all manner of marriage perversion that would turn the stomach of even the stoutest here today. Let's not discount the slippery slope. We live with standards of all sorts in a civil society. Think of our schools. My children must meet certain standards to move from one grade to the next. If they can't meet the standard, are they sub-par citizens? No, they just didn't meet the standard that we as a community have set for the good of everyone. Yale University has very high standards as to who gets into their school. Are they bigots for not accepting everyone? No. They have set a high standard, and people know it and deal with it. There are many other valid options for those that can't get into Yale. In our state, there are valid options for those who want a same sex union.

What is wrong with holding marriage between one man and one woman as a standard? What harm is it inflicting? You may say that the harm is to same sex couples being treated unequally. To that, I say that the burden of proof lies with same sex couples to prove what good they are doing society to be raised to the same level of standard as the accepted practice since the beginning of time. What cataclysmic benefit is being brought by same sex couples that would motivate us as a society and, yes, Connecticut as a state, to embark on a huge experiment like this?

Lastly, I would like a word about the hearing on same sex marriage that took place in April of 2007. I saw many segments of this on CT-N and via the web. I did not watch the whole thing. I felt that the hearing was very hostile toward those with opposed to same sex marriage and I implore you to avoid creating that same hostile environment today or in the future. Your constituents expect better and your role as a civic leader demands better. Thank you.