

HB 6452, is entitled **AN ACT CONCERNING DISCRIMINATION**

I believe what we are discriminating or distinguishing here, today, (and what is truly at stake) is what is truly in the best interest & Common Good of our society, which will include what's taught in our public schools to our children and how a few want to impose their views upon the many. Should we protect & legitimize ALL gender identities and expressions just because some feel attracted that way, or should we rather uphold certain boundaries & norms that are state has *always* upheld, because it is in the best interest & common good of our society?

This bill would raise a cluster of various transsexual related behaviors, under the title of gender identity and expression, to a protected class. In effect, it would legitimize behavior in our society which many feel is intrinsically-disordered and contrary to the laws of nature. I don't think this is a slippery slope we want to go down. In essence, this proposed Bill seeks the constitutional protection of ALL gender identities and expressions (no matter how deviant) to having the same constitutional protection under the law as race, color, religion and national origin. Tell me, how is doing this serving the Common Good of the People of Connecticut? Is it rather not opening up Pandora's Box to an anything goes, gender identity and expression, in Connecticut? Is this truly in the best interest of our society, in the best interest of our children? How do alternative gender identities & expressions serve the Common Good of society, and thus, become fit for constitutional protection under the law? I don't dispute that certain members in our society struggle with homosexual tendencies, nor that these members should be treated with respect, but I do not see how this alternative lifestyle deserves constitutional protection (and seemingly being legitimized under our state laws). I don't think anyone here can dispute that the union of a man and a woman is for the Common Good of society, but where does the union of two men, or two women, serve our society's Common Good?

1. For one, the union of a man and a woman is natural, biologically life-producing and family forming for the Common Good of society, while the union of two men and two women is contrary to our biology and therefore cannot produce children.
2. The union of a man and a woman gives children the right to having a father AND a mother, while the union of two men and two women does not.
3. The union of a man and a woman brings the sexual complementarity of both the masculine and feminine traits that produce new life, build up a balanced society, enrich family life, and strengthen our children's own identity, while the union of two men and two women is naturally lacking either the masculine or the feminine in the lesbian or homosexual relationship.

Let me be clear, this Bill is seeking the constitutional protection (and therefore legitimization) of alternative lifestyles and ALL gender identities and expressions as "constitutionally protected classes". What would this practically mean?

- It means that your son or daughter could be exposed to teachers in their schools who on one day will be a man and the next day could decide to be a woman . . . and this would be protected.
- Under this bill your child could be forced to learn that their teacher, say Mr. Jones, has now become Mrs. Jones--and that this is perfectly normal.
- It would mean that court-ordered same-sex "marriage" is just the first step in a campaign to force children in our public schools to be exposed to "alternative lifestyles" even if their parents disapprove, (its already happened in Massachusetts, from Kindergarten on up).
- Above all, this legislation shows the hubris of those who see "gender" as something to be changed at will, of those who are trying to deconstruct the most basic of natural categories-- male and female.

(back)

The Webster dictionary defines *transsexual* as "having personal characteristics that transcend traditional gender boundaries and corresponding sexual norms." The key words here are "boundaries" and "norms". Boundaries are set up to protect a good in society, and are not meant to be broken. If it isn't broken, don't fix it. And norms are in place to protect that which is normal and in the best interest of the Common Good of all in society. The only "good" we need to protect & uphold today is the heterosexual identity and expression (which is under attack in CT) from which one man and one woman biologically produce NEW LIFE within marriage, children are born into families with biological parents, and children can be raised by both their father AND their mother. Same-sex "marriage" may have been imposed on the citizens of CT through the courts, but this issue is far from over, since we do not readily welcome the re-definition of Marriage & Family Life, of which Society has always been built up, and built upon, under the union of One man and one woman in the law since the foundation of this country and state. Thank you.

Mike Klinger
CT