



Christian Coalition of Maine

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR
Paul Volle

All that is needed for evil to triumph is for good men to do nothing. - Sir Edmund Burke

Public Hearing on L.D. 2239, *An Act to Ensure Civil Rights and Prevent Discrimination*, February 16, 2000, Augusta Armory

(Commonly Known as *Special Rights for Homosexuals*)

Good morning honorable ladies and gentlemen of the of the Judiciary Committee. I am Paul A. Volle of Westbrook, Maine in Cumberland County. I am also the Executive Director of the Christian Coalition of Maine representing constituents in each one of your respective districts.

I am here to speak in opposition to this legislation. You see before you eight boxes containing over 8,000 petitions, representing over 65,000 signatures, many of them from each one of your districts. These signatures were gathered in ninety days over the summer of 1997, for the purpose of placing a People's Veto of L.D. 1116 *An Act to Prevent Discrimination* on the ballot. L.D. 1116 was in fact overturned by the people on February 10, 1998, just two years ago this month.

The people of Maine have spoken on this issue! If those who support L.D. 2239 want this law, let them do the honorable thing, by hitting the streets and gathering the appropriate number of signatures to place it on the ballot.

I submit to you, that until these supporters can put before you a sufficient number of valid signatures to place this issue on the ballot again, it does not deserve to be either placed into law or placed on the ballot.

The only real difference between the referendum voted on in 1998 and this year's proposed referendum is that, in 1997, the people of Maine went through the hard work of collecting over 65,000 signatures to get a People's Veto referendum on the ballot. This year, the supporters of this proposed law want the legislature to hand a referendum to them on a silver platter without their having to do the hard work of the petitioning process.

In a joint press release on Tuesday, January 4th of this year Marc R. Mutty, spokesperson for the Catholic Diocese stated, "The new draft is a bill the Diocese considers a good compromise that addresses the long standing concerns of the church..." Well this so called compromise is a phony compromise, because it does not change the net result of the new bill, not one bit. It still discriminates against the people of faith sitting in the pews each Sunday. The same people the Diocese is supposed to be leading and protecting, is selling out their religious freedoms.

If this bill is not conferring special rights to a small percentage of people in Maine, why is there not mountains of base line empirical data that this group has been shown to be chronically and intractably damaged or disadvantaged in the area of employment, housing, lending, public accommodations, and education, among others?

In all other classes of civil rights protection it has been demonstrated that there is an inherent trait and that it is not changeable. This is not the case with homosexuality.

For these reasons and many others too numerable to mention at this time I urge you to vote "Ought Not To Pass!"

Thank you for your time and attention.

Christian Coalition of Maine, Inc., P.O. Box 517, Westbrook, Maine 04092

Phone (207) 854-0080 • Fax (207) 854-0084 • Email: ccme@ccofme.org • Website: www.ccofme.org



THE CHRISTIAN CIVIC LEAGUE of Maine

Bringing a Biblical Perspective to the Dialogue Over Public Policy

Statement regarding homosexual rights by Michael S. Heath, executive director of the Christian Civic League of Maine on Wednesday, February 16, 2000 at 9:00 a.m. at the Augusta Armory before the Maine Legislature's Joint Committee on Judiciary.

Chairman Thompson, Chairman Longley, distinguished members of the Judiciary committee, I am Michael Heath, executive director of the Christian Civic League of Maine. I stand today on behalf of our staff, board and statewide membership of christians and churches to respectfully urge you to defeat the amended version of L.D. 2239.

In my few minutes this morning I will comment on three issues: its inadequacy, its direction and its intention.

May I preface my brief remarks by asserting that we prayerfully appear before you today. The Bible teaches homosexuality is a moral evil. People who choose this lifestyle may not be evil, but the sin itself is vexing to us. We reluctantly discuss it publicly. We feel we must because of the profound consequences that accrue to our families, state and nation if we don't.

Two and one half years ago catholics in Maine invited the Legislature to amend the homosexual rights measure that was eventually passed by that Legislature and vetoed by the people in a popular vote on February 10, 1998. Their seven amendments rightfully articulated concerns over exempting religious organizations, an individual's right of conscience, the teaching of homosexuality in our schools, youth organizations like the Boy Scouts, adoption, domestic partner benefits and affirmative action. We want to observe that this version of the bill appears to address a significant minority of these legitimate concerns.

Secondly, we believe that this advance in rights for individuals based on their sexual practices will lead quickly to more public discussion about homosexual marriage, domestic partner benefits, widespread adoption rights and the affirmation of homosexuality as morally normal, and perhaps inevitable for some, in our schools. Turn your eyes westward to Vermont to see where we are headed — homosexual marriage. We prefer to draw the line here.

Lastly, I personally joined many of your constituents who worked hard over a three month period to gather signatures for the peoples veto just two years ago. The League would like to respectfully suggest that this decision, while it certainly is your right, is ill advised and perhaps unjust. You are being asked to create a statewide ballot vote just two years after a historic, nationally recognized campaign on both sides of this issue, that was the result of a grueling signature gathering process on the part of close to 2000 of your citizens.

If this issue is so important that we must create the third statewide vote in just six years, why don't the folks who want that vote go out and gather signatures? Why are they coming to you?

Could it be that there is a political gap between the legislature and the people on this issue that would only be widened by not insisting on a signature drive on the part of its supporters? The Catholic church recently gathered 30,000 signatures in one day. If they feel strongly about this compromise perhaps they should do what thoughtful citizens did in 1997 -- gather signatures. The educational campaign may help close the gap.

Some of the folks who worked so hard in 1997 have told me that this feels like salt in an open wound. We suggest you insist that advocates of homosexual rights put the salt shaker away.

Christianity's moral teachings on homosexuality are beyond dispute. For the good of our state you must reject the temptation to create legal rights that are based on sexual wrongs. We urge you to stand strong. Please don't pass this measure.

I plan on being available to any of you who may have questions about our position as this proposal moves through the legislative process.

Thank you, and God be with your deliberations.

END



Special Class Protections for Self-Alleged Gays: A Question of "Orientation" and Consequences

A public policy analysis
by Tony Marco

Copyright Tony Marco, 1991-1994, all rights reserved

- Academics
 - Humanities
 - Social Sciences
 - Sciences
 - Theology
- Academic Integration
- Faculty Offices
- Classes

[Previous](#) | [Table of Contents](#) | [Next](#)

Departments

- Current Issues
- Publications
- Conferences/Events
- Apologetics
- Ministry Tools
- Bible Studies
- What's New

Special Interest

- Past Features
- Other Sites
 - Help LU
 - About LU
 - Link to LU
- Feedback

Navigation

- Site Map
- Site Index
- Advanced Search
- Browsing Help
- LU Home

LU Updates

- Receive
- LU-Announce

E-mail address:

Register

"Religious Exceptions" in "Gay Rights" Laws Deceptive and Transitory At Best

Local and state "gay rights" legislation often gains public acceptance when such legislation contains compliance "exceptions" for religious organizations. Typically, clauses stating that religious denominations will not be compelled to hire "someone not a member of the denomination in question" or other such wording give an illusion of protection for religious organizations against gay militant aggression. Cursory analysis reveals that these protections (1) place religious organizations in an unflattering light at best; (2) at worst will prove only temporary.

1. As author Stephen Bransford has observed, at best these kinds of allowances for church impunity against enforcement of "gay rights" laws place churches and religious organizations in an unflattering public light. Gay militants are able to continue attacking the church as "the only institution in society that is allowed to discriminate against gays," and other such disinformation.
2. Parachurch ministries are usually not protected at all under "gay rights" bills with "religious exceptions." Non-compliance clauses customarily written into these bills by gay militants most often say something like: "Religious organizations need not hire individuals **not of their denominations**. Most parachurch organizations are non-denominational, i.e., denominational affiliation is not a condition of employment. Therefore, these organizations have no real protection from the threat of "discrimination" lawsuits for refusing to hire gay individuals.
3. Anyone may conceal his/her "sexual orientation," meet membership requirements in a denominational church, then suddenly claim to be gay and demand church employment. As most "gay rights" laws' "religious exceptions" are phrased, denominational churches thus enjoy no real protection against the threat of gay militancy.
4. The U.S. Supreme Court, in *Bob Jones University vs. Simon* (1983), ruled that the beliefs of any tax-exempt religious organization **must be "approved by public policy"** in order for an organization to retain tax-exempt status. According to Constitutional attorneys, this

may well mean that, under the guise of "preventing religious subsidies" the Federal government has the power to completely regulate religious beliefs according to Federal dictates. **If gays gain inclusion in the Federal Civil Rights Act of 1964 -- or some other new gay-protective federal legislation is enacted -- promotion of the militant gay political agenda will be the "public policy" of the United States. In that event, any "gay rights" bill "religious exceptions" will splinter like balsa-wood in a hurricane.**

It would be naive indeed for religious individuals and organizations to assume that gay militants are ignorant of the implications of *Bob Jones University vs. Simon.*

[Previous](#) | [Table of Contents](#) | [Next](#)

[Printer-Friendly Version](#)

[See Related Resources](#)

copyright © 1995-1999 Leadership U. All rights reserved.

This site is part of the Telling the Truth Project.

Updated: 29 November 1996

As author Stephen Thomas has observed, at best these kinds of allowances for church discipline against enforcement of "gay rights" laws place churches and religious organizations in an untenable public light. The primary aim is to ensure that the church is "the only institution society has followed to discriminate against gays" and other such individuals.

Research shows that nearly all major religious denominations have written into their constitutions "anti-gay" provisions or clauses. Religious organizations need not hire individuals of their denomination. Most research organizations are non-denominational, i.e., denominational affiliation is not a condition of employment. Therefore, these organizations have no role in discriminating against the threat of "discrimination" lawsuits for refusing to hire gay individuals.

As the author of "Religious Organizations: More Subsidies" notes, the fact that religious organizations are exempt from certain laws does not mean they are exempt from all laws. The fact that religious organizations are exempt from certain laws does not mean they are exempt from all laws. The fact that religious organizations are exempt from certain laws does not mean they are exempt from all laws.





CALVARY BIBLE CHURCH

Park Street, P.O. Box 222

Stratton, Maine 04982

Church: (207) 246-4652

Pastor Michael Lynn

Home: (207) 246-7895

Testimony given at the public hearing on L.D. 2239, *An Act to Ensure Civil Rights and Prevent Discrimination*, February 16, 2000 (Augusta Armory).

Good morning ladies and gentlemen of the Judiciary Committee. My name is Michael Lynn, Pastor of the Calvary Bible Church in Stratton, Maine (northern Franklin County). I am here to speak in opposition to L.D. 2239. Two years ago, I helped gather signatures to veto the special rights of L.D. 1116 and I encouraged my church people to do the same. To me, this is not only a Biblical issue dealing with the sin of homosexuality, but an issue of fairness, dealing with the referendum process. The concerned citizens of Maine spent months gathering signatures on petitions (over 65,000) and then the people of Maine voted to veto the previous special rights legislation. If supporters of L.D. 2239 desire to put this issue before the people of Maine again, they should be required to do the same thing that I and hundreds of other Maine citizens did over two years ago.

I fear my rights as a citizen and as a Pastor to speak out on this moral issue will be limited or perhaps forbidden as not supposedly "politically correct." It may be argued that I can say what I want within the walls of my church, but in reality, unable to practice my faith outside the church, in the areas affected by this proposed legislation.

Civil rights legislation has historically been based on inherent traits, such as skin color, gender, or ethnic background, things which can not and do not change. Homosexuality, or one's sexual orientation, is not such a trait. I can personally recognize and Biblically support the inherent and unchangeable traits of individuals and therefore respect their differences. But I cannot support personally, morally, or Biblically, special rights for a small group of people who argue on the basis of discrimination but actually desire public acceptance and endorsement of their abnormal and unnatural sexual lifestyle. This in no way means that I, and I trust any of these other opponents, condone or tolerate the physical or emotional attacks upon those involved in homosexuality. We do, however, reserve the right to lovingly confront with Biblical truth those involved in this lifestyle, to share with them God's love for them as individuals, but God's hatred for their sin. Some proponents have suggested we must re-interpret Biblical laws concerning this issue. Shall we also re-interpret the laws forbidding murder, rape, theft, or other matters? I don't think so.

I urge this committee to give an "Ought not to pass" and let those who support this bill to do the same hard work that we did to veto the previous special rights legislation. Thank you for your time and consideration.

Submitted by Michael Lynn, Pastor.

INDEPENDENT - FUNDAMENTAL - EVANGELISTIC
"The Church That Believes The Bible And Loves People"

TO MEMBERS OF THE HOUSE & SENATE JUDICIARY COMMITTEE
(at the Augusta State Armory, Feb.16th,2000)

Ladies & Gentlemen,

My name is Harvey Lord. I am a resident of Paris,Maine. I was born in Bethel,Maine nearly seventy-four-years ago. I have seen some strange things in my long life. Certainly one of the strangest is the willingness of ^{portions of} an educated citizenry to grant legal recognition and protection to an un-natural and disease ridden behaviour that has been recognized for at least three thousand years as a threat to any civilized society. In my opinion it is impossible to grant special protection to a particular immoral behaviour without undermining the heterosexual marital relationship which is one of the most basic foundationstones of any civilized nation.

You certainly must know that homosexual activists are seeking to redefine totally the origin and nature of marriage. You must be aware that our public schools are being sent all kinds of propaganda seeking to pressure these schools into promoting homosexuality. They would have us believe that the homosexual "life-style" is a positive experience. The opposite is true. The A.I.D..S epidemic is only one manifestation of this "life-style".

I would remind you that our Declaration of Independence has five references to the Creator God who is also identified there as both Divine Providence and Supreme Judge of the world . We still do have the national motto "In God We Trust" and affirm this relationship in our pledge of allegiance to the nation's flag. It was George Washington, in his Inaugural Address who warned as follows: "The propitious smiles of Heaven can never be expected on a nation that disregards the ^e ~~r~~ eternal order and right which Heaven itself has ordained." Our first president made very plain that he regarded

(page two, testimony of Harvey Lord to the joint legislative committee on the judiciary)

Biblical morality as essential to the survival of our nation. With that in mind I urge you to reject any legislation which seeks to provide special protection for homosexual orientation and behaviour. OR SHALL WE BECOME LIKE SODOM AND GOMORRAH?

Thank you.

A handwritten signature in cursive script that reads "Harvey Lord". The signature is written in dark ink and is positioned to the right of the typed text "Thank you."

Public Meeting on Legalizing the Gay and Lesbian Lifestyle
The Augusta Armory
February 16, 2000

Ladies and gentlemen of the Judiciary Committee, my name is Eric Greiner of Spruce Head in Knox County. I am also the acting chairman of the Maine Taxpayers Party.

The object of government as stated in the Preamble of the Constitution of the State of Maine is to "promote" her citizen's rights and liberties that we have in common. Yet 3 years ago the Maine Legislature violated those common rights and liberties when it enacted into law special rights to a special interest group. This law recognized not the color of skin, the origin of one's birth, or one's age due to the passing of time. Unlike those characteristics that are a part of all of us from birth, the law protected a chosen lifestyle that the majority of Mainers find repulsive. So repulsive, that the majority of Maine voters in 1998 repealed that law. Article I, Section 2 of the Maine Constitution says "All power is inherent in the people;..." The people spoke and you refuse to listen.

The legislature was wrong in its action in 1997 and it is wrong in 2000. It is wasting your time and the taxpayer's money in considering again what the majority of Maine people do not want, and that is special treatment for a lifestyle. Those who practice the homosexual lifestyle know this. That is why they are going back to the legislature, because they know they can get from you what they will not get from the people – legal acceptance.

If you enact another law to protect this lifestyle, you will require Mainers to act against their principles, both moral and economic. You will force the landlord who has invested his or her money in both real estate and property taxes to accept renters that he now has the right not to, thereby upsetting the harmony of his community. You will force the business owner who now has the liberty to custom-blend his or her workforce, to hire someone who the employer feels is not conducive to the work environment, thereby jeopardizing morale and productivity. You will force this same business owner to pay insurance and survivor's benefits presently reserved for one-man one-woman married couples. You will force lending institutions to make loans that they would not normally do, for fear of a discrimination lawsuit. You would be forcing this agenda into the classrooms of impressionable children whose parents, though opposed to the homosexual lifestyle, cannot afford to remove their children to private school or homeschooling, thereby causing moral conflict at home. All the above are violations of one's unalienable rights to defend their liberty, possess their property, and pursue happiness.

To see proof of these, one only needs to look at the condition of our nation's defense personnel. Forced integration, the "don't ask, don't tell" policy and politically correct sensitivity training have done grave damage to the size, readiness, and morale of our armed forces, thereby putting this nation at risk.

The practitioners of the homosexual lifestyle have equal protection now under the law as Maine citizens, as described in Article I, Section 1 of our state Constitution. They cannot be discriminated against for gender, race, or age just as I cannot. That is equality. To grant them anything beyond that is an elevated distinction and therefore a special right.

If the Maine legislature fails to uphold its duty on this issue again I can promise you that the majority of Maine voters will return in force to set this matter right.

Thank you.

98 Mills Road
Whitefield, ME 04353
February 18, 2000

Judiciary Committee
Maine State Legislature
Station No. 115
Augusta, ME 04333

To the Judiciary Committee

Dear Sirs or Ladies:

On February 16 I addressed your Committee for just a moment as an opponent of the so-called Gay Rights bill. After thinking about what I said at that time, I would like to more fully state my position. I told you about my daughter and husband who have three small children who own a duplex, live on one side and rent out the other. They are Christians and follow God's Word as it is written in the Bible in all that they do, They could not possibly rent to homosexuals or unmarried couples (fornicators) or any others who are openly intent on sinning.

Many places in the Bible, but especially in Romans 1:24-28, God describes homosexuality as a sin. Christians are also told to not give place to the Devil (that is to not consciously encourage sin (Ephesians 4:27)).

After I returned to my seat, a homosexual man told me that this law would only apply to houses with over four rents. I thought about that and I conclude that it would still make no difference because God's Word is still plain and valid. Even if my daughter and her family were renting out five apartments, the Bible hasn't changed and they must still follow God's Word. Also, I recognize this as a way for people who practice this sin to get their toe in the door and then demand more.

The First Amendment to our Constitution says that people should not be prohibited from the free exercise of their religion. There isn't and shouldn't be anything about the free exercise of sin!

I can't for the life of me understand why the Legislature is even reviewing this matter at this time. The people of Maine voted it down only two years ago.

The collection of signatures for a referendum in between polling times is arduous. I was one of those who went door to door in Whitefield and my daughter did likewise in Nobleboro. If these people who are for this proposed law are so in favor of it, they should get off their duffs and do the same as we did and not expect the Legislature to do their dirty work for them. I don't think our Legislature should be used as a tool for the encouragement of the practice of homosexuality.

Yours truly,

Albert R. Boynton