



Christian Civic League of Maine

Sen. Bailey, Rep. Perry and members of the Health Coverage, Insurance, and Financial Services Committee, I'm Carroll Conley, Executive Director of the Christian Civic League of Maine. I thank you for the opportunity to speak in opposition to LD 227.

The mission statement of the Christian Civic League is to bring a Biblical perspective to public policy. Certainly, a foundational premise of Christianity is all human beings are image bearers of their Creator and therefore imperfectly but genuinely reflect the nature of God revealed in the creation and in scripture. A nearly universal manifestation of God's nature is our pursuit of justice and fairness. When it comes LD 227, I may have profound differences of opinion on how to address the issues we see arising in the last decade regarding transgender ideology; however, I share with you the same commitment to pursuing justice, fairness, and compassion. Unfortunately, any deviation from the dominant cultural narrative regarding transgenderism right now in the US is perceived as being unjust, unfair, and without compassion. However, that narrative seems to be unique to the United States. Progressive European nations that we are often told to look toward for their progress in challenges like climate change and access to health care are presently addressing the issues regarding minors and transgender treatment in a different way. Countries like Sweden and Finland went down the same path regarding minors self-diagnosing and receiving chemical and surgical treatment without parental approval years ago. They have gone through analyzing this approach and are presently greatly restricting it or abandoning it. You may question my commitment to fairness and compassion, but I don't think any fair-minded person would question these progressive nations as they wrestle with the same issues we are here.

Another grave concern of mine is the procedural haste and lack of transparency associated with LD 227. Regardless of our differences, we all are supposed to be committed to fairness. How can dropping a 21-page amendment to a bill shrouded in the cloak of a "concept draft" scheduled on Election Day be justified?

This bill also ignores the bedrock principle of parental rights. If this legislative body is going to ignore what progressive nations are doing now, I would ask why not consider having parents go through due process regarding termination of their rights rather than just doing it by fiat. I ask that the members of the Health Coverage, Insurance, and Financial Services Committee to vote "ought not to pass" for LD 227.