

**Testimony Against SB 777**  
**William B. May, Chairman**  
**Catholics for the Common Good**  
Assembly Judiciary Committee, June 26, 2007

Thank you for the opportunity to testify on SB 777. I would like to refer the committee members to Catholics for the Common Good's letter to Senator Kuehl expressing our concerns with SB 777.

I complement the author for the stated objective of reducing discrimination in schools. I hope we can agree that each and every person has intrinsic dignity by virtue of his or her humanity. This dignity demands respect and the law should protect and defend human rights.

Since sections 200 and 220 of the California Education Code already provide protection against discrimination for all, specifically including homosexual, bi-sexual and transgendered persons, SB 777 is not necessary. Because of its vague language it only opens the door to unintended consequences that would divert more teacher and financial resources from the classroom and expose schools to increased risk of litigation.

What would be the ramifications of the elimination of "sex" as a biological fact and replacing it with a new designation "gender identity" throughout the Education Code? What kind of accommodations would schools be required to make on the basis of gender identity? How much money and time would be diverted from the classroom to tiptoe through this quagmire to avoid lawsuits? How would schools deal with mischievous teenagers using gender identity preferences to draw attention to themselves and create disruptions in the schools?

How would schools determine what speech or activities would "reflect or promote a discriminatory bias against" homosexual, bisexual or transgender people? Would stating that marriage is only between a man and a woman (defined in the law) be considered promoting discrimination, since some interest groups argue the current law is discriminatory? How will people who have a different understandings of human sexuality and marriage with a mother and father as the best foundation for the development of children be treated under SB 777? Will they be considered bigots, as they are referred to by certain special interest groups? How will parents react to their children being taught that they are bigots? After biased and discriminatory instruction, how are children to be protected from discrimination, bigotry and bullying if they hold different views on marriage and family and sexual ethics?

SB 777 is unnecessary and it should not progress further in the state legislature until these questions are answered.

