SB202

Exhibit No. 6
Date 1-21-05
Bill No. SB202

January 21, 2005

Dear Senator Toole:

By the introduction of "sexual orientation" under the administration of Montana Law, it is notable that "sexual orientation" is the only special rights category that is "declared" and not self-evident. This wording implies that "sexual orientation" refers to an identifiable class of people. This also incorrectly implies that "sexual orientation" is an inborn state of being and a civil rights issue rather than an atypical sexual behavior, like pederasty – sexual activity between a man and a boy.

The purpose of this letter is to express my opposition to the enactment of Senate Bill 202, which implies that "sexual orientation" is a person's state of being. "Sexual orientation" does not describe a person's state of being, it describes a person personal choices. A person's sexuality is not defined by who he is. A person's sexuality is defined by what he does, and there is no procedure to establish how "sexual orientation" can be identified.

"Sexual orientation" is solely a declared statement of a person's behavior and not an innate characteristic of a class of people.

At a GLSEN conference in 2000 at Tufts University, Massachusetts Department of Education HIV/AIDS coordinators discussed various "sexual orientation" with teenage students and also described ways to perform various sexual acts. This event became known as the notorious "fistgate scandal," and the controversy it raised over the exposure to children of vulgar and disturbingly graphic descriptions of acts is still reverberating in Massachusetts.

Would this be considered malicious intimidation against children? I believe it would be more appropriate to include "children" or "aged" persons, whose class is identified by what they are, rather than what they do.

In my opinion, the bill should be rejected.

Sincerely,

Stephanie Michelle Lane

Stephanie Michelle Lane
Hamilton, Montana