

## Iowans' Concerns on SF 427

This bill grants protections to a minority based on behaviors and preferences which are not verifiable, and may or may not be visible to others.

To claim this as a “civil right” is an insult to those who have suffered true discrimination due to immutable traits such as race, ethnic background, age, and disabilities.

Employers will be vulnerable in sexual harassment lawsuits from employees who are forced to deal with flamboyant sexual behavior of co-workers.

Sexual practices of any nature should not be protected in the workplace. This bill sends a confusing message to employers who will be penalized for allowing sexual harassment conversations among employees. While at the same time, it protects employees who choose to verbalize or visualize their “sexual orientation” and “gender identity.”

Employers will likely be forced into expensive litigation costing literally thousands to simply defend themselves against false claims of discrimination.

Many times insurance companies will force employers to settle no matter the facts, creating a win-win situation for vindictive employees and more cost to employers.

Co-workers fear seeing members of the opposite sex in employee bathrooms because their “sexual identity” will not necessarily equate to their “sex at birth”, thus all bathrooms will, in a sense, become co-ed.

Students as young as kindergarten may be exposed to cross-dressing students in bathrooms; and junior and high school students may feel violated by cross-dressing students in locker rooms and sports activities.

Sen. Gronstal (D) guffawed at the idea of cross-dressing teachers being a problem in Iowa school districts as he denounced an amendment that would have excluded schools from the bill. Yet, students in other states have been forced by school districts to remain in classrooms with cross-dressing teachers against their moral conviction and parents' will.

As of now, there is no exemption for schools, faith-based organizations, day cares, or clubs like the Boy Scouts who have already spent thousands of dollars to defend themselves from angry “sexual orientation” opportunists.

According to Sen. Staci Appel (D), homeowners with apartments or duplexes on their residential dwelling would not have the right to use discretion when accepting or denying renters, i.e. an eighty year-old lady with an upstairs apartment could be and “should be,” according to Sen. Appel, forced to rent to a lesbian, gay, bisexual or trans-gendered person – even against the homeowner's moral conviction.

HF 611 is a live bill in Iowa House mandating Sex Ed curriculum for K-12. The bill calls for “sex ed” information that is free of “gender bias” (which is not defined), and could, because of this bill, now protect and include teaching students sexual acts and practices without regard to gender, including male to male, female to female, and male to female. When asked if that was the intent of the bill, Sen. Staci Appel (D) said she would have no problem with that concept and, in fact, would support it.

There is currently a lawsuit pending in the Iowa Supreme Court to legalize same-sex marriage. Yet, Sen. Gronstal mocked Republicans for attempting to add an amendment protecting traditional marriage, saying civil unions and same-sex marriage will not be any more probable after this bill because Iowa has already passed the Defense of Marriage Act (DOMA) in 1997. The Senator obviously doesn't remember that Iowa also had a ban on therapeutic cloning until last February when Democrats voted to repeal it.

## Questions To Ask

Would a parent be able to fire a nanny for cross-dressing or being homosexual if it was in opposition to the family's moral beliefs or religious convictions? Why are family exemptions not listed?

Would political candidates be able to discuss opposition to homosexuality and lesbian, gay, bisexual and trans-gendered issues on the campaign trail?

How will employers be able to fire bad employees who can now simply claim they are victims of “sexual orientation” or “gender identity” discrimination?

How will employers handle sexual harassment lawsuits from heterosexuals who feel threatened by bisexuals or cross-dressing employees using the bathroom of the opposite sex?

How will this affect the HF 116, sex education curriculum calling for instruction of sexual practices without “gender bias?” Does this mean students must learn about sexual acts without respect to the old fashioned notion of “male/female” reproduction, but rather learn of female to female or male to male sexual practices? Will students no longer be able to “opt out” because these sexual practices now fall into “sexual orientation,” a protected class?

What is next, affirmative action to ensure employers have the required number of gay, lesbian, bisexual and trans-gendered employees on staff?

Why should the sexual preference of one trump the moral conviction of another?

Like a bully with a pulpit, Sen. Gronstal quickly denounced every possible amendment without allowing his colleagues to speak. One wonders if he doesn't trust his party to speak without exposing deeper concerns for Iowans to fear.