



## **AB 2654 – Sexual orientation, Nondiscrimination**

John Laird (D-Santa Cruz)

CWA Position – Oppose

### **Talking Points**

1. AB 2654 is sponsored by Equality California, a lesbian, gay, bisexual and transgender advocacy organization, which says the bill “is part of a multi-year effort by Assemblymember Laird and EQCA to ensure that Californians have the most comprehensive civil rights protections in the nation.” It is, in fact, another omnibus bill to add “sexual orientation” to still more business and professions sections of law that have antidiscrimination clauses. Included are requirements that local agencies only deal with contractors and subcontractors that provide equal employment opportunity based on sexual orientation. Likewise, motor vehicle and property insurance companies could not discriminate based on sexual orientation regarding insurability or for policy issuance or cancellation. The same applies to surety or bonding agencies. Sexual orientation is also added to nondiscrimination language with regard to court-appointed special advocates for juvenile court. Pre-paid health plans are affected as well.
2. This measure continues California’s trend of denying personal rights of conscience and closely-held moral or religious beliefs in deference to the desires of the homosexual activists. No exemptions are offered for those with personal convictions, thus forcing individuals to accept and support sexual behaviors with which they disagree. Private businesses and organizations should not be forced by the state to set aside their moral or religious principles.
3. Special rights have historically been afforded to certain groups in order to ensure that individuals are not discriminated against due to immutable characteristics. *California law already protects these characteristics.* Special rights should not be established based on an individual’s *behavior*, yet this is the intent of AB 2654 and related legislation.
4. In general, when “sexual orientation” is added to a legal or corporate nondiscrimination code, it is a giant step toward the adoption of policies that discriminate against people with traditional views of morality. Indeed, if we look closely at the term “sexual orientation” itself, it is really a radical challenge to the beliefs of all major religious faiths because it attacks the notion that sexual behavior has moral dimensions. California law currently defines “sexual orientation” as heterosexuality, homosexuality or bisexuality.” According to the therapeutic manual of the American Psychiatric Association, there are at least 20 distinctive sexual variations of “sexual orientation” and perhaps many more. Since the underlying concept of “sexual orientation” is that all sexual behavior is equally valid, there are no good choices or bad choices, just inclinations. AB 2654 and like measures force the acceptance of these “inclinations” with the new result of turning immorality into law.

**CONCERNED WOMEN FOR AMERICA  
OF CALIFORNIA**