

Dear Assembly Members:

Acting Mayor Claman and others are accusing me of distorting the facts concerning the proposed ordinance, AO 2009-64. I find it amusing because the Mayor and others are actually distorting what I have said. I offer the following to correct these misrepresentations.

1. I stated, "This ordinance would allow heterosexual and homosexual men to dress as women and walk into a women's restroom." I did not add "so they can prey on women and children." This false portion of the quote appeared in a press release from the Mayor's office, and was repeated by others who testified at Tuesday's public hearing. I have simply said, "Women should have the right to go into a woman's restroom without the fear of a male entering." At the June 9 Assembly hearing, two teenage girls from our church went into the ladies' restroom. Shortly after they entered, two males dressed as women walked into the same women's restroom. The two teenage girls verbally complained to a security guard who stated there is no law against it and nothing they could do. I believe women and mothers should have the right to use the ladies' restroom without the fear of male intrusion. They should also be able to send their daughters to the ladies' room without the possibility a males entering, for whatever reason. Are we losing all common rationale for decency?

2. I stated, "The Boy Scouts would be denied funding and the use of public facilities." This quote was misrepresented as, "the Boy Scouts would loose the right to chose their leaders if Anchorage adds "sexual orientation". The Boy Scouts would be denied local government grants or use of public facilities because they choose not to allow homosexual males to be in leadership positions over young boys.

3. I believe Anti-Discrimination laws will trump other laws that presently grant protection to property owners of smaller rental units and small business leaders. I do not believe the proposed exemption will prove to be a true exemption.

4. I believe the terms "reasonable work rules" and "so long as they are applied uniformly" will void the right of an employer to establish and enforce a dress code for their employees. Any male can claim his orientation to be female, dress in appropriate female clothing and an employer would be powerless to do enforce his company's dress code under this ordinance.

5. I never maintained that "Employers would be forced to hire someone who isn't qualified for the job." I stated, "If two people are qualified, then the Employer would be forced to hire the homosexual, Bisexual, Transvestite, etc., to avoid the possibility of a discrimination lawsuit."

This will place a tremendous burden on small business owners. Local business owners in Anchorage don't need this unnecessary burden.

In addition to the above problems, this ordinance will trample on the religious rights of churches, Christian schools, other Christian organizations and individual Christians. At great expense, we may be able to win in the supreme courts, but why would you want to subject religious organizations and individual Christians to such judication. If you are going to protect the rights of people and organizations then protect the rights of everyone.

Some of you believe that one group of people must surrender their rights in order to give rights to others, but there has to be a balance and it needs to be for undisputable reasons. Homosexuality is not an acceptable lifestyle by the big three world religions. Judaism, Christianity, and Islam. In this city homosexuals hold many professional and political jobs. Economically they seem to be doing as well as others. Some polls suggest even better. Are special laws really warranted.

This ordinance and even the S version demands that religious groups, businesses, and individuals relinquish far too many of their rights. Something is wrong with this. With so many potential problems, this ordinance, if passed, will cause those whose rights are being endangered to continue to fight until it is changed. This will prolong this divisive issue for months and years to come in every local election we have.

OUR CITY DOES NOT NEED THIS.
THANK YOU FOR YOUR CONSIDERATION.

Jerry Prevo