

RECEIVED
CITY CLERKS OFFICE
- CITY COUNCIL - CITY OF SACRAMENTO

Law & Legislation Committee ~~May 20~~ 9 54 AM '85

May 16, 1985

2:00 PM

Thank you for the opportunity to address you on this vital issue in our city. I represent the local chapter of the National Association of Evangelicals and also serve as the Editor of the California NAE Government Affairs Newsletter. We represent approximately 150 churches in the Sacramento area whose memberships would include nearly 30,000 voters. Since pastoring Valley Community Church in the city of Sacramento for the past 23 years, it is clearly a deep concern of mine that our community be a comfortable one for any and all people.

This proposed ordinance is, however, something that creates another government intrusion upon the comfort of employers and property owners. Presently, there is too much government regulation for this to remain a truly free society.

Homosexuality is not an inherited condition. Sexual "orientation" is a status by choice. To be sure, sexual practices should remain a private matter. Whereas, we affirm God's good gift of sexuality, I speak for a host of people who wish that private sexual matters should be left private and not become the reason for governmental interference over hiring or firing practices. Equal protection of civil rights is due all, in-

cluding homosexuals or even those whose orientation is Beast-ability. However, the NAE opposes legislation which would extend special consideration to people based on their "sexual orientation." Sodomy is no reason for the government to insist on employment rights against an employer's wishes. Employers have worked to develop the business. The City of Sacramento should not insist that someone who prefers sexual relations with someone of the same sex be legislated special consideration for employment or housing. Briefly, SEXUAL PREFERENCE IS NOT A REASON FOR LEGISLATION FOR CITY CONTROL OF EMPLOYMENT OPPORTUNITIES.

We are convinced that homosexuals, lesbians, or others who desire employment may do so without incident if they will not press the issue of their private sexual orientation.

Good judgment is part of a successful business. This ordinance would limit the businessperson from exercising personal judgment. Legislation concerning private sexual practices should not thwart the freedom of employers to choose suitable employees. The owner must be allowed to make judgments of his/her business without the City of Sacramento interfering as this ordinance certainly would do. Your position as leaders in our city places upon you a great responsibility to promote unity in this community. This issue will only divide. The vast majority of citizens in Sacramento, prefer that you leave this issue alone...letting any and all practice sex as they choose...but not pressing this issue of sexual orientation as

a means to bring employment and housing benefits. Private choices are private. Public policy should never be based on private sexual choices. Whereas, we do not wish any hardship on anyone, we believe the business community must be left to make its own decisions about who the employees will be. Don't divide this community to a fever pitch of referendums and such. Let this issue of sexual orientation remain where it belongs...in the hearts and minds of people, not in the policy of how this city does business.

A. DWIGHT BURCHETT
Valley Community Church
3150 Wissemann Dr.
Sacramento, CA 95826
383-0775