

REP. JIM FERRIN & MARK SHURTLEFF: ACCOUNTABLE FOR THEIR ACTIONS?

Rep. Jim Ferrin and Attorney General Mark Shurtleff were vocal champions of House Bill (HB) 85, “Hate Crimes Amendments,” by Democrat Rep. David Litvack. HB 85 would:

- **Punish Thoughts Rather than Actions**

In America, we look at bias and prejudice only to determine whether the crime was premeditated or whether there was malicious intent to do harm. HB 85 would have focused our judicial system on thoughts and beliefs.

- **Demean Victims and Divide Our Community**

When someone is attacked in our community—for whatever reason—we are ALL attacked. In America, Justice wears a blindfold and is impartial. She does not protect victims based upon the color of skin, their creed, or their group. All victims are equal.

- **Undermine Our Traditional Systems of Justice**

Our justice system entitles the accused to be judged by a jury of his peers who are above the crime with which he is charged. Under “hate crimes” laws, no such presumption can be made, because few mortals are not guilty of thinking ill of some group at one time or another.

Rep. Ferrin and General Shurtleff are not alone in their support of special rights for certain groups—including those with different “sexual orientations.” Yesterday, the anti-American *United Nations*—supported by *France*—passed a resolution to further the “sexual orientation” agenda. (See Reverse)

Only you can make them accountable.

Exerpts from “U.N. Seeks Criminal Sanctions Against Foes of ‘Gay Rights’”

Reported by Austin Ruse, *NewsMax.com*, Thursday, April 24, 2003

A heated debate took place today at the United Nations Commission on Human Rights in Geneva, as members considered an unprecedented proposal to expand the U.N.’s definition of discrimination to include discrimination based upon “sexual orientation.”

The resolution, introduced by Brazil and co-sponsored by 19 other nations, including most European nations and Canada, is the first resolution in U.N. history to link homosexuality with human rights law. One advocacy group, International Gay and Lesbian Human Rights Commission, describes the resolution as “a historic opportunity to advance LGBT [Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual and Transgender] issues in international human rights law.”

The resolution “Calls upon all states to promote and protect the human rights of all persons regardless of their sexual orientation” and for the U.N. High Commissioner for Human Rights “to pay due attention to the phenomenon of violations of human rights on the grounds of sexual orientation.” It “Expresses deep concern at the occurrence of violations of human rights in the world against persons on the grounds of their sexual orientation.”

Pro-family legal scholars are deeply concerned with the Brazilian proposal. A. Scott Loveless, associate professor of law at the World Family Policy Center at Brigham Young University, believes: “The remedy proposed may have worse societal implications than the alleged disease, which is so-called homophobia. It is highly likely that gay rights advocates will use this resolution, if it passes, to advance their agenda to legalize gay marriage and to create hate-crimes legislation.”

Loveless notes that “in their quest to legitimize homosexuality, many of these countries have actually limited some of our most fundamental freedoms, including freedom of speech. In Canada and Great Britain, people who have spoken out against homosexual behavior have been criminally prosecuted for speaking, not for actually harming anyone.”

Jane Adolphe, assistant professor of law at Ave Maria Law School, believes that the resolution may be used against the Catholic Church. According to Adolphe, “This initiative opens the door for further attacks on the church. With respect to the commission, individuals could presumably use this discrimination language to bring complaints against the church with regard to hiring, employment, even the doctrines of the church itself.”

“I reject that H.B. 85 advances or is an attempt to advance a homosexual political agenda.” — Rep. Jim Ferrin in his piece, “Why I support H.B. 85—Hate Crime Amendments,” February 21, 2003.

“Many people have asked me why, given my Republican political philosophy and religious beliefs, I could support including a ‘protection for sexual orientation.’ They claim supporters of this bill are motivated by the ‘militant gay rights movement,’ and this is just a step in their plan to obtain special rights or status... HB 85 does not create any legal right or status based on sexual orientation. Therefore, I do not see this as any kind of ‘slippery slope’ to an official recognition of the gay lifestyle.” — Attorney General Mark Shurtleff in his piece, “We Hold These Truths... A ‘Hate Crimes’ Primer.”

Language straight from HB 85:

(6) As used in this section, "group" means the race, color, disability, religion, sexual orientation, national origin, ancestry, age, or gender of any individual or group of persons... (see lines 51-52)

(Read the bill at <http://www.le.state.ut.us/~2003/bills/hbillamd/hb0085.htm>)