First, so there can be no mistake about my stance allow me to state it clearly and concisely. *There is **NO** kind of sexual activity – heterosexual, homosexual, bi-sexual, any SEXUAL – that is "safe" for emotionally immature school-aged children – male or female – even those who have reached that miraculous, chronological "age of majority" – 18 years old.* This is confirmed by the increase in suicide, sexually transmitted diseases, drug/alcohol abuse, self-mutilation, sexually induced, emotional distress of all kinds among our teens since the "sexual liberation" of the 1960s.

In all my trips around the sun, I have honestly never once had anyone tell me they wished they had become sexually active younger but many, especially women, have said, if they had it to do over again, they would have, should have, waited. Any adult who throws up his/her hands with "they are going to do it anyway, so we may as well teach them how to do it *safely"* A) has abdicated their responsibility as an adult; B) is advocating their own personal agenda; C) is condoning child abuse; OR the ever popular D) all of the above.

Brain research and medical science now validates what most of us already knew intuitively that the adult brain is not fully developed until 25 years old – give or take. Most of us need do nothing more than introspectively and honestly compare the choices and decisions we made at 16, 17 or 18 to those we made from our mid-twenties onward to know this is true**.** But yet ever since late 1940s, when pedophilia researcher "extraordinaire" Alfred C. Kinsey began corrupting the world's understanding of sexual behavior, too many in our society have been brainwashed to believe that sexual pleasure and expression is the "be all, end all" altar of human existence at which we must all bow. The tragedy is they have forced our children along for their ride.

This brings us to current events in Arizona and the repealing of ARS 15-716 "Instruction on Acquired Immune Deficiency Syndrome" subsection (C) a.k.a. by some the "no promo homo" statute. This highly inflammatory, agenda-driven nickname, created by the left as an insulting affront designed to silence Christians, conservatives and parents who actually believe the moral upbringing of their child(ren) is their God-given right, appears NOWHERE in the statute as they intend people to believe.

Personally, I don't recall any public discussion of repealing the "no promo homo" statute during the campaign – admittedly, I could have missed it. However, clearly it became one of the top, if not THE top, self-proclaimed, priority of the current superintendent of public instruction virtually as soon as she took office.

A lawsuit was filed on March 28th in the federal court in Tucson asking the court to strike down ARS 15-716 (C) as discriminatory under the U.S. Constitution. The plaintiffs were "Equality Arizona" a nonprofit organization that advocates for LBGT rights; in addition to a TWELVE YEAR OLD (sexually active?!?), seventh grade student who self-identifies (according to the lawsuit) "as "queer" and "not heterosexual."" The defendants were the current SPI and the members of the State Board of Education (SBE). It was filed 3 days AFTER the SBE's March meeting. (A cynic might think it timed to deliberately circumvent any discussion on the part of the defendants– or at least by the ten defendants who had not already publicly proclaimed their position - prior to the legislature jumping in.)

According to a letter sent to the legislature, Attorney General Brnovich refused to "defend the state" because the plaintiffs "did not sue the state" – well, at least, not the *legislative branch* of the state (Howard Fischer, Capital Times April 9, 2019). In the same article the AZ Dept. of Ed (ADE) spokesperson says "his boss has not yet met with her "*state-assigned attorney*" to formally decide on a course of action."

Here in lie the rubs. First, what would be the point? She already, very publicly, well before the lawsuit, announced her intended "course of action"– to have ARS 15-716(C) stricken from statute. (Based on her very public statements, a cynic might, once again, not help but wonder if she was a "behind-the-scenes" player in creating the lawsuit *against the state* even while serving as an executive officer *of the state.*) But additionally the attorney general <u>IS</u> the SPI's "state-assigned attorney" and he, too, already very publicly announced his intentions not to defend the defendants.

And while the SPI can speak to her stance on the position of her office, she cannot do so on behalf of the SBE. And if all that were not enough, coincidentally the A.G. also just happens to be the state board's attorney. While generally legal advice

would not be discussed in public, according to Open Meeting Law (OML), an executive session for legal advice MUST be noticed to the public. So, unless the SBE met in violation of AZ OML, according to their website they had not met to discuss the SBE's official position on the lawsuit prior to the A.G.'s public declaration not to defend "the state."

On April 10th, the day after the A.G.'s announcement, amazingly, through the legislative "shenanigans" https://arizonadailyindependent.com/2019/04/21/strike– everything– legislative– shenanigans– continue/ of a floor amendment (which allowed NO opportunity for parents impacted by this change to weigh-in on the change) SB1346 suddenly morphed; adding ARS 15-716 to the bill and striking from statute:

C. No district shall include in its course of study [AIDS/HIV] instruction which:

1. Promotes a homosexual life-style.
2. Portrays homosexuality as a positive alternative life-style.
3. Suggests that some methods of sex are safe methods of homosexual sex

Of course they left in statute that AIDS/HIV instruction is perfectly appropriate beginning in *KINDERGARTEN*. (And yet we wonder why 56% of our third graders can't read and 47% can't do basic arithmetic with such diversions from academic instruction? But I digress.)

HB1346 flew through both chambers and on April 11 was sent straight to the governor's desk for an immediate signature all within 24 hour - maybe less.

Interestingly, it wasn't until April 25th just days before its April meeting – a full month after the lawsuit was filed and more than two weeks after the A.G. refused to defend the, well, *actual defendants* and the legislature and governor took action – that the SBE agenda was *amended* to include an executive session for the actual, named *defendants to the lawsuit* to, finally, laughably under the circumstances, "*consider its position and instruct its attorneys* [the A.G.] *in pending litigation*." (A cynic might, once again, be wondering if it was by order of the SBE's boss – the governor - that an earlier meeting was not scheduled or that

the agenda item to discuss this pending litigation was withheld, until after all was said and done, from the original agenda when created mid-month)

So, WHY bother at that point? Clearly, the board's attorney already "considered *his* position" and very publicly "instructed *his* clients" of his unwillingness to defend them regardless of *their* position on the "pending litigation" not vice versa. (And, BTW, in what universe does the client's attorney publicly announce his intent NOT to defend a client, should the client so desire, without EVER discussing it with the client – especially when the client has no say to choose another attorney unless the "state-appointed" attorney says so? But, I digress, again). Open Meeting Law requires any discussion of changes to board rule must occur in open session and by that point in time the only thing really left for the board *to discuss* was rule changes.

Here is, in my opinion, the infuriating hypocrisy of our legislature. After passing SB1346 by huge margins (55-5 in the House and 19-10-1 in the Senate) they then pass HCR2009 resolving pornography to be a "public health crisis." I suppose they have never heard the age-old axioms - "actions speak louder than words" or "talk is cheap."

Legislators, if you would like to know the roots of your declared pornography induced hyper-sexualization of our children look no further than Alfred Kinsey, the Kinsey Institute for Research in Sex, Gender and Reproduction, working in conjunction with Indiana University since 1947 and the resulting "sex education" we have allowed to invade our children's education. (I can't help but wonder what the members of the #MeToo movement would think about Kinsey's documented view of rape as a crime "easily forgotten" by its victims or that the only difference between "rape" and "a good time" is if the girl's parents are awake when she gets home(!) – but, again, I digress).

The obscene materials which pass for "sex education" were a direct result of Kinsey's "experiments" and have been created and effectively peddled for decades by Planned Parenthood, UNESCO (United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization), SIECUS (Sexuality Information and Education Council of the U.S) and their ilk to our schools, our children and children worldwide, for that matter.

SIECUS was launched by – drum roll – The Kinsey Institute and one of its first leaders was previously the medical director of – wait for it – Planned Parenthood (am I the only one to whom all this sounds more than a bit - incestuous?). All of this is being brought to a school near you, endorsed and advanced by the "Ivory Towers" of education that train our teachers to believe sexualizing our children is their duty; the education establishment that run our schools; supported all too often in those efforts by our elected school board members – and now our legislators and governor – all of whom are responsible for protecting our precious children. Many of the same people who browbeat the legislators and governor into the knee-jerk repeal of ARS 15-716(C) are the same ones telling – rather – expecting parents to unquestioningly "trust us" with "your" children.

What is truly, pathetically sad is, had our legislators just taken even a modicum of time for discussion and rational, thoughtful consideration – rather than being driven by fear of a hyperbolic tagline - they could have protected ALL of our children by striking the existing language and replacing it with:

ARS 15-716:

C. No district shall include in its course of study, instruction which *PROMOTES, CONDONES OR ENCOURAGES STUDENTS TO ENGAGE IN ANY SEXUAL ACTIVITY OR PURSUE ANY SPECIFIC SEXUAL LIFESTYLE.*

Because, simply stated, there is NO such thing as physically or emotionally "safe" sex or "free" love for children regardless of how many adults try, or programs are adopted intending, to teach them otherwise.