It is easier to tell the truth than to lie

It is a lie to tell the truth than to lie, because when you lie, you have to make stuff up, and making stuff up is hard. So perhaps the most positive thing to say about some of the critics of SB 180 – The Religious Liberty Rights of Conscience Act, is to congratulate the critics on the effort and imagination it must take to misrepresent it so badly.

The critics of SB 180 in and out of the Senate have been as diligent in their efforts to make the act look bad as the critics of the critics have been in their efforts to make the critics look bad.

The critics of SB 180 in and out of the Senate have been as diligent in their efforts to make the act look bad as the critics of the critics have been in their efforts to make the critics look bad.

SB 180 has nothing to do with a waiter serving a meal at a restaurant or a cashier at Wal-Mart, as the Senatorial rhetoric would imply. All it does is to stop the increasingly aggressive bullying of people of faith who are asked to provide a service that would directly involve them in an activity that violates their religious convictions.

The critics of SB 180 in and out of the Senate don’t want to actually read the bill, rather than they deliberately misrepresent it.

While the Senatorial rhetoric and the groups apparently funding it in their efforts to defeat SB 180 are certainly打着 the religious flag and encouraging the bullying of people who are mistreating their own businesses and simply trying to do the right things according to their religious beliefs.

SB 180 would provide a very small, safe space for religious people whose florists are increasingly being threatened by those who preach tolerance, but who seek to have very little idea about how to practice it themselves.

The critic’s issue is not to protect SB 180, but the issue is to protect the religious freedom of business owners. It is the time to make your voice be heard.

The legislature is another week closer to a new session. Do not let the toughest issue of the past few weeks go unaddressed.

Please contact us!

The Family Foundation
P. O. Box 911111
Lexington, KY 40511-1111

kent@kentuckyfamily.org
In deciding this issue, why should psychological gender trump biological gender? Currently, the U.S. Department of Education in Washington, D.C. is trying to dictate logical gender the next week? What about students who identify as “bisexual” or “fluid”? House Bill 364 “The Student Privacy Act” calls the toll-free Legislative Message Line and leave this message for “call the toll-free Legislative Message Line and leave this message for (Senators and Representatives) “Pass The Student Privacy Act - House Bill 364” “Pass The Student Privacy Act - House Bill 364” This bill protects the gender identity student as well as the privacy rights of all other students. In addition, it gives the local schools options. Obama Administration Threatens with Loss of Funding The Obama Department of Education has been telling School Districts across America that they must allow students with gender dysphoria to use the bathroom and locker room of the opposite biological sex or they will lose federal funding. Title IX was enacted in 1972 to “level the playing field” for women regarding entrance to schools and programs available to them. The most obvious effect of the law was in athletics, where Title IX allowed female athletes to “level the playing field” for women. However, the legislation is so broad that it has been interpreted to allow a student with gender dysphoria to use the same bathroom and locker room as the opposite biological sex. The Bevin Administration must decide whether to continue Governor Beshear’s efforts to have the machines installed and utilized in Kentucky in a “common interest” agreed case. Governor Beshear and his Administration worked to have the machines installed and utilized before they were declared illegal. The case has been in court for more than five years but court decisions have not been rendered. The machines still are functioning. If Governor Beshear decides to move forward in support of the machines, he will complete Governor Beshear’s gambit for legalizing them. Governor Beshear tried numerous times to expand gambling in Kentucky, failing with every legislative effort after the federal government’s Office of Civil Rights said that sex designations inathletic facilities were discriminatory and that the General Assembly did not want to legalize casino gambling or expanded gambling of any kind. But Beshear’s last effort was through the court system that would deliberately target the poor. The Beshear Administration tried to use a legal judge that the use of horse racing-themed slot machines was permitted wagering on horse races. Instead, the Supreme Court of Appeals agreed to allow the machines to be operating in the state of Kentucky. The Obama Administration is pressuring schools to allow students to decide what their “gender identity” is and use the facilities of the sex they believe they are. Despite the objections of many parents and students, at least one Kentucky high school is allowing a biological male in the girls’ facilities. The Student Privacy Act allows administrators to care for students with gender dysphoria while still respecting the privacy rights of all the other students. Under this Act, administrators would determine how best to accommodate all students except they would not be allowed to place students of opposite biological sex in the same bathroom, locker room or overnight accommodation at the same time. Two Federal Courts Side with Student Privacy In 2015 two cases of students with gender dysphoria were decided in Federal Court. In both cases, the students were biological females identifying as males who sought to use their school’s male facilities. One school was a public university and one was a public elementary school. In both cases the schools did not allow the student to use the bathroom of the opposite biological sex and the students filed suit against the school that matched their biological sex. Instead, they provided an alternate facility. Both schools were sued for discrimination under Title IX. In both cases, the schools were found “not guilty” of discrimination in Federal Court. Students with gender dysphoria are not the only students who feel vulnerable, emotions and fears often lead to isolation and destructive behavior. All students should be cared for while still balancing the needs of other students. Status of House Bill 364 In Senate Committee Passed Senate Committee Passed by Full Senate Signed by Governor Passes by Full House Passed House Committee House Committee policy for Kentucky schools. The Student Privacy Act would maintain local control by returning the decision to Kentucky citizens. Local control would be further maintained by allowing school administrators to determine how best to accommodate all students given their unique student body, programs and facilities. The law simply eliminates one option – administrators choose students of opposite biological sex in the same locker room, rest rooms or sleeping accommodations at the same time. Opponents say Transgender Students are Vulnerable Students with gender dysphoria are not the only students who feel vulnerable, isolated, bullied, and unfortunately, even suicidal. During the sensitive time and pressure comes emotions and fear that lead to isolation and destructive behavior. All students should be cared for while still balancing the needs of other students. Many students for the Department of Education’s Office of Civil Rights is claiming that Title IX means students with gender dysphoria must be allowed to go into the bathroom or locker room designated for the sex that they self identify as or the school will be guilty of a violation of Title IX. This bill protects the gender identity student as well as the privacy rights of all other students. In addition, it gives the local schools options. Serious Questions Raised Should the state in the girls’ locker room new or the girls’ “zone”? Should the locker in the boys’ bathroom come back with the boys on the senior locker? Then other students recognize the student is biologically different from a girl student. Is this what others are saying about their right to privacy? Expanding on the rights of others students. The Obama Administration has threatened school districts with the loss of federal funding if they do not comply. Two Federal District Courts have disagreed with the Administration’s interpretation of Title IX. The Administration is appealing. House Bill 364 Gives Local Control Currently, the U.S. Department of Education in Washington, D.C. is trying to dictate who should use the bathroom and locker rooms of the opposite biological sex. The Obama Administration is pressuring schools to allow students to decide what their “gender identity” is and use the facilities of the sex they believe they are. Despite the objections of many parents and students, at least one Kentucky high school is allowing a biological male in the girls’ facilities. The Student Privacy Act allows administrators to care for students with gender dysphoria while still respecting the privacy rights of all the other students. Under this Act, administrators would determine how best to accommodate all students except they would not be allowed to place students of opposite biological sex in the same bathroom, locker room or overnight accommodation at the same time. Two Federal Courts Side with Student Privacy In 2015 two cases of students with gender dysphoria were decided in Federal Court. In both cases, the students were biological females identifying as males who sought to use their school’s male facilities. One school was a public university and one was a public elementary school. In both cases the schools did not allow the student to use the bathroom of the opposite biological sex and the students filed suit against the school that matched their biological sex. Instead, they provided an alternate facility. Both schools were sued for discrimination under Title IX. In both cases, the schools were found “not guilty” of discrimination in Federal Court. Status of House Bill 364 In Senate Committee Passed Senate Committee Passed by Full Senate Signed by Governor Passes by Full House Passed House Committee House Committee policy for Kentucky schools. The Student Privacy Act would maintain local control by returning the decision to Kentucky citizens. Local control would be further maintained by allowing school administrators to determine how best to accommodate all students given their unique student body, programs and facilities. The law simply eliminates one option – administrators choose students of opposite biological sex in the same locker room, rest rooms or sleeping accommodations at the same time. Opponents say Transgender Students are Vulnerable Students with gender dysphoria are not the only students who feel vulnerable, isolated, bullied, and unfortunately, even suicidal. During the sensitive time and pressure comes emotions and fear that lead to isolation and destructive behavior. All students should be cared for while still balancing the needs of other students. Many students for the Department of Education’s Office of Civil Rights is claiming that Title IX means students with gender dysphoria must be allowed to go into the bathroom or locker room designated for the sex that they self identify as or the school will be guilty of a violation of Title IX. This bill protects the gender identity student as well as the privacy rights of all other students. In addition, it gives the local schools options. Serious Questions Raised Should the state in the girls’ locker room new or the girls’ “zone”? Should the locker in the boys’ bathroom come back with the boys on the senior locker? Then other students recognize the student is biologically different from a girl student. Is this what others are saying about their right to privacy? Expanding on the rights of others students. The Obama Administration has threatened school districts with the loss of federal funding if they do not comply. Two Federal District Courts have disagreed with the Administration’s interpretation of Title IX. The Administration is appealing. House Bill 364 Gives Local Control Currently, the U.S. Department of Education in Washington, D.C. is trying to dictate who should use the bathroom and locker rooms of the opposite biological sex. The Obama Administration is pressuring schools to allow students to decide what their “gender identity” is and use the facilities of the sex they believe they are. Despite the objections of many parents and students, at least one Kentucky high school is allowing a biological male in the girls’ facilities. The Student Privacy Act allows administrators to care for students with gender dysphoria while still respecting the privacy rights of all the other students. Under this Act, administrators would determine how best to accommodate all students except they would not be allowed to place students of opposite biological sex in the same bathroom, locker room or overnight accommodation at the same time. Two Federal Courts Side with Student Privacy In 2015 two cases of students with gender dysphoria were decided in Federal Court. In both cases, the students were biological females identifying as males who sought to use their school’s male facilities. One school was a public university and one was a public elementary school. In both cases the schools did not allow the student to use the bathroom of the opposite biological sex and the students filed suit against the school that matched their biological sex. Instead, they provided an alternate facility. Both schools were sued for discrimination under Title IX. In both cases, the schools were found “not guilty” of discrimination in Federal Court. Status of House Bill 364 In Senate Committee Passed Senate Committee Passed by Full Senate Signed by Governor Passes by Full House Passed House Committee House Committee policy for Kentucky schools. The Student Privacy Act would maintain local control by returning the decision to Kentucky citizens. Local control would be further maintained by allowing school administrators to determine how best to accommodate all students given their unique student body, programs and facilities. The law simply eliminates one option – administrators choose students of opposite biological sex in the same locker room, rest rooms or sleeping accommodations at the same time. Opponents say Transgender Students are Vulnerable Students with gender dysphoria are not the only students who feel vulnerable, isolated, bullied, and unfortunately, even suicidal. During the sensitive time and pressure comes emotions and fear that lead to isolation and destructive behavior. All students should be cared for while still balancing the needs of other students. Many students for the Department of Education’s Office of Civil Rights is claiming that Title IX means students with gender dysphoria must be allowed to go into the bathroom or locker room designated for the sex that they self identify as or the school will be guilty of a violation of Title IX. This bill protects the gender identity student as well as the privacy rights of all other students. In addition, it gives the local schools options. Serious Questions Raised Should the state in the girls’ locker room new or the girls’ “zone”? Should the locker in the boys’ bathroom come back with the boys on the senior locker? Then other students recognize the student is biologically different from a girl student. Is this what others are saying about their right to privacy? Expanding on the rights of others students. The Obama Administration has threatened school districts with the loss of federal funding if they do not comply. Two Federal District Courts have disagreed with the Administration’s interpretation of Title IX. The Administration is appealing.
The Student Free Speech and Religious Liberty Act

Senate Bill 15: The Student Free Speech and Religious Liberty Act

Christian students at all levels in education should no longer be sent to the “back of the bus” because of their personal faith.

This bill would prevent schools from infringing on the First Amendment rights of students in classroom assignments and speeches, and would require schools to grant religious student groups access to public forums in the same way they grant access to all other groups.

I would very much like to say “thank you” to my parents and God in their graduation speech, and Charlie Brown’s Christmas is a legal form of expression when the school chooses to present plays that may have religious verbiage in them (i.e. A Charlie Brown Christmas).

I would also like to say that schools may not discriminate against a student group (like a Christian Student Fellowship) simply because the group conducts its internal affairs and elects leaders in accordance with its stated mission. Currently, many schools contend that a student only has free speech in designated “free speech zones.” That does not appear anywhere in the U.S. Constitution, the Kentucky Constitution and no American — other than a student today — is told they cannot speak up and share their thoughts unless they stand in a special “zone.”

This bill is simply catalogues existing law so that schools are not intimidated by people who strongly believe in the separation of church and state. Churches have ruled that schools that engage in religious activities have a chance to make a better choice in order to create and foster an environment that is more conducive to learning and create a better class of citizens.

“Pass The Student Privacy Act - Senate Bill 15”

This bill protects the religious liberty and free speech rights of students who are often intimidated by ignorant or even anti-Christian educators and administrators.

Charlie Brown’s Christmas is Okay

This bill would protect the rights of conscience for American workers such as bakers, photographers, florists and ministers — “Protected Service Providers” — who often serve in the wedding ceremony realm and who do not want to use their personal, contracted, customized and specialized skills in furthering something that violates their conscience and faith teachings.

“The Religious Liberty / Rights of Conscience Act - Senate Bill 180”

This bill protects citizens from the legal entanglements or even anti-Christian educators and administrators.

Legal Cases of Intimidation and Intolerance

Recent legal cases have highlighted the uncompromised targeting of citizens, simply because they believe participating in or promoting same-sex marriage violates the teachings of their faith.

Consider Baker v. Obergefell, a young New York photographer, who in 2015 declined to photograph a same-sex wedding celebration. She believed using her artistic talents in that setting would violate the teachings of her faith. Elise took her appeal all the way to her state Supreme Court where she lost. The resulting fines, legal expenses and noble struggle forced her out of business.

Consider Barber v. Bonta, a floral shop owner who has served her community and other states against religious freedom are Senate Bill 15 (SB 15) and Senate Bill 180 (see page 3 for S 10). Sen. Robinson.

The Religious Liberty / Rights of Conscience Act - Senate Bill 180

Across America, Religious Liberty and Rights of Conscience have been intensely under attack for more than two decades — and especially in 2015. To stop the onslaught, this bill underscores the underlying premises of our Amendment — in particular, the “freedom” of religion and its protection of the rights of conscience. By doing so, it is an effort to properly apply Thomas Jefferson’s “wall of separation” that he proposed in order to keep government out of a citizen’s free exercise of their faith.

No human authority shall, in any case whatever, control or interfere with the right of conscience.” Gov. Bulletfor failed to honor the Kentucky Constitution and imposed Kim Davis and her conscientious objections.

The Freedom of Conscience — Uniquely American

Even during World War II, when the ongoing existence of America was in question, the United States government never forced a conscientious objector to pull a trigger and violate his conscience. Why are we now changing our standard over the “free exercise” of religion and its undergirding of the rights of conscience. By so doing, it is an effort to properly apply Thomas Jefferson’s “wall of separation” that he proposed in order to keep government out of a citizen’s free exercise of their faith.

The Constitutionality of Rights or the Power of Force

If the first federal court hearing in the lawsuit against County Clerk Kim Davis on July 31, it is not clear whether it or the ACLU attorneys are willing to drive the case all the way to the United States Supreme Court. This would in part be an effort to force Davis to allow two same-sex couples to marry in Kentucky. The hearing on July 31 was even more striking: it had to deal with Davis’ refusal to marry two same-sex couples. Obviously, this is an about getting a marriage license — it’s all about the use of the power of government to force citizens to obey even if it hurts them to violate their conscience.

Sen. Albert Robinson is the sponsor of both Senate Bills 15 and 180

Two bills that work against the backlash against religious freedom are Senate Bill 15 (SB 15) and Senate Bill 180 (see page 3 for S 10). Sen. Robinson.

S 180 does not Create New Rights

Multiple court cases and existing law have repeatedly established these rights of students. However, because these rights are not clearly spelled out in statute form, often students, parents and administrators are uncertain about where the line is.

The Rights of Conscience Act - Senate Bill 15:

This bill would allow students to express their faith in ways that would otherwise be constrained by current laws. For example, the bill would allow students to display religious symbols in public schools and universities, and it would allow students to engage in religious activities during school hours.

Encouraging Critical Thinking & Free Exchange of Ideas

Supposing your viewpoint is contrary to learning and developing critical thinking skills. Not only that, but also what we are “politically correct” can be very dangerous — leading to intolerance and restriction of our educational model.

Student should make decisions and in-control when there is an appropriate, acquired, free exchange of ideas, not where there is censorship.

S 185 Discourages “Viewpoint Discrimination”

Many conservative and people of faith have been experiencing increasing pressure to be silent about their beliefs and opinions. Some students have felt their views are unwelcome in the classroom.

This bill would encourage students to be open about their faith and teach that viewpoint does not reflect that of their teacher or administrator.
Pro-life bills deserve a debate and a vote!

Bills: Senate 7, 25, 152, 212 / House 257, 492

Since 2004 – for 12 years – no pro-life bills have been allowed on the House floor by House Leadership. Clearly, whether you are “pro-life” or “pro-choice” you would be for honest and robust debate on issues that separate us. This should be particularly true for the House of Representatives, which holds the distinction as “the peoples’ Chamber.”

Senate Bill 7 - Tiered Funding of Abortion Providers: After the discovery of Planned Parenthood’s selling of fetal remains, this bill was written to protect funding so that public funds are given (and at times withheld) to those who do not provide abortions. This bill cleared the Senate on Feb 2 with a vote of 32 to 5. Since then, SB 7 has been stalled in the House Appropriations and Revenue Committee.

Senate Bill 25 - Ban on Sale of Fetal Body Parts: This bill bans the sale of aborted baby parts in Kentucky. It is in response to the video revelations from last year, demonstrating that Planned Parenthood was profiting from the deliberate harvesting of body parts taken from aborted fetuses. This bill cleared the Senate on Jan 27 with a bipartisan vote of 36 to 2. Since then, SB 25 has been in the House.

Senate Bill 152 - The Ultrasound Bill: This is a common-sense Ultrasound Bill that simply lets the patient see the tech information that patients in all other surgeries are offered. The House has repeatedly killed all Ultrasound bills for more than a decade. Kentucky’s two abortion clinics advertise that they already offer this tech information that patients in all other surgeries are offered. The House has repeatedly killed all Ultrasound bills for more than 10 years. Kentucky was a pro-life state even during the entire 1960s and 1970s, all kinds of phrases were used to disguise what abortion really was. Now that ultrasound technology has come into use, pro-life choice or pro-choice advocates can see all they can wish to in implementation – and what they have done for the last 10 years in Kentucky.

House Bill 257 - The Unborn Child Protection Act: During his last month in office, he okayed Planned Parenthood’s January opening of another abortion clinic in Louisville without proper licensing. And just last week it was learned that Planned Parenthood (PP) is the thirteenth most pro-life state in the nation in positive legislative actions taken. But that does not matter to the two almost identical bills protect women by regulating abortion clinics like any other free-standing surgery center. This means that they cannot slip by with less-than-standard safety measures as has been allowed by Gov. Beshear. HB 492 is stuck in House Health & Welfare and SB 212 just began its process in the Senate.

The deceit is evident for all to see

A quick glance of 2008 and 2009 illustrates the on-going problem over the years: House Republicans use committees strategically to kill pro-life bills. In 2008: After the Ultrasound Bill unanimously passed the Senate committee and the full House by a bipartisan margin of 32-4, there was significant reaction when then House Speaker (Latin for “little one”) – is in response to the video revelations from last year, demonstrating that Planned Parenthood was profiting from the deliberate harvesting of body parts taken from aborted fetuses. This bill cleared the Senate on Jan 27 with a bipartisan vote of 36 to 2. Since then, SB 25 has been in the House.

In 2008: After The Ultrasound Bill unanimously passed the Senate committee and the full House by a bipartisan margin of 32-4, there was significant reaction when then House Speaker (Latin for “little one”) – is in response to the video revelations from last year, demonstrating that Planned Parenthood was profiting from the deliberate harvesting of body parts taken from aborted fetuses. This bill cleared the Senate on Jan 27 with a bipartisan vote of 36 to 2. Since then, SB 25 has been in the House.

In 2008: With SB 25, a Senate (from the House), the Ultrasound Bill passed the Senate with a similar 32-4 majority. Then Rep. Tim Burch (25th House District), Chairman of the House Health and Welfare Committee, promptly introduced it in the House and was placed in the House of Representatives.

In 2008: With SB 25, a Senate (from the House), the Ultrasound Bill passed the Senate with a similar 32-4 majority. Then Rep. Tim Burch (25th House District), Chairman of the House Health and Welfare Committee, promptly introduced it in the House and was placed in the House of Representatives.

In 2010: Since then, it has been killed by abortion clinics and the new chairman was more supportive. Proponents and opponents alike believe it would have passed the full House with more than 30 votes.

Kentucky should be leading, not following

Kentucky was once ranked by Americans United for Life (AUL) as the thirteenth most pro-life state in the nation in positive legislative action taken. But that does not matter to the two almost identical bills protect women by regulating abortion clinics like any other free-standing surgery center. This means that they cannot slip by with less-than-standard safety measures as has been allowed by Gov. Beshear. HB 492 is stuck in House Health & Welfare and SB 212 just began its process in the Senate.
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Pro-life bills deserve a debate and a vote!

The House’s “people’s Chamber” is where issues of life and health are debated and formed. Pro-life bills should not be blocked any longer!

Bills: Senate 7, 25, 152, 212 / House 257, 492

Since 2004 – for 12 years – no pro-life bills have been allowed on the House Floor by House Leadership. Clearly, whether you are “pro-life” or “pro-choice,” the health and robust debate on issues that separate us. This should be particularly true for the House of Representatives, which holds the distinction as “the people’s Chamber.”

Senate Bill 7 - Tied Funding of Abortion Providers: After the discovery of Planned Parenthood’s selling of fetal body parts for research funding so that public funds are given (hidden) to these organizations that provide abortions. This bill cleared the Senate on Feb. 2 with a vote of 32 to 5. Since then, SB 7 has been stalled in the House Appropriations and Revenue Committee.

Senate Bill 25 - Ban on Sale of Fetal Body Parts: This bill bans the sale of aborted baby parts in Kentucky. It is in response to the video revelations from last year, demonstrating that Planned Parenthood was profiting from the deliberate harvesting of body parts taken from aborted fetuses. This bill cleared the Senate on Jan. 27 with a bipartisan vote of 36 to 2. Since then, SB 25 has been in House Committee.

Senate Bill 152 - The Ultrasound Bill: This is a common-sense Ultrasound Bill that simply lets the patient see the tech information that patients in all other surgeries are offered. The House has repeatedly killed all Ultrasound bills for more than a decade. Kentucky’s two abortion clinics advertise that they already do ultrasounds so there is no increased cost. It passed the Senate 32 to 4 on Feb. 29 and was placed in the House Health & Welfare Committee.

House Bill 257 - The Unborn Child Protection Bill: This bill provides for the health and welfare of the female demise of an unborn child and it provides for the health and welfare of the female demise of the female remains. The bill has 56 co-sponsors, demonstrating to all that if the bill is brought to the House Floor, it will pass. Unfortunately it has remained in the House Health & Welfare Committee (the “Graveyard Committee”) under Chairman Tom Burch since being sent there on Jan. 19.

House Bill 492 & Senate Bill 212 - Abortion Clinic Regulations: Their two almost identical bills protect women by regulating abortion clinics like any other free-standing surgery center. This means that they cannot slip by with less than standard safety measures as has been allowed by Gov. Beshear. HB 492 is stuck in House Health & Welfare and SB 212 just began its process in the Senate.

Status of Senate Bill 7
- In Senate Committee
- Passed Senate Committee
- Signed by Governor
- Passed by Full Senate
- Passed House Committee
- Signed by Governor
- Passed by Full House
- Passed Senate Health & Welfare Committee and SB 212 just began its process in the Senate.

Status of Senate Bill 25
- In Senate Committee
- Passed Senate Committee
- Signed by Governor
- Passed by Full Senate
- Passed Full House
- Passed Senate Health & Welfare Committee
- Signed by Governor
- Passed by Full House
- Passed House Health & Welfare Committee
- Senate Bill 212 just began its process in the Senate.

Status of Senate Bill 152
- In Senate Committee
- Passed Senate Committee
- Signed by Governor
- Passed by Full Senate
- Passed Full House
- Passed Senate Health & Welfare Committee
- Senate Bill 152 was placed in the House Floor in March and was placed in the House Health & Welfare Committee.

Status of House Bill 257
- In Senate Committee
- Passed Senate Committee
- Signed by Governor
- Passed by Full Senate
- Passed Full House
- Passed Senate Health & Welfare Committee
- Senate Bill 257 was placed in the House Floor, it will pass. Unfortunately it has remained in the House Health & Welfare Committee.

Kentucky should be leading, not following

When the Republican controlled Congress passed the Partial Birth Abortion Ban Act of 2003, Kentucky did nothing to protect the unborn. Since 2004, only 5 pro-life bills have been allowed on the House Floor and 1 on the Senate. Now, in 2015, with the new pro-life leadership in the House, only 1 pro-life bill has been allowed on the House floor. This is the pro-life movement’s 10th year of fighting for pro-life rights in Kentucky.

The House leadership killed the bill in committee. This bill is in response to the video revelations from last year, demonstrating that Planned Parenthood was profiting from the sale of aborted fetal remains. The bill has 56 co-sponsors, demonstrating to all that if the bill is brought to the House Floor, it will pass. Unfortunately it has remained in the House Appropriations and Revenue Committee.

Steve Beshear is the first Kentucky governor in decades that did nothing to protect the unborn

Kentucky was once ranked by Americans United for Life (AUL) as the thirteenth most pro-life state in the nation in its annual legislative baseline for life. But now, two years after the pro-life movement took its pro-life bills on full force to all the different Kentucky lawmakers, Kentucky is in the middle of the pack. The bill has passed the Senate by 32 to 4 on Feb. 29 and was placed in the House Health & Welfare Committee.

Years of deception are exposed

If a picture is worth 1000 words, then an ultrasound is an encyclopedia - SB 152. During the Roe v. Wade years of the 1960s and 1970s, all kinds of phrases were used to disguise what abortion really was. Now that ultrasound technology has come into its own, pro-choice or pro-abortion advocates can do all they can to block its implementation – and that they have done for the last number of years in Kentucky. But even a simple review of what they said to the stamp of years is revealing. Here are some of those lies:

- “It is just a parasite.”
- “It is just a blob of tissue.”
- “It is only a ‘product of conception.’”
- “We’re just going to restore a window of opportunity.”
- “We’re only going to terminate your pregnancy.”
- “Abortion is safer than giving birth to a full term baby.”
- “I would rather have an abortion than have a cavity filled.”
- “Life begins when the baby can survive on its own.”
- “It’s only a fetus.” (Latin for “little one” – Abortionists avoid the term “baby.”)

Steve Beshear is a strong supporter of Planned Parenthood (PP), at least since the 1980s. That fact ended his first bid for Governor when he was eliminated in the 1987 Democrat primary after his ties to PP were revealed when protestors picketed a Lexington fundraiser.

Steve Beshear is the first Kentucky governor in decades that did nothing to protect the unborn

This past year, Governor Beshear has signed into law a bill that allows Planned Parenthood to be the only provider of abortion in Louisville without proper licensing. And just last week it was revealed that his Administration had not been properly inspecting Kentucky’s abortion clinics during his tenure.
This bill would prevent schools from infringing on the First Amendment rights of students in classroom assignments and speeches, and would require schools to grant religious student groups access to public forums in the same way they grant access to all other groups. It would allow students to speak up and share their thoughts unless they stand in a special “zone.”

The bottom line is that this bill would let students’ rights, giving them protection from school officials or outside groups who talk about tolerance and diversity, but who actually practice intolerance.

Charlie Brown’s Christmas is Okay

This bill simply guarantees existing law so that schools are not intimidated by people of groups who wrongly threaten litigation because somebody sings a Christmas carol or prays at an athletic contest. The courts have ruled that schools may include religious content in plays and performances. Students stay “Thank God” in their graduation speech, and Charlie Brown’s Christmas is legal to perform. Students can pray, read Bibles, and they do not have to go to a free speech zone in order to share their perspectives or their opinions. Teachers, principals, administrators as well as parents and students will benefit from the clarity this bill brings.

Encouraging Critical Thinking & Free Exchange of Ideas

Supporting a viewpoint is contrary to learning and developing critical thinking skills. Not only does it not allow and would work that are “politically correct” can be very dangerous – leading to indoctrination rather than real education. Students learn to make decisions and to judge when there is an appropriate, accepted, free exchange of ideas, not where there is censorship.

The Religious Liberty / Rights of Conscience Act

Across America, Religious Liberty and the Rights of Conscience have been intensely under attack for more than two decades — especially in 2015. To stop the onslaught, this bill underscores the underlying premises of the First Amendment — in particular, the “free exercise” of religion and its undergirding of the rights of conscience. By so doing, it is an effort to properly apply Thomas Jefferson’s “wall of separation” that he proposed in order to keep government out of a citizen’s free exercise of their faith.

In the first federal court hearing in the lawsuit against County Clerk Kim Davis on July 13, it was interesting to note that County to Kenton County — a minimum of five counties. Obviously, this is not a marriage license. . . It’s about respect for the Culture of Conscience Act — Senate Bill 180

The rights of students who are often intimidated by ignorant or even anti-Christian educators and administrators, and the rights of citizens who wrongly threaten litigation because somebody sings a Christmas carol or prays before an athletic contest.

This bill protects citizens from the legal entanglements of government, from choosing not to participate in a same-sex marriage ceremony, and protects the Civil Rights and Freedom of Conscience. Senators and Representatives.

Legal Cases of Intimidation and Intolerance
Recent legal cases have highlighted the unimpeded targeting of citizens, simply because they believe in same-sex marriage ceremonies. This bill would prevent schools from infringing on the rights of students who are often intimidated by ignorant or even anti-Christian educators and administrators.
Currently the U.S. Department of Education in Washington, D.C. is trying to dictate biological gender the next week? What about students who identify as “bisexual” or “fluid”? Leave this kind, supportive message on Gov. Bevin’s Message Line: 502-564-2611

As the Obama Administration pressures schools to allow students to decide what their “gender identity” is and use the facilities of the sex they believe they are, despite the objections of many parents and students, at least one Kentucky public high school is now allowing a biological male in the girls’ facilities. The Student Privacy Act allows administrators to consider the privacy rights of all the other students. Under this Act, administrators would determine how best to accommodate all students except they would not be allowed to place students of opposite biological sex in the same bathroom, locker room or overnight accommodation at the same time.

In Kentucky, the U.S. Department of Education has been telling School Districts across America that they must allow students with gender dysphoria to use the bathroom and locker room of their choice or the school will be guilty of violating Title IX. Opponents say Transgender Students are Vulnerable These students want to use the bathroom and locker rooms of the biological sex they identify as but are prevented from doing so by the sensitivity of their schoolmates. What’s more, many students fear violence and intimidation if they are allowed to use facilities of the sex they identify with. This is why the Obama Administration is appealing the Administration’s interpretation of Title IX. The Administration is appealing.

In 2015 two cases of students with gender dysphoria were decided in Federal Court. In both cases, the students were biological females identifying as males who sought to use their school’s male facilities. One school was a public university and one was a public elementary school. In both cases the schools did not allow the student to use the bathroom of the opposite biological sex and the students then forced the students to use the bathrooms that matched their biological sex. Instead they provided an alternate facility. Both schools were sued for discrimination under Title IX and, in both cases, the schools were found “not guilty” of discrimination in Federal Court.

Many students forced to share facilities with a biologically opposite student have experienced awkward, bullied, and unfortunately even suicidal. During the sensitive teen and pre-teen years emotions and fears often lead to isolation and destructive behavior. All students should be cared for while still balancing the needs of other students.

Policy for Kentucky schools. The Student Privacy Act would maintain local control by returning the decision to Kentucky citizens. Local control would be further maintained by allowing school administrators to determine how best to accommodate all students given their unique student body, programs and facilities. The bill simply eliminates one option — administrators cover place students of opposite biological sex in the same locker room, rest rooms or sleeping accommodations at the same time.

Proponents say Transgender Students are Vulnerable Students with gender dysphoria are the only students who feel vulnerable, bullied, and unfortunately even suicidal. During the sensitive teen and pre-teen years emotions and fears often lead to isolation and destructive behavior. All students should be cared for while still balancing the needs of other students.

Opponents say Transgender Students are Vulnerable Students with gender dysphoria are the only students who feel vulnerable, bullied, and unfortunately even suicidal. During the sensitive teen and pre-teen years emotions and fears often lead to isolation and destructive behavior. All students should be cared for while still balancing the needs of other students. Many students forced to share facilities with a biologically opposite student have experienced awkward, bullied, and unfortunately even suicidal. During the sensitive teen and pre-teen years emotions and fears often lead to isolation and destructive behavior. All students should be cared for while still balancing the needs of other students.

The purpose of Kentucky schools is to educate Kentucky students,” says Joyce Ostendorf, policy analyst for The Family Foundation. “Schools should not be used as vehicles to advance the Obama Administration’s liberal social agenda.”

Students prefer privacy too

In order to advance the Obama Administration’s liberal social agenda, the purpose of Kentucky schools is to educate Kentucky students,” says Joyce Ostendorf, policy analyst for The Family Foundation. “Schools should not be used as vehicles to advance the Obama Administration’s liberal social agenda.”

Students prefer privacy too
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Major decision on Instant Racing slot machines

The underneath of Kentucky’s instant racetrack slot machines raised a concern that it was not horse racing. The Obama Administration is pressuring schools to allow students to decide what their “gender identity” is and use the facilities of the sex they believe they are, despite the objections of many parents and students, at least one Kentucky public high school is now allowing a biological male in the girls’ facilities. The Student Privacy Act allows administrators to consider the privacy rights of all the other students. Under this Act, administrators would determine how best to accommodate all students except they would not be allowed to place students of opposite biological sex in the same bathroom, locker room or overnight accommodation at the same time.
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It is easier to tell the truth than to lie.

Senate Bill 180 has been targeted by groups and individuals who preach tolerance but do not practice it themselves.

SB 180 has nothing to do with a waiter serving a meal at a restaurant or a cashier at a retail store. It has nothing to do with a florist delivering flowers to someone. It is not about a lawyer or an attorney or a doctor or a dentist. It is not about the employees of any of these businesses. It is about the business owners themselves.

The critics of SB 180 in and around Frankfort are attacking the First Amendment rights of business owners who have the right to refuse to provide a service to someone who would go against their religious convictions.

The critics of SB 180 want to enact a new form of religious discrimination. They want a religious test of who can provide what service. They want to violate the rights of business owners. They want to violate the rights of their fellow citizens.

For instance, a Christian photographer who is asked to provide his creative services for a same-sex wedding, but he would not provide the African-American T-Shirt company who might be asked to print a T-shirt with White Supremacist messages.

SB 180 would provide a very small safe space for religious people whose beliefs are being threatened by those who preach tolerance. Those who believe in the First Amendment are the ones who are being threatened.

It is not only the bill protect the Christian photographer who is asked to provide his creative services for a same-sex wedding, but it would protect the African-American T-Shirt company who might be asked to print a T-shirt with White Supremacist messages.

Not only would the bill protect the Christian photographer who is asked to provide his creative services for a gay wedding, but it would protect the African-American T-Shirt company who might be asked to print a T-shirt with White Supremacist messages.

SB 180 has nothing to do with a waiter serving a meal at a restaurant or a cashier at a retail store.

SB 180 has nothing to do with a lawyer or an attorney or a doctor or a dentist. It has nothing to do with the employees of any of these businesses. It is about the business owners themselves.
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“Not only would the bill protect the Christian photographer who is asked to provide his creative services for a gay wedding, but it would protect the African-American T-Shirt company who might be asked to print a T-shirt with White Supremacist messages.”
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