

## TESTIMONY OF JAMES BAILEY BRISLIN

Sen. Coleman, Rep. Fox, Sen. Kissel, respected members of the Judiciary Committee, good afternoon.

My name is James Brislin. I am a resident of Enfield and a 2L in the evening division at Western New England College School of Law.

I appear before you today to testify in opposition to the Bathroom Bill, H.B. 6599, also known by the Orwellian title, "An Act Concerning Discrimination".

First and foremost, Mr. Chairman, I wish to decry to procedural tactics employed to raise this legislation. For much of the session, I had been tracking this bill as H.B. 5901. Suddenly, last week, it was raised as H.B. 6599 on March 16 and scheduled for today's hearing, the following day. In essence, supporters of this measure were provided with less than a week's notice of the only public hearing on the matter.

Given how long we have waited for the committee to address this legislation, I fail to understand why it needed to be fast-tracked in this manner— why a hearing later on in the month wouldn't be better.

Certainly, this procedure has the appearance of trying to pull a fast one over the general public. This lack of transparency and openness was the calling card of the prior committee chairmen, and was best exemplified by their handling of S.B. 1098, the bill to restructure the Catholic Church. With the committee under new management, many of us hoped to see a new era of openness and transparency. The committee's handling of this measure has been a disappointment to me and to others and has not lived up to the high standards we should expect from our elected officials.

I oppose H.B. 6599 because it creates a new civil rights classification, "gender identity and expression", that is overbroad and reflects a flawed understanding of human sexuality. The "sex" classification has its basis in anatomy and physiology. The proponents of this measure are seeking to use the long arm of the law to redefine sexuality as a social construct, instead of as a matter of biology. In essence, if I wake up tomorrow and decide that I'm a woman, I would be able to act like a woman even though I have a male physiology. If this measure is codified as law, it will be confusing to children and promote an understanding of human sexuality that the vast majority of state residents strongly oppose.

I particularly object to Section 9, on page 8. If Section 9 is implemented, there is nothing to stop schoolchildren from being exposed to cross-dressing teachers. Likewise, there is nothing to stop a teacher from starting the year as Mr. Jones, going to have an operation, and returning as Ms. Jones. This is not right for the kids. Certainly when I was a child, my parents would not want me exposed to such gender confusion. I do not want that for my future children.

If this legislation passes, anyone who decides they are a member of the opposite sex would be able to use opposite sex restrooms. Connecticut General Statutes §46A-64(b) enumerates exceptions to the discrimination laws. Among the exceptions noted are exceptions for restrooms and locker rooms for the classification of "sex". The proposed legislation does nothing to extend that exception to "gender identity and expression" Consequently, transgendered men will be allowed to use the women's restroom, regardless of physiology. Sexual predators who want to prey on women and children will have a new tactic at their disposal: pretend to be transgendered and obtain access to the women's restroom.

We are counting on you, the members of the Judiciary Committee, to reject HB 6599 and protect the innocence of our children and the safety of our girlfriends, wives, and mothers. Thank you for your consideration.