

Dear Chair Klemin and members of the House Judiciary Committee,

My testimony is in opposition to the House Bill 1333 . I strongly ask that you give this bill a Do Not Pass. This bill does little to advance any laws, as we already have bills about such things that are more than effective enough at subjects, such as indecent exposure and the like. It only seeks to strangle consenting adults performing for one another. This bill specifically calls out male and female posing performers but all it is is a shallow attempt to ban Drag shows at venues that allow them to do it (Often for charity purposes.) All this bill does is to further target consenting adults engaged in consenting activities. Because if its an event I don't wanna see? I just don't go to it so perhaps the people pushing this bill should just not go to these events if they do not like them. All of those activities listed are usually ticket and age checked at the door anyway.

The bill goes further to indicate "provide entertainment that appeals to a prurient interest, or similar entertainers, regardless of whether or not performed for consideration." I hope everyone understands what this means wholly in full context? Who decides if it's Prurient interests, because that seems ripe for abuse to me and used to pressure minorities. Did you know Women in pants were considered cross dressing not that long ago? So if any of the ladies of the legislation got a bill passed and danced in their seat a happy little dance is that illegal? Its televised kids could see it and a lewd display of power one might argue. You know men posing as women on stage has been a thing since before shakespeare's time? So now a theater, short on performers for a show, can't let their actors play other roles that don't fit their gender? The author of the bill may think the Prurient clause is a nice safe guard but it's not because again, who determines if it's Prurient interests? This law is solely to target, what the bill writers assume is, 'sexualized' behavior? This is in fact a poorly worded hate bill with far reaching consequences. There are Burlesque shows behind closed doors (in convention areas) age checked at the door that raise money for charity that are targeted by this. Theater performances shut down for fear of someone in the audience deciding a scene was a little too close to sexual because two actors have to perform a kiss. It wasn't intended as a Prurient display but the bill clearly states whether performed for consideration or not. Where does the bill end or start to even offer anything but oppression? All because the authors of the bill are worried about the LGBTQ+ community? Is their lifes really so sad they have to worry about what other consenting adults do around other adults? A god fearing republican lady in a suit on her way to Washington D.C. kisses her husband for just a moment too long in the airport because she won't see him for a few weeks... Or in another wording 'A crossdressing woman passionately kissing her husband in a public area where there COULD have been a kid! How disgusting and totally a Class C felony.' And many more examples I could waste all day laying out....

So all I can say in conclusion is this. This bill is hurtful, and does nothing to advance law but oppress people and give too much power to people who would abuse it. It targets an event that is and has been used plenty for charity purposes. It makes illegal activities that have been widely accepted for longer then our nation has existed. Criminalizes Normal and safe behavior. Please please please take these into consideration and vote Do Not Pass.

-Nathan Brown 1/22/23