

Many Quotes About AB 1266

By Autumn Sandeen

Published October 31, 2013 | Updated March 31, 2026

https://www.transadvocate.com/many-quotes-about-ab-1266_n_10570.htm

Abstract

I've collected a number of quotes from those against California's School Success and Opportunity Act (AB 1266) referendum signature drive and should it turn out to be successful. There's also some background quotes by some of the characters or organizations involved with signature drive as they give some context for previous comments. So, to give [...]

Article

I've collected a number of quotes from those against California's School Success and Opportunity Act (AB 1266) referendum signature drive and should it turn out to be successful. There's also some background quotes by some of the characters or organizations involved with signature drive as they give some context for previous comments.

So, to give you an idea of the measured words of the PJI at the hearing on AB 1266 (The California Success and Opportunity Act) bill and their current comments on their website, here's the link to PJI's Tom McReynold's testimony at that June 12, 2013 hearing:

Excerpt from the testimony:

[T]his takes us down the road of gender identity in a way that is fundamentally inconsistent with the views of most Californians, and we think will lead to problems in areas outside of San Francisco and L.A. Unified that are certainly common sense and creates some real liability concerns on the other side of the spectrum for our school districts.

...If opening up the restrooms to whosoever will is such a great idea; if desegregating restrooms is such a great idea, then let's not start with our students. Let's not start with the youngest of society. We're not just talking about high school students -- we're talking about grade school students in this bill. Let's start right here in the legislature. [laughs] If you think privacy concerns don't matter, I'd encourage you to take the signs off of your own restrooms and doors and see how you like it.

Of course the requirements of AB 1266 don't require taking the signs off of the doors at California's schools -- this is pure hyperbole.

Other commentary from PJI from Brad Dacus, president of the Pacific Justice Institute on AB1266:

It's a very extreme piece of legislation that grotesquely violates the right of privacy of boys and girls throughout California's public schools. No 13-year-old girls should have to have the continued apprehension of a boy seeing them naked in the locker room.

Unsigned statement from the PJI website “Gender Insanity”:

Under this legislation, there are absolutely no safeguards against abuse. Any teenage boy who “identifies” with teenage girls must be given full access to girls’ teams and facilities—including showers, bathrooms and locker rooms. Coaches and parents would have no say in the matter. This is not equality; it is insanity. We cannot stand by and allow politicians controlled by radical special interest groups to sacrifice the privacy of the 99% of our students who are not confused about their biological gender for the 1% (or less) who are. It is incredibly naïve for the Legislature to believe that such a law would never be abused or exploited by a predator.

More from Brad Dacus of PJI on AB1266:

Forcing boys and girls to share bathrooms, locker rooms and sleeping arrangements is not equality; it is insanity.

Testimony from Ben Perez’s (of the Traditional Values Coalition) testimony at the California State Senate Education Committee hearing on June 12, 2013:

Excerpt from his testimony:

This bill would call for any student and young adult who perceives themselves to be something other than their sex at birth to share shower facilities, restrooms, locker rooms with gender or sex they feel they are at any given time.

The problem is that this bill, or current law for that matter, affords a clear definition as to what constitutes legitimate gender identity and gender expression. The bill opens up Pandora’s box, in effect, that creates a slippery slope that allows anyone to claim they are something sexually and then have full access to the opposite sex facilities without regard to privacy.

We feel this is an absurd and offensive policy that would not bode well with the majority of students.

Speaking of things that are offensive, the TVC’s executive director Andrea Lafferty frequently has referred to transgender people as “she-males.” Here she is referring to trans people as she-males with regards to a Congressional ENDA hearing held in 2009:

During the hearing, every pro-ENDA panelist carefully avoided mentioning the fact that protecting “gender identity” in the law will force businesses and non-profits to cater to the whims of cross-dressers, transsexuals, drag queens, and she-males.

Andrea Lafferty again on the same subject of ENDA in another 2009 TVC post on their website using the same pejorative:

And, on the issue of ‘gender identity,’ one doesn’t have to be a psychiatrist or psychologist to clearly understand that if a person rejects his birth sex, he is experiencing disordered thinking. Even Members of Congress should be able to understand this simple truth. Disordered thinking is treatable. It should not be granted minority status under federal law.

...If Americans saw what these gender confused individuals looked like - and what impact they will have on business practices, they’d be outraged,” said Lafferty. “Imagine being forced to hire or retain a person who goes through half of a so-called sex change operation? Should a business really have to

deal with she-male demands? Or, to hire or retain a person who just “thinks” he’s the opposite sex, but doesn’t “transition” into another sex. The legal problems for employers will be insurmountable.

Andrea Lafferty yet again referring to transgender people as “she-males,” this time arguing against Montgomery County, MD transgender non-discrimination ordinance:

[Senator] Leventhal has just confirmed for us what we’ve been saying for years about the federal Employment Non-Discrimination Act and transgender sexual confusion. Maryland officials are considering and Congress has considered passing legislation that will force innocent girls into dealing with she-males, cross-dressers and transvestites in their shower stalls and locker rooms. Why should Montgomery County or the U.S. Congress be forcing Americans to cater to the whims of men and women who are mentally ill? Why does a man who thinks he’s a woman deserve special protections to use girl’s restrooms and locker rooms? Have our legislators lost their minds? It seems so.

The TVC’s Louis Sheldon on AB1266:

The lines will be forever blurred now that any youth can use any bathroom or locker room or play on any team they feel like. You can theoretically have an all-girls softball team made up of biological boys. This bill is absurd and mere lunacy. There was no public demand for this bill. Brown has cemented the adage that ‘California is the land of fruits and nuts.

Savecalifornia.com’s Randy Thomasson, regarding AB1266 recommended that California parents...

...protect their children from the insanity of biological boys in girls’ restrooms and girls’ showers and biological girls in boys’ restrooms and boys’ showers by exiting the dysfunctional, immoral public schools for homeschooling and solid church schools.

Thomasson, in an interview on AB 1266, also stated on the Jesse Lee Peterson radio broadcast (beginning at the 9:48 mark in the linked video) a call for trans pealed to have conversion (reparative) therapy:

It is not natural. It is not a civil right. It is not good because it destroys sexual boundaries. It is a depressed person who may be molested in their past, they may have had a terrible trauma from a father or mother or the absence thereof, and for a young child to go “Y’know, I’m going against my natural gender -- I’m a girl and I think I’m a boy” or “I’m a boy and I think I’m a girl” -- Y’know they don’t need a new law to force everyone to approve of that. They need good counseling to get to the core of the trauma that caused this disorder.

Thomasson again, this time from the 16:20 mark of that same linked video, stated that due to AB 1266, kids will be having consensual sex in girls restrooms/locker rooms, and that trans girls will rape cis girls and cis boys will rape trans boys:

[T]here is no way to deny a child -- a teenager in a government school -- from saying “Y’know,” a boy saying “I am female.” And, one day he goes into the girls showers, he’s on the girls teams, he’s in the girls restrooms -- What is going to happen in those restrooms? There’s going to be sexual...consensual sex with kids; there’s going to be non-consensual sex with kids -- lots of problems.

And, imagine that even if it's not someone who is creating mischief, somebody who is truly sexually confused...it is a teenage girl who goes into the boys showers -- imagine what happens there....the boys are probably going to do some very bad things to her.

More from Randy Thomasson:

Jerry Brown and the Democrats have targeted every kid in public school with gender-bending brainwashing.

Even more from Randy Thomasson in a World Net Daily article explaining why he called Masen Davis a “lady” on CNN:

At the beginning of the interview, the liberal host calls the woman who is a transsexual activist ‘sir,’ and refers both to her and I as ‘gentlemen. But at the end of the interview I say ‘good to talk to you ladies,’ because both the host and my bearded opponent are indeed biological females. (Of course, the bearded Masen Davis didn’t like this fact at all and she’s complaining to CNN about me - how tyrannical and anti-free-speech!)

Also stated by Thomasson from that same article:

SaveCalifornia.com loves all people, yet confused or malicious folks who don’t care about facts or truth call our love ‘hate.’ But it’s a fact that if you’ve inherited a Y chromosome from your father, you’re male; if not, you’re female. No one can alter God’s unchanging laws of nature. But the homosexual-bisexual-transsexual activists and their supporters can’t be bothered with facts, can they? Instead, they engage in ad hominem arguments and personal attacks.

Gina Gleason, a member of Privacy for All Students -- the coalition of religious right organizations (California Research Institute, PRI, SaveCalifornia.com, and a few more -- on the California Republican Party endorsing repeal by referendum of AB 1266:

Clearly the California Republican Party understands that AB 1266 is a threat to the privacy and safety of public school students throughout California. Forcing boys and girls to share bathrooms, showers and locker rooms will not decrease bullying. It is bullying.

From Frank Shubert, the National Political Director of the National Organization for Marriage (NOM) -- NOM having come out in support of repeal by referendum of AB1266:

[AB 1266’s] purpose is to advance an adult political agenda by special interests who wish to use our public schools as a tool to strip gender and gender differences from societal norms. In the process, the privacy and security interests of all students, including those who are transgendered, are compromised.

Schubert, in the same article, added that AB1266 uses children as “weapons in a culture war.” This mirrors what NOM’s Brian Brown stated when he said that AB1266 is using children as “weapons in [a] culture war.”

Also from Frank Shubert:

The truth, however, is that there is no such thing as “gender identity” any more than there is “ethnic identity.” There is only gender.

This is an example of what happens when politicians and activists push agenda politics, and where political correctness trumps objective reality. No matter what any politician or activist says, there are only two genders: male and female. Nature and chromosomes determine gender, not education bureaucrats, activists or politicians.

(Schubert’s article on the bill is [here](#)).

From Mat Staver of the Liberty Counsel comes this:

Speaking about the new California measure, Matt Staver, founder and director of the Liberty Counsel, said that Governor Brown’s signature allowing “students the right to use dressing rooms, locker rooms, and restrooms based on their subjective self-perceived sex, regardless of their birth gender, is unconscionable and extremely dangerous to children. Now, girls in elementary and high school will be forced to shower and change in locker rooms with boys masquerading as a girl. When an incident happens -- and no question, it will -- Governor Brown will have the innocence of that abused girl on his hands. This is not about intolerance or hatred or bigotry: it is about biology, which you cannot change, and common sense, which seems rare today. Staver warned that “until there is a public outcry and people stand up and say, ‘Enough is enough,’ our children will be in jeopardy!”

From Karen England of Privacy For All Students coalition and California’s Capitol Resource Institute (CRI):

AB 1266 is extreme, poorly drafted and utterly lacking in standards and safeguards. California law already protects transgendered students against discrimination and bullying. This bill is rife for abuse and subjects all California students to an unwarranted invasion of privacy, allowing them to be exposed to fully mature students of the opposite sex in school showers, bathrooms and locker rooms. It goes way too far.

That said, Karen England said passing SB 777 into law in 2007 already allows trans girls into girls locker rooms:

School boys have always made excuses to get into girls locker rooms -- now they won’t need any because it will be a state-sanctioned policy.

And Karen England also claimed the same thing was likely true for California’s SB 1477 (2006):

Under SB 1437 school districts would also likely have to do away with dress codes and would have to accommodate transsexuals on girl-specific or boy-specific sports teams. It is shameful that the same day parents are suing because many children are not prepared to pass a basic exit exam, the State Senate is preoccupied with promoting homosexual and transgender history in our schools. It is also shameful that the California Teacher’s Association is supporting this radical agenda when they should be focused on preparing our students in the fundamentals.

So was she was “crying wolf” and/or lying in 2006 and 2007 as to the effect of what SB 777 and SB

1477 be? Why the push to repeal by referendum AB 1266 if SB 777 and SB 1477 would still be law?

Well, for background on England's point of view, this is another statement of hers back from back in 2011:

If you're born a male or a female, then you should remain a male or a female on your birth certificate. It's actually quite deceptive -- and it shouldn't be legal to be able to have a birth certificate that has you identified as one sex when you're really another sex altogether. I don't know why we need to have special privileges on something this radical and controversial for people who are wanting to go through a sex change, or for people who are saying they want to go through it but want to conceal their identity or want to -- quote, unquote -- 'get married' under Proposition 8. It's just radical, and I can't believe they're even discussing this at the state legislative level.

There are problems with CRI's tax status and financial transparency that bring question to CRI's integrity.

Moving to a statement from Janice Shaw Crouse, Ph.D., of the Concerned Women of America:

Perhaps if schools focused on teaching the necessary basics and avoided eagerly following the latest pseudo-scientific fads, children would be better prepared for life by the time they graduate. But then, those pushing their warped progressive ideology wouldn't be able to experiment on them.

Gov. Huckabee stated the following at the Values Voters Summit about AB 1266:

So, Jerry Brown, the governor of California, this week signed a bill -- by the same legislature that passed a bill that said if six-year-olds, who are biologically boys think that they are really girls, that they should be able to go to the girls restroom. And if they're sixteen and they really -- maybe you're biologically all male but they identify as female, they should be able to go to the locker room with, shower with, and play on the sports teams of the girls. And, to those of us who believe that there is a difference between male and female, we would say 'We have been told you're on your own.' And by the way, it is a good thing that that didn't come up when I was in high school 'cause I'm pretty sure that every boy in my high school would have suddenly felt like that he was just a little more comfortable showering with the girls no matter how uncomfortable the girls might have been with it.
Is that not the craziest think you've ever heard?

And Ernest Istook, a Washington Times columnist, stated this regarding AB 1266 and gender identity in general:

Gender identity is the warped concept enshrined into California law in August when Governor Jerry Brown signed AB1266. Among other things, that law gives teen-age boys the right to shower with the girls in public school--no matter how loudly the girls object--if the guys say they think of themselves as female. The same boys can change their minds the next day, a concept known as being "gender fluid." ...
...Experience has shown that the activists who push for "gender identity" will keep pushing for more than mere tolerance. We've seen that in the same-sex and abortion causes. Soldiers and others are being pressured to disavow their personal religious beliefs, as are bakers and wedding

photographers. Doctors, nurses and pharmacists are threatened with loss of professional licenses if they don't assist in abortions.

The very notion of "gender identity" disregards biology. It's not about biological sex, or genes or DNA. It elevates an individual's behavior and their subjective state of mind over the rights and even the privacy of others. It's a bottomless pit of controversy. The best way to deal with it is to avoid it.

Now with all that said, it's important to keep statements that really reflect the content and intent of AB 1266. From the testimony about AB 1266 at the California State Senate Education Committee hearing on June 12, 2013 by the bill's sponsor, California Assemblymember Tom Ammiano (D-17). Text of his testimony:

The text of his statement:

Although current California law already protects students from discrimination in education based on sex and gender identity, many school districts are not in compliance with these requirements. AB 1266 clarifies existing law by requiring all students in K-12 be permitted to participate in school programs, activities, and use facilities in accordance with that student's gender identity -- to ensure compliance with current law and guarantee transgender students have the same opportunities to participate and succeed as others.

No student can learn if they feel like they have to hide who they are in school, or if they are singled out for unequal treatment. Denying transgender students equal treatment based on their gender identity denies them the right to a safe and supportive learning environment.

Schools across California, including some of the state's largest school districts, are in compliance with existing law by already accepting and supporting their transgender students and allowing them equal access to school activities and facilities based on their gender identity.

No harm has ever been documented when schools permit transgender students common sense, equal access on the same basis as all other students, treating transgender girls like all other girls and transgender boys like all other boys.

Making this requirement clear would help parents and students understand their rights, while also helping schools comply with the law -- reducing conflict and the potential for litigation while protecting students health and well-being.

This bill does not require schools to create new programs or new facilities for any students, and therefore would not have any fiscal impact.

I know this is a sensitive issue, but it is about families -- especially families that have a transgender child. It is in honor of these families that I ask you for an 'aye' vote.

Also in contrast is the testimony of Judy Chiasson, Ph.D. at same State Senate Education Committee hearing. Dr. Chiasson is a Program Coordinator for Human Relations at the Los Angeles Unified School District (LAUSD). Excerpt of Chiasson's testimony:

Excerpt from her testimony:

At first we had our concerns. Would letting students participate in activities and facilities that were consistent with their gender identities create problems? What would happen? And, ultimately we decided that we as the adults needed to manage our fears and give the students the respect and

dignity that they deserved. And I'm pleased to say none of our fears have been materialized. Our transgender students use facilities, participate in gym class and play on sports teams in a way that corresponds with their gender identity.

We treat our transgender students -- our boys, our transgender boys and girls -- simply like any other boys and girls with the same rights and responsibilities, rules, and obligations.

In the eight years that we've had our policy we've not had any problems. On the contrary, it has solved many problems. It's a nonissue on our campuses. Our transgender students use the bathrooms for the same reasons as everybody else. They do their business, fix their hair and make-up, and gossip with friends.

So when we instituted this policy we had no idea how many students that this would effect. In 2011, we conducted a survey in conjunction with the YRBS, the Youth Risk Behavior Survey, and we learned that point-five percent of our students self-identified as transgender. In a district of our size, that's about thirty-five-hundred students. We were shocked. We had no idea that we had that many transgender students.

For most of them, this is their private secret. But, we want them to know that we're here for them whenever they're ready.

(Dr. Chiasson also wrote a piece for the Huffington Post Gay Voices on AB 1266 entitled Success and Opportunity for Transgender Students that's worth reading.)

There are a lot of statements out there by a lot of social conservatives on AB 1266 that are worth noting, as well as statements by more knowledgeable people on the bill that are also worth noting.

I dread the reality that the list of statements against AB 1266 will likely grow in the next couple of weeks, and maybe beyond.

Suggested citation

Autumn Sandeen. "Many Quotes About AB 1266." TransAdvocate, October 31, 2013.
https://www.transadvocate.com/many-quotes-about-ab-1266_n_10570.htm