

Good morning and thank you for coming. We are here to discuss House File 3396 and its Senate companion bill, SF 3002 as introduced.

These bills have been titled as the "**Individual's Right to Privacy and Safety in Public Accommodations Act**".

These bills pertain to human rights; clarifying certain provisions in the Human Rights Act which governs biological-specific accommodations. They amend Minnesota Statutes 363A and certain sub divisions.

This bill protects the privacy and public safety of adults and young people, both in our society and in schools.

This bill originated from a constituent of mine who works in the metro area. This is her testimony:

At her place of employment a man declared himself to be a woman this past year and informed the employer that he had decided to use the women's restroom. Both of these individuals were long time employees of this company. The employer decided not to object and the man began to use the women's restroom. This, according to my female constituent, caused great anxiety, discomfort and fear for her and other women. They complained to the employer and the remedy was to tape the cracks in the bathroom to prevent anyone from seeing into the stall. Needless to say this did not alleviate the fears or discomfort of the female employees. These women are now using a restroom in another building in order to protect their safety and privacy. My constituent is afraid to protest because she believes her job would be at risk.

- This bill is necessary after the MN Supreme Court decision in 2001, Goins v West Group, which dealt with the subject of individuals using the public accommodations of their choice rather than the traditionally assigned public accommodations based on their biological sex.
- The bill uses “sexual orientation” as already defined in MN law, and ensures that anyone, whether gay, straight, or “trans-gender,” may use a restroom based on **biological** sex, which is the only objective method of preserving the safety and privacy of all. The bill provides exceptions for small children accompanying an opposite-sex parent; disabled people accompanying an opposite-sex caregiver; emergency personnel; and maintenance personnel. It would also cover an opposite-sex person in a “bona fide” emergency (which could include emergency incontinence where no bathroom is otherwise available).

At this time I will call on Senator Scott Newman, an attorney, to comment on the 2001 MN Supreme Court case Goins v West Group as to why this bill is a necessary clarifying-extension on that decision.

After Sen. Newman, testimony from several citizens followed by questions