

**Testimony in Opposition to SB2307**  
**Presented to the North Dakota Legislative Assembly**  
**Presented by Meghan Anderson**

Dear members of the North Dakota 69<sup>th</sup> legislative assembly. Thank you for the opportunity to provide testimony today. My name is **Meghan Anderson**, and I am here to strongly oppose **SB2307**, a bill that—though well-intended—poses serious threats to our **constitutional freedoms, fiscal responsibility, and the rights of parents** in North Dakota.

**1. First Amendment and Government Overreach**

As conservatives, we believe in limited government and the constitutional rights of individuals. The First Amendment of the U.S. Constitution protects freedom of speech and prohibits government overreach in regulating content. SB2307 treads dangerously close to government-mandated censorship, which is precisely the kind of overreach that conservatives have fought against for decades.

By attempting to impose vague standards such as “modern North Dakota standards” and “prurient interest,” this bill grants unchecked authority to government officials to decide what information is appropriate for the public. This opens the door for political bias and selective enforcement, something that should concern every freedom-loving North Dakotan.

Today, the government might target books that some find offensive. Tomorrow, it could be speech, political opinions, or even religious texts. The best way to preserve our freedoms **is to resist unnecessary government control from the start.**

**2. Protecting Parental Rights, Not Expanding Government Control**

North Dakota Republicans have long stood for parental rights. We trust parents—not the government—to make the best decisions for their children. SB2307 takes that power away.

Rather than empowering parents to oversee their children’s education, this bill imposes a one-size-fits-all approach dictated by state officials. If a parent believes a book or resource is inappropriate, they have every right to guide their child's reading habits. That decision should not be made by bureaucrats or politicians in Bismarck.

Conservatives don’t want government deciding what we can and cannot read. If we wouldn’t trust the government to regulate news, religious materials, or political speech, why would we trust it to regulate our libraries?

### 3. Financial Burden and Unfunded Mandates

Republicans also stand for fiscal responsibility and local control, yet SB2307 imposes unnecessary costs on taxpayers without offering funding solutions.

- Public libraries, schools, and state agencies would be forced to purchase new filtering software, hire compliance officers, and spend valuable resources on enforcement.
- County attorneys, already stretched thin, will now have to police library materials instead of focusing on serious crimes that affect public safety.
- Small towns and rural communities, many of which already struggle with funding their libraries, will face disproportionate burdens—forcing them to cut services or even close facilities.

This unfunded mandate goes against our conservative principles of fiscal prudence and small government. If the state is going to force regulations on local communities, who is going to pay for it?

### 4. Unintended Consequences: A Slippery Slope Toward Censorship

While SB2307 claims to target explicit materials, it opens the door to broader censorship.

- Books on history, health, and literature could be wrongly classified as inappropriate.
- Sex education materials could be removed, limiting access to critical health information that prevents teenage pregnancy and disease.
- Classic works of literature like Shakespeare, Mark Twain, and even the Bible contain content that, under broad interpretations, could be deemed inappropriate.

By allowing a vague, subjective standard to dictate what can and cannot be accessed, we risk losing valuable educational and historical resources.

---

### Conclusion: Keep Government Out of Libraries

Republicans have long championed **freedom, personal responsibility, and local control**. SB2307 contradicts these values by:

- Expanding government control over personal and educational choices
- Forcing taxpayers to fund unnecessary bureaucracy

- Undermining parental rights in deciding what their children can and cannot read
- Creating a pathway for government overreach into censorship

If we truly believe in freedom and limited government, we must oppose SB2307. Let parents—not the government—decide what’s appropriate for their families. Let’s focus taxpayer dollars on real issues, not expensive and unnecessary regulations.

I urge you to **vote no to this bill** and instead support policies that empower families, protect constitutional freedoms, and uphold the principles that North Dakota Republicans stand for.

Thank you for your time.