2023 HOUSE HUMAN SERVICES

HB 1403

2023 HOUSE STANDING COMMITTEE MINUTES

Human Services Committee
Pioneer Room, State Capitol

HB 1403
1/30/2023

Relating to prohibiting governmental entities from interfering with parental rights.

Chairman Weisz called the meeting to order at 10:40 AM

Chairman Robin Weisz, Vice Chairman Matthew Ruby, Reps. Karen A. Anderson, Mike Beltz, Clayton Fegley, Kathy Frelich, Dawson Holle, Carrie McLeod, Todd Porter, Brandon Prichard, Karen M. Rohr, Jayme Davis, and Gretchen Dobervich present. Rep. Kiefert not present.

Discussion Topics:

- Government and parent boundaries
- Constitutionality of the law
- Definition of government interest
- Amendment (23.0565.02000)

Representative Heilman introduced HB 1403 with supportive testimony. (#17809)

Mark Jorritsma, Executive Director of North Dakota Family Alliance Legislative Action, testimony in support of bill (#17684).

Patricia Leno, North Dakota citizen, spoke in favor of bill.

Aimee Cobas, Executive Director for the Council of Educational Leaders, testimony in opposition to bill, and proposed an amendment (#17550) (#17551) (23.0565.02000)

Nick Archuleta, President of North Dakota United, offered testimony in opposition to bill (#17709).

Todd Ewell, Deputy Director of North Dakota Commission on Legal Council for Indigents, spoke in a neutral position to HB 1403.

Additional written testimony:

- Bree Langemo, North Dakota citizen and parent, (#17546).
- Lucia Singleton, North Dakota citizen, (#17624).
- David Singleton, North Dakota citizen and parent (#17641).
- Faye Seidler, North Dakota citizen, (#17661).
- Kayla Gonser, North Dakota citizen and parent, (#17712)
- Teresa Johnson, North Dakota citizen, (#17741).

Chairman Weisz adjourned the meeting at 11:00am.

Phillip Jacobs, Committee Clerk By: Leah Kuball

2023 HOUSE STANDING COMMITTEE MINUTES

Human Services Committee
Pioneer Room, State Capitol

HB 1403
2/15/2023

Relating to prohibiting governmental entities from interfering with parental rights.

Chairman Weisz called the meeting to order at 4:11 PM.

Chairman Robin Weisz, Vice Chairman Matthew Ruby, Reps. Karen A. Anderson, Mike Beltz, Clayton Fegley, Kathy Frelich, Dawson Holle, Carrie McLeod, Todd Porter, Brandon Prichard, Karen M. Rohr, Jayme Davis, and Gretchen Dobervich present. Rep. Kiefert not present.

Discussion Topics:

- Committee action

Representative Fegley moved a DO NOT PASS on HB 1403

Representative Frelich seconded motion

Roll call vote:

Representatives	Vote
Representative Robin Weisz	Y
Representative Matthew Ruby	Y
Representative Karen A. Anderson	N
Representative Mike Beltz	Y
Representative Jayme Davis	Y
Representative Gretchen Dobervich	Y
Representative Clayton Fegley	Y
Representative Kathy Frelich	Y
Representative Dawson Holle	N
Representative Dwight Kiefert	Y
Representative Carrie McLeod	N
Representative Todd Porter	Y
Representative Brandon Prichard	N
Representative Karen M. Rohr	N

Motion Caries: 9-5-0

Bill carrier: Representative Fegley

Chairman Weisz adjourned the meeting at 4:14 PM

Phillip Jacobs, Committee Clerk By: Leah Kuball

REPORT OF STANDING COMMITTEE

HB 1403: Human Services Committee (Rep. Weisz, Chairman) recommends **DO NOT PASS** (9 YEAS, 5 NAYS, 0 ABSENT AND NOT VOTING). HB 1403 was placed on the Eleventh order on the calendar.

TESTIMONY

HB 1403

HB 1403 Testimony

I'm writing in opposition of HB 1403 and encourage our legislators to not support this legislation. As a parent of a transgender teen in the State of North Dakota, I find it more often than not that his LGBTQ+ friends do not have supportive home lives. HB 1403 provides fundamental rights for parents and effectively chills the rights of our youth, inviting abuse especially for our LGBTQ+ youth. Based on the data below, our LGBTQ youth in North Dakota have higher rates of suicidality, having seriously considered or attempted suicide, compared to their straight peers. Suicidality is reduced significantly when LGBTQ+ youth have a supportive parent or family at home. Unfortunately, a small number of LGBTQ+ youth, 5-7%, feel that they can talk to their parents when feeling sad, hopeless, or anxious. Significantly, 72% of our transgender youth report that their parents swore at them or put them down in the past year, and less than half of our transgender youth felt they had a teacher or adult to talk to if they had a problem. In addition, 27.2% of our transgender youth are not sleeping at home, and 20% have been kicked out, abandoned, or ran away. Please do not support HB 1403 as providing fundamental rights to parents can cause great harm to the unsupported LGBTQ+ youth in our state.

North Dakota High School LGBTQ+ Outcomes by Comparison

High School Data Split by - Transgender (T) Lesbian, Gay, Bi (LGB) Straight (S)			
Suicidality	T	LGB	S
Qn26 - Seriously considered suicide 12 months before survey	53.2%	50.4%	16.2%
Qn27 - Made a plan about how they would kill themselves in past 12 months	49.2%	42.8%	13.2%
Qn28 - Have ever attempted suicide in past 12 months	30.4%	23.4%	6.1%

Mental Health and Parents	T	LGB	S
Qn114 - Youth who would talk to their parents if feeling sad, empty, hopeless, angry or anxious	5.6%	7.5%	22.2%
Qn87- Youth who didn't usually sleep in parents or guardians home in the last thirty days	27.2%	7.3%	2.3%
Qn111 - Youth kicked out, ran away, or abandoned	20.0%	5.9%	2.7%
Qn115 - Youth whose parents swore at or put them down one or more times within 12 months of survey	72.2%	71.6%	44.6%
Qn25 - Youth who felt sad or hopeless almost every day for 2 weeks within the last 12th months	65.9%	71.4%	33.4%
Qn119 - Youth who reported mostly bad mental health within last 30 days	53.6%	64.8%	27.5%
Qn117 - Youth reporting one teacher/adult they can talk to if they have a problem	45.6%	56.8%	63.7%

Source: 2021 YRBS data from the ND Department of Public Instruction.

Testimony in support with request for amendment

HB 1403

Chairman Weiss and members of the House Human Services Committee. For the record my name is Dr. Aimee Copas and I serve as the executive director for the North Dakota Council of Educational Leaders. NDCEL represents all your school leaders throughout the state including Superintendents, Principals, and all other administrators and directors.

We come to you today with enthusiasm that parents are so very excited about engaging in the lives of their children and in their children's education. We do ask for a minor amendment to this bill so that it is very clear the role of education in the lives of the children and in partnership with the parent and how that may be interpreted. For years we as educators have witnessed the real retreat of parental involvement in our schools and lack of desire for parents to provide ground rules, basic parenting in manners, conduct, and in support of our educators who are not only trying to teach them basic academics but who are acting ***in loco parentis*** as is their responsibility according to the setting they work in. "In loco parentis" refers to the rights and responsibilities that certain organizations or individuals have about minors under their care. The term is typically used in reference to schools with respect to how the teachers and staff should behave toward the students. It can be used in a way that is meant to ensure schools have the rights to do what is necessary in the students' best interests, such as locker searches. "In loco parentis" can also refer to the responsibilities a teacher has for his or her students as the acting guardian for students in a classroom. As defined by the courts, this phrase has two fundamental applications about how schools and school employees

are expected to behave with students. One major use of the term is in reference to the rights schools have about students and behavior issues. Since a school is seen to be acting in the place of the parents of every student at the school, the school is expected to act in the highest regard to all students. This is the basis for actions such as locker searches, student conduct policies, and dress codes. Truly – local educators and school employees (teachers, administrators, paras, bus drivers, cooks, aids, coaches, etc.) are all key partners in assisting to create the contributing citizens to our state and world that we are hoping to create.

We love the concept of this invigoration in parent engagement because we as educators really miss the days of when a teacher would call home with an issue that was being seen at school and the parent was a partner in a resolution instead of immediately assuming their child could have "NEVER" done anything like that and point blame back at the school. Remember when we got in trouble at school, and it usually meant we were in more trouble when we got home. As educators, we are telling you-that partnership is one that we miss terribly. The kids know they have the upper hand in this one. They're smart – and we (educators and parents) need to re-lock our arms. Parents stepping back into the arena with us is wonderful.

Please know our educators approach their life's work and life's mission – to provide for a great education for kids – with a heart to do what is right for all students who enter the doors of their schools. Schools have witnessed a development of hostility to education in the national rhetoric and it has seeped into the fiber of North Dakota. Most parents would say…"my kid's teacher is fantastic, but we are fearful that our system of public education indoctrinates children in a left-wing ideological agenda; that public

schools alienate children from their families and cultures, thereby undermining parental authority; and that, basically, the goal of public education is to enlist children on the wrong side of our current culture wars." Except…have you recently noticed the conservative nature of our state? Your teachers and administrators and school staff are a part of the North Dakota culture too. We are your next-door neighbors, were your friends in high school, go to your church, have children in those schools as well, and by-in-large have the same conservative mindset of the parents they work with. We implore you to not allow this to become a playground for hostility. Allow this law to guide partnership.

This brings me to our request for a clarifying amendment. This amendment does not change the spirit of the bill, but rather helps everyone understand their role and perhaps aligns it even more appropriately.

Please see the attached amendment. We would ask that in the definition section we add a definition of "in loco parentis" as it pertains to this section of code. The term "in loco parentis" is a Latin phrase that translates as "in place of a parent" or "instead of a parent" and refers to how schools' teachers and school administrators are expected to act with reference to students and other minors. In other words, the employees of a school are charged by the parents of the students to act on their behalf while the students are there.

We furthermore as for the addition of freedom of liability when K12 schools or their employees are acting in good faith regarding "in loco parentis." Thank you for your consideration of these amendments.

23.0565.02000

Sixty-eighth
Legislative Assembly
of North Dakota

HOUSE BILL NO. 1403

Introduced by

Representatives Heilman, K. Anderson, Christensen, Frelich, Murphy, M. Ruby

Senators Barta, Beard, Boehm, Clemens, Weston

A BILL for an Act to create and enact a new section to chapter 14-09 of the North Dakota Century Code, relating to prohibiting governmental entities from interfering with parental rights.

BE IT ENACTED BY THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF NORTH DAKOTA:

SECTION 1. A new section to chapter 14-09 of the North Dakota Century Code is created and enacted as follows:

Interference with parental rights prohibition - Cause of action.

1. Notwithstanding any other provision of law, a governmental entity may not interfere with the fundamental right of a parent to direct the upbringing, education, health care, and mental health of the parent's child, unless the governmental entity demonstrates the interference:
   a. Furthers a compelling governmental interest; and
   b. Is narrowly tailored and is the least restrictive means available to further the compelling governmental interest.
2. If a parent's fundamental rights protected by this section are violated, a parent may assert that violation as a claim or defense in a judicial proceeding and may obtain appropriate relief against the governmental entity. The prevailing party in an action filed pursuant to this section is entitled to reasonable attorney fees and costs.

3. Exception of liability. K12 public schools and employees are exempt of liability when are in good faith acting 'in loco parentis' The term "in loco parentis" is a Latin phrase that translates as "in place of a parent" or "instead of a parent" and refers to how schools' teachers and school administrators are expected to act with reference to students and other minors. In other words, the employees of a K-12 school are charged by the parents of the students to act on their behalf while the students are there.

It is Sunday afternoon as I write this. I had just sat down by the fireplace with a good book for a rare chance to read something other than The Very Hungry Caterpillar or the rough draft of a middle schooler's book report when I received an email that the House Human Services Committee will be hearing **HB 1403** the next day. I was tempted to think to myself: *They'll do what they're going to do, regardless of what one little testimony might say. I probably am not going to change anyone's mind.*

Then one of my little ones looked up at me, smiling and giggling over the toy he was proud to have mastered. I wondered what he would say if he knew that his mama did nothing, NOTHING to try and influence the decision being made tomorrow that could have major impacts on his life. As the one entrusted with his care, his growth, his life, is it not my duty to do everything possible to positively impact him, even if I question the effectiveness of my efforts? At least, I can tell him (and myself) that I tried.

Ladies and Gentlemen, this is real and it is raw. I have vomited nearly nonstop for five consecutive months for each of my six pregnancies. I have given birth naturally, unmedicated, by C-section, and by VBAC. I have changed over 37,000 diapers, prepared over 71,000 meals, some of which were appreciated, and many of which were not. I have cleaned up carpet and bedding in the middle of the night when a child has been sick, showed them how to wash dishes, and helped them cry and understand and tried to comfort them when their uncle died. I have witnessed their trepidation and their joy upon taking first steps, learning to read, decorating a Christmas tree, and learning how to make friends. I have loved each one of their sloppy kisses as toddlers and cherished real, meaningful hugs from teenagers who are nearly as tall as I am. Their drawings and photos and magnet letters cover my refrigerator, and every night before I go to bed I look at a wall hanging my daughter gave me that says "I love that you're my Mom." And I decide to wake up the next morning, with God's help, to try to be worthy of that love she freely gives me.

Now, some of you may be moved to tears, and others of you may be internally rolling your eyes. My goal in sharing this with you is neither of those reactions, but instead to ask you, respectfully, that until you are willing to *die* for my children, as I am willing to *die* for them, that you PASS HB 1403, and prohibit governmental entities from interfering with parental rights.

Thank you taking the time to read this testimony.

As a parent in North Dakota, I am in favor of HB 1403.

Dear Chair Weisz and members of the House Human Services Committee,

My testimony is in opposition to House Bill 1403. I ask that you give this bill a Do Not Pass.

I'm a suicide prevention advocate that works primarily within North Dakota. I serve as the expert on LGBTQ+ data and outcomes. We have already had several bills proposed this legislative session that seek to empower parents with fundamental parental rights over all aspects of their child's life.

While I have not had time to keep up with the entirety of testimony being heard, I did manage to hear Samantha Field's testimony. She was representing the Coalition for Responsible Home Education and talked about the potential harm that becomes possible when parents have near absolute authority over their children.

She speaks about not being given a basic education or progressing past the eighth grade reading level. She speaks about the harm of fundamental rights being given to parents, because it makes the fundamental rights of youth virtually meaningless.

Senator Janne Myrdal, during hearing of Senate Bill 2231, suggested that many parents don't believe that being transgender is immutable. She went on to say that it was liken to anorexia and the goals should be to not continue in that direction. Meaning that one should help a youth with anorexia better manage food and nutrition or a youth with gender dysphoria should be made to get more comfortable with their physical anatomy.

Sen Myrdal said she does not agree with the science presented and I think many parents believe the same things she believes. I think many parents reject the science and best practices of our major medical medical organizations. And I believe we have clear evidence of the harm this has on youth when looking at it from a medical lens. The question becomes do parents have the right to harm their youth, based on personal belief?

While public perception is certainly geared towards being skeptical against transgender medicine, it is established, researched, practiced, and supported medicine. Allowing individuals to go against it from a medical framework is not different from allowing parents to use leeches as a cure for anything really.

And while arguing against trans medicine may seem reasonable or legislation that chills intervention for trans youth may seem palpable. The kind of power we need to instill in the individual to override medical authority on best practices is extremely far reaching. At what point do we allow a family to take a child home after they've been hit by a car and pray the injury away? And fear not, this family has sincere beliefs that praying will work. In the same way Sen Myrdral has sincere beliefs trans youth don't benefit from trans medicine.

I believe parents serve their youth best when they serve as advocates. I see parents excelling when they listen to their youth, encourage them, love them, give them opportunities to explore

and excel in all aspects of life. I've heard from parents and leaders of our healthcare and education institutes and I feel within North Dakota, parents do have great authority over being advocates for their youth.

I've heard of all of these institutes respecting and attempting to work with parents in every way possible while limiting the capacity for some parents to be neglectful or harmful. When I read HB 1403, I read it in the context of its capacity to do harm. I read it within its capacity to empower parents to be more abusive and have less oversight.

As I've said in previous testimony to these bills, I would implore great caution when attempting to expand these rights and in understanding the way they chill and serve to prevent protection to youth. I have already seen testimony from a director of the human service zones asking for clarifications on these bills and how some of them proposed would interfere with the capacity to help youth.

Does a parent have a right to determine their youth's gender identity? Do they have the right to refuse vaccinations? Do they have the right to refuse education, therapy, or diabetes medication? Do they have the right to starve their kid, if they think their kid is too fat? The right to lock their kid in the room the entire weekend? Let's ask these questions while considering the language within this bill:

> Notwithstanding any other provision of law, a governmental entity may not interfere with the fundamental right of a parent to direct the upbringing, education, health care, and mental health of the parent's child, unless the governmental entity demonstrates the interference

I will let other people speak to the policy considerations of this bill. What I worry about is youth and the youth who can't advocate for themselves. Who find themselves in homes that are not safe, with parents who do not care about them, and where they can't find help. I've seen kids in pain. I've seen kids feel hopeless. I've seen kids abandoned by the people who were supposed to love them. I've seen parents tell their own kid they don't want them anymore. That they don't love them.

And when a parent does not love their kid and has total control of their kid's upbringing, education, health care, and mental health - that is a scary situation. I see parents looking at legislation like this and thinking it will make them the absolute authority of their household. The king or queen of their kid's life. You don't need therapy kid, HB 1403 says I get to say what your mental health is.

And I see kids running away from these homes. I see kids turning to self harm. I see kids that become anxious and depressed or suicidal in these homes. Even though this law would potentially allow parents of trans youth protection against legal discrimination within the state while pursuing healthcare, the ability of this bill to empower abusive parents is far too broad.

According to the Youth Risk Behavior Survey, about 1.5% of our total youth are in homes where their parents are often violent to each other. 46% of total high school youth reported their parents or other adults in their home swore at them, insulted them, or put them down one or more times in the last twelve months before the survey. These numbers are higher for queer youth.

It is for these reasons I strongly urge you to consider voting Do Not Pass. Thank you for your time, consideration, and service to our state.

Best regards,
Faye Seidler

NORTH DAKOTA Family Alliance LEGISLATIVE ACTION

Faith · Family · Freedom

Testimony in Support of House Bill 1403

Mark Jorritsma, Executive Director
North Dakota Family Alliance Legislative Action
January 30, 2023

Dear Chairman Weisz and honorable members of the House Human Services Committee. My name is Mark Jorritsma and I am the Executive Director of North Dakota Family Alliance Legislative Action. I am testifying on behalf of our organization in support of House Bill 1403 and respectfully request that you render a "DO PASS" on this bill.

Given that we just discussed HB 1362, this bill has a similar intent – to codify that parents are the fundamental authority in all aspects of their children's lives. Thus, our comments are focused on areas where these two bills are the same or differ. Both bills specifically mention education, but HB 1403 notes other areas as well, including health care and mental health. However, both contain broad language that can be interpreted in a similar fundamental sense to cover all these areas.

The other way this bill differs is that it provides reimbursement of costs if a parent brings a suit against a governmental entity that their parental rights have been violated and the court decides in their favor. We believe that the addition of this section could offer some greater compliance of government entities with this bill.

North Dakota Family Alliance Legislative Action believes HB 1403 seeks to accomplish the same fundamental purpose as HB 1362 – protection of parental rights. For that reason, we respectfully request that you render a "DO PASS" on House Bill 1403.

Thank you for your time and I'd now be happy to stand for any questions.

1515 Burnt Boat Dr., Suite C-148, Bismarck, ND 58503
mark@NDfamilyalliance.org
701·355·6425
www.ndfamilyalliance.org

Great Public Schools *Great Public Service*

Testimony Before the House Human Services Committee
HB 1403
January 30, 2023

Chairman Weisz and members of the House Human Services Committee, I am Nick Archuleta, president of North Dakota United. I rise today to urge a ***do not pass*** recommendation for HB 1403.

HB 1403, Mr. Chairman, seeks to establish an already established fact. That is, that parents enjoy the right to direct all aspects of their child's upbringing, including his or her education. The 14th Amendment's due process clause, as has been interpreted by the US Supreme Court and the ND Supreme Court, ensures that right for parents.

Subsection 2 of Section 1 indicates that a parent can bring legal action against a government entity, like a school board, or a social services agency, if a parent feels that the entity violated a parent's "fundamental right." If that parent can convince a court that their right has, in fact, been violated, the court can award the parent "reasonable attorney fees and costs."

Mr. Chairman and members of the Committee, teachers do their absolute best to teach to the standards that have been developed by North Dakota teachers for North Dakota's students and which are approved by locally elected school boards. It is a very labor-intensive endeavor. Teachers have no idea what may trigger a parent into believing that the parent's rights, as described in this bill, have been violated. Even if the parent's claim is not compelling, is dismissed by the court, and the school district get reimbursed for the services of their attorneys, the relationship between that teacher and student may be irretrievably damaged. And, Chairman Weisz, anyone who knows anything about education knows that learning is predicated on relationships, and the learning relationship established between teachers and students is absolutely vital to student success.

Again, Chairman Weisz and Committee members, this bill is unnecessary and potentially harmful to quality teaching and learning. For that reason, ND United urges a ***do not pass*** recommendation for HB 1403.

As a parent in North Dakota, I am in favor of HB 1403.

As a parent in North Dakota, I am in favor of HB 1403.

Legislative Assembly

North Dakota House of Representatives

STATE CAPITOL
600 EAST BOULEVARD
BISMARCK, ND 58505-0360

Representative Matt Heilman
District 7
5501 Flatrock Drive
Bismarck, ND 58503-8929
mheilman@ndlegis.gov

COMMITTEES:
Education
Political Subdivisions

January 30, 2023

Chairman Weisz and Members of the Human Services Committee,

I am state Representative Matt Heilman from district seven. I am here before you today to testify on behalf of my parental rights bill, House Bill 1403. This bill will protect the parents in our state by ensuring their fundamental rights are protected, and if infringed, are allowed to receive appropriate relief. House Bill 1403 was modeled after Montana's bill.

In the special session of 2021, the legislature passed HCR 3049 stating that parents are the primary caretakers and guardians of their children. The resolution also states that parents are the primary stakeholders in their children's futures. HCR 3049 also says it is necessary to restore the balance of respect and power between parents and the government for the benefit of children by recognizing parents as the chief stakeholders of children's futures. This bill will do that by reinforcing the boundaries between government and parents.

Section one of this bill lists the fundamental rights as upbringing, education, health care and mental health. The bill goes on to say a government entity may not interfere with these rights unless there is a compelling government interest. I will elaborate more on the "compelling government interest" shortly.

Section two of this bill goes on to say a parent may be able to obtain appropriate relief against that government entity. The bill ends with saying that the prevailing party is entitled to reasonable attorney fees and costs.

The "compelling government interest" is word for word form the Strict Scrutiny Test. The Strict Scrutiny Test is one of three tests used to determine the constitutionally of laws that has been used going back to the 1940's. The three tests are the rational basis test, intermediate scrutiny, and strict scrutiny. Strict Scrutiny is the hardest of the three tests.

First, let us cover what "fundamental rights" means. Fundamental rights, as mentioned in the bill, are the upbringing of a child, education, health care, and mental health. The U.S. Constitution, Bill of Rights, and Due Process (5th and 14th amendment) also are included. However, fundamental rights also established by the Supreme Court include marriage, privacy, contraception, interstate travel, procreation, voting, and custody of one's child(ren).

Just for the sake of refreshing the mind, the 5th amendment says that an individual cannot be compelled by the government to provide incriminating information about themselves. This is often referred to as the right to remain silent or "pleading the fifth."

The 14th amendment has a few components to it as well. One of them being Due Process and the Equal Protection Clause. To quote from the 14th amendment "(Due Process) no state shall make or enforce any law which shall abridge the privileges or immunities of citizens of the United States; nor shall any state deprive any person of life, liberty, or property, without due process of law; (Equal Protection Clause) nor deny to any person within its jurisdiction the equal protection of the laws."

One of the earliest examples of Strict Scrutiny was Skinner v. Oklahoma (1942). In this Supreme Court case, it was decided that the state cannot sterilize convicted criminals. This helped establish procreation as a fundamental right. Another was Loving v. Virginia (1967) where the Supreme Court struck down a state law banning interracial marriage. Strict Scrutiny is not limited to the U.S. Supreme Court, these are just more notable cases where it was used.

The process of the Strict Scrutiny Test is not terribly complicated. The main purpose is to determine the constitutionally of a law. There are two factors: the first being what is the government's purpose and the second is how the law accomplishes the purpose.

When talking about purpose, there are three purposes. 1. A legitimate purpose (rational basis test) where there is a rational relationship between government and the law passed. 2. The other is the important purpose (intermediate test) where there is a substantial purpose between government and the law that was passed. 3. The last one is the compelling purpose (Strict Scrutiny Test) where relationship between government and the law has to be narrowly tailored or least restrictive to meet that compelling interest. In that respective order, each one is harder than the other with Strict Scrutiny being the hardest.

As you can see, it is used when there is discrimination against race, religion, freedom of speech and other fundamental rights. This legislation is crucial to pass to ensure the fundamental rights of parents are protected. Let us build off the past resolution by passing this parental rights bill. Together we can ensure the parents in our state will have their fundamental rights protected. I respectfully ask for a due pass recommendation and I will stand for any questions.