January 12, 2023

## **VIA EMAIL**

Representative Ginny Klevorn, Chair Members of the House State & Local Government Finance & Policy Committee Representative Carlie Kotyza-Witthuhn Room 10, State Office Building St. Paul, Minnesota 55155

Re: Support for HF 1: the Protect Reproductive Options Act

Dear Members:

I write in strong support of HF 1 which codifies the Minnesota Supreme Court's ruling in *Doe v. Gomez*, 542 N.W.2d 17 (Minn. 1995) that the right to abortion is protected by the Minnesota Constitution. In particular, I'd like to highlight the importance of subdivision 5.

Last fall, the Prinsburg City Council took up an ordinance that would have allowed its residents to personally sue abortion providers, including companies that provide legal abortion drugs by mail, despite the Minnesota Supreme Court's ruling in *Doe v. Gomez*.

After I advised the Prinsburg City Council that the proposed ordinance was unconstitutional and preempted by state law under *Doe v. Gomez*, they unanimously voted it down. But proponents of the ordinance have vowed to continue pressing other rural Minnesota communities to adopt it. Notwithstanding their obvious illegality, local government regulations like the proposed City of Prinsburg ordinance stand to confuse and dissuade Minnesotans from exercising their fundamental right to make autonomous decisions about their own reproductive health, thus potentially undermining the PRO Act.

Subdivision 5 codifies the PRO Act's preemptive effect by expressly preempting all local government regulations—like the ordinance recently considered by the City of Prinsburg—that conflict with or seek to limit an individual's rights under the PRO Act. It puts local government units across the State on notice that regulating reproductive health is beyond their authority.

Sincerely,

Keith Ellison

Minnesota Attorney General