

Laurie Higgins:

Hello, Illinoisans, it's *baaack*!

Yes, an [amendment](#) to the “Equitable Restrooms Act” is back thanks, ironically, to a woman—at least I *think* State Representative Katie Stuart (D-Collinsville) is a woman. It’s hard to tell these days.

Stuart has resurrected a moribund amendment to the Equitable Restrooms Act, which was passed in 2019 and took effect January 1, 2020. But before we get to Stuart’s pernicious amendment, some background about the Equitable Restrooms Act is in order.

The Equitable Restrooms Act was passed to remedy a problem of which every woman who has attended a large sporting event or concert is well aware:

“The General Assembly finds that an inequitable situation occurs due to delays which women face in the use of restroom facilities when men are rarely required to wait for the same purpose. Rectifying this inequitable situation is a matter of serious public concern. This Act shall be liberally construed toward that end.”

The Equitable Restrooms Act, which applies to “places of public accommodation,” recognizes differing needs that emerge from the sexual differentiation of the human species:

“A place of public accommodation shall be equipped with the following facilities:

- (1) At least one women's toilet stall for every 200 persons in the maximum legal capacity of the public accommodation.*
- (2) At least one men's toilet stall for every 700 persons in the maximum legal capacity of the place of public accommodation.*
- (3) At least one men's urinal for every 250 persons in the maximum legal capacity of the place of public accommodation.”*

Herein lies the problem for leftists: The Equitable Restrooms Act acknowledges the existence of two different sexes, which is exactly what the “trans” cult and its collaborators seek to eradicate.

The next devious step in the campaign to eradicate all public recognition of sex differences came one year after the Equitable Restrooms Act took effect.

In Feb. 2021, another traitor to women, former State Senator Melinda Bush, proposed the first incarnation of the amendment now being resurrected by Stuart. Bush's amendment was titled the "Equitable Restrooms—*All-Gender Act*."

As I wrote at the time, Bush's "amendment will mandate that if an existing *single-sex multiple-occupancy* bathroom is converted to a *mixed-sex bathroom*, any nearby single-sex multiple-occupancy bathroom must be converted to a mixed-sex bathroom. Further, if a *new* mixed-sex multiple-occupancy bathroom is constructed, any bathroom nearby must also be a mixed-sex bathroom."

"Trans"-cultists are inching closer to their dystopian dreams of a world that pretends sex differences have no meaning, and they're hoping no one notices.

Bush's amendment died, but like a rotting zombie, it has returned with a little help from Stuart, Daniel Didech (D-Buffalo Grove), Kelly Cassidy (D-Chicago), Hoan Huynh (D-Chicago), Maura Hirschauer (D-Batavia), Lindsay LaPointe (D-Chicago), and Mark Walker (D-Arlington Heights).

Curiously, for a bill that implicitly denies the meaning of sex differences, this amendment requires that "Stall dividers [be] equipped with a sturdy and functioning locking mechanism controlled by the user and a partition privacy cover or strip that ensures that no one is able to see through the space between the stall divider and door."

Americans have been told explicitly that the sexual integration of women's private spaces poses no risks to women, so why the need for all these elaborate changes to stalls?

Americans have also been gaslit into believing that feelings of modesty and the desire for privacy generated by biological sex differences are meaningless. But are they?

As I wrote in 2021:

“If biological sex as manifest in biology and anatomy has no intrinsic and profound meaning relative to undressing, nudity, or intimate bodily functions, then there remains no reason for any sex-segregated private spaces anywhere for anyone.

“If objective, immutable biological sex has no more meaning than eye color, then logically, sex-segregated bathrooms, dressing rooms, showers—including in high school locker rooms and college sports facilities, shelters, semi-private hospital and nursing home rooms, prisons, and dorm rooms make no sense.

“If biological sex is a superficial trait as unimportant as skin color, then it makes no sense for any woman to prefer female gynecologists for exams or female x-ray technicians for mammograms.

“If biological sex is a meaningless characteristic, then there remains no reason to require locker room attendants in middle and high school locker rooms to be of the same sex as the students they oversee. Would we ever require all locker room attendants to have a certain eye or skin color?

“But if objective, immutable biological sex is intrinsically and profoundly meaningful with regard to feelings of modesty and the desire for privacy when engaged in intimate bodily functions or undressing, then the refusal to respect and accommodate biological sex differences in private settings is evil.”

Illinoisans should by now be able to predict the next step. After Stuart's amendment passes, leftists will wait a while for Illinois women to adjust to having to walk past their male co-workers standing at urinals to enter stalls next to their male boss or male strangers. And then Illinois leftists will propose another amendment *requiring* that all *new and existing* multiple-occupancy bathrooms be co-ed.

How do you feel about that, moms and dads?