



SUNDAY CLOSING Fact Sheet

There are sound economic and social reasons for the prohibition on Sunday motor vehicle sales to remain in effect.

The Minnesota motor vehicle sales industry has fought for and supports the maintenance of this law since 1957.

- The current law is supported by new and used car dealers.
- The industry's 18,000 + employees are opposed to working on Sundays.
- Dealerships will sell no more cars in a year but will increase overhead by adding another day to their operating week -- it will increase dealers' costs by approximately \$20 million annually.
- Car dealerships require a wide range of skilled employees including mechanics, sales people, financing and insurance specialists, accountants, administrative staff, and various managers.
 - Labor union employees are opposed to working on Sunday.
 - Adding another day to the work week would require many employees to work overtime or be forced to take on fewer hours to allow for more part-time employees in the schedule.
 - Labor shortages, especially in rural Minnesota, already make it extremely difficult to find quality full or part time hires.
- Many dealerships are already open very late hours six days per week.
- Manufacturer support is not available to dealers on Sunday.
- Customers cannot register a motor vehicle title on Sunday.
- Customers cannot get insurance coverage on Sunday.
- Many rural areas do not have financing available on Sunday.
- There is no public outcry for dealerships to be open on Sunday. In fact, many consumers like to know that there is a day to shop without sales pressure.

The primary reason for the statute was to provide statewide uniformity with regard to the sale of motor vehicles by dealers. It was also enacted to provide car salespersons a day of rest, becoming a benefit in the industry and a way to attract and retain quality employees.

The Court Record

In 1997, Minnesota Courts rejected an attempt by the Minnesota Civil Liberties Union to overturn the state's law banning the sale of motor vehicles on Sunday. Both the District Court and Appellate Court held that the current law serves a legitimate state interest and is based upon the unique business and financial considerations applicable to the automobile sales industry.

"It is clear the law is a rational and reasonable response to both the particular concerns of the industry [a day of rest for employees] and the general concerns of the government [cost of vehicles to consumers]."