

January 29, 2025

Testimony to the House Committee on Judiciary

NAME: Cynthia Gentry

TITLE: Kansas Citizen

EMAIL ADDRESS: ckgentry2011@gmail.com

BILL NUMBER: HB 2062 Providing for Child Support Orders from the Date of Conception

PROPONENT, OPPONENT, or NEUTRAL: Opponent

ORAL or WRITTEN ONLY TESTIMONY: Written only

Chair Humphries & members of the committee,

I am writing to voice my opposition to bill HB 2062. Please vote NO on HB 2062. I work in OB/GYN healthcare and see first hand the effects of restricted care for women based on laws that restrict physicians on how they can care for pregnant women. At “conception” the fetus is a few cells and may or may not be viable to full-term. Viability does not start until 24 weeks at best.

This bill would limit healthcare access and options for pregnant women. When fetus “rights” are elevated above the health and rights of a pregnant woman, healthcare professionals and settings may withhold life-saving medical care.

This bill would also decrease OB services in our state. When state legislatures restrict medical professionals’ ability to perform healthcare, many medical professionals flee the state, resulting in the closure of delivery rooms and OB services. Already, rural areas are a desert for OB/GYN’s.

I strongly urge you to vote no on bill HB 2062]

Cynthia Gentry
Shawnee KS

January 29, 2025

Testimony to the House Committee on Judiciary

NAME: Danielle Giarla

TITLE: Kansas Citizen

EMAIL ADDRESS: daniellegiarla@gmail.com

BILL NUMBER: HB 2062 Providing for Child Support Orders from the Date of Conception

PROPONENT, OPPONENT, or NEUTRAL: Opponent

ORAL or WRITTEN ONLY TESTIMONY: Written

Chair Humphries & members of the committee,

I am writing to voice my opposition to bill HB 2062.

Please vote no on HB 2062. This bill could criminalize miscarriages that are naturally-occurring. A bill like this would jeopardize women's health and prevent women from seeking medical care that could save their life or their fertility in the future. The state cannot put legal rights onto a fetus or embryo without subjugating the rights of individuals who are pregnant. Additionally, fetal personhood laws could impact contraception access.

Kansas voters have made it clear the last few years that we do not want our government making laws in regards to our bodies and reproductive rights. We can make our own private medical decisions with our doctors.

Danielle Giarla

Kansas Citizen

Lenexa

susanmhumphries@gmail.com

H.Judiciary@house.ks.gov

January 29, 2025

Testimony to the House Committee on Judiciary

Joan T. Gilson, PhD

Resident, citizen of Johnson County Kansas, Great Grandmother, Retired Professor

Writerslife2012@gmail.com

HB 2062 Providing for Child Support Orders from the Date of Conception

Opponent

WRITTEN ONLY TESTIMONY

Chair Humphries & members of the committee,

I am writing to ask you not to move HB 2062 out of committee and not to support its re-introduction. This bill will not accomplish any useful purpose for protecting infants and mothers; on the contrary, you will find that you have incurred a number of unintended consequences, not limited to but including increased taxation on us to support its enforcement. Furthermore, fewer obstetricians will come to Kansas to start their practices because of this unwarranted intrusion. This bill will also cause unnecessary results in terms of insurance premiums, state and federal supported benefits to families and children, and harmful medical results, especially with regard to the medical and emotional trauma of miscarriage.

As you examine bills this session, please give a thought to the already overburdened taxpayers. We don't to pay for a bill like this that creates expensive, unenforceable administrative structures and that further interferes with couples and women as they try to raise their families.

Thank you for your service to the people of Kansas. We know you put in long hours for little return, and we understand some of the challenges you face in your efforts to support us. Please vote no on HB 2062.

Sincerely,

Joan T. Gilson, PhD

Lenexa Kansas

January 29, 2025

Testimony to the House Committee on Judiciary

NAME: Jennifer Gragson

TITLE: Kansas Citizen

EMAIL ADDRESS: jenniferlynnballard@gmail.com

BILL NUMBER: HB 2062 Providing for Child Support Orders from the Date of Conception

PROPONENT, OPPONENT, or NEUTRAL: **OPPONENT**

ORAL or WRITTEN ONLY TESTIMONY: **WRITTEN ONLY**

Chair Humphries; members of the committee,

I am writing to voice my **opposition** to bill HB 2062.

Please vote no on HB 2062 as it jeopardizes IVF services for families that very much want children. This bill is a step toward fetal personhood and could impact or halt the use of in vitro fertilization (IVF). We saw the result of this disastrous outcome in Alabama.

Kansas voters have repeatedly voted in support of reproductive rights and the right to make their own private medical decisions, including the right to choose. Please vote no on HB 2062.

Jennifer Gragson

Kansas Citizen

January 29, 2025

Testimony to the House Committee on Judiciary

Rose Grimes

ypicc@att.net

HB 2062 Providing for Child Support Orders from the Date of Conception

Opponent

Written Testimony:

Chair Humphries & members of the committee,

I am writing to voice my opposition to bill HB 2062.

Please vote No on HB 2062. This bill would limit healthcare access and options for pregnant women. When fetus “rights” are elevated above the health and rights of a pregnant woman, healthcare professionals and settings may withhold life-saving medical care.

HB 2062 would interfere with some woman’s religious beliefs whether an embryos and fetuses are the same as a living child from the date of conception. Not all religions believe this nor does science and the medical field. Some religions believe that until an infant is born and takes its first breath on its own, they are a child. This bill interferes with the Separation of Church and State and is against the law.

Five different religion organizations have sued the state of Missouri for their abortion ban because it takes away a woman’s right of her Freedom of Religion.

In 2022, Kansas voters 59% to support the reproductive rights and the right to make their own private medical decisions, including the right to choose. Voters have repeatedly voted to support the right to choose.

Please vote No on HB 2062

Rose Grimes

Overland Park, KS.

January 29, 2025

Testimony to the House Committee on Judiciary

NAME: deAnne Guarino

TITLE: Kansas Citizen

EMAIL ADDRESS: maisiejoyguarino@gmail.com

BILL NUMBER: HB 2062 Providing for Child Support Orders from the Date of Conception

PROPONENT, OPPONENT, or NEUTRAL: Opponent

ORAL or WRITTEN ONLY TESTIMONY: written

Chair Humphries & members of the committee,

I am writing to voice my opposition to bill HB 2062.

Kansas of all political parties, walks of life and ages came out in August 2022 and voted for the government to STAY OUT of our business. Stop trying to legislate one person's or should I say one church's version morality.

I strongly urge you to vote no on HB 2062.

deAnne Guarino

Ottawa

January 29, 2025

Testimony to the House Committee on Judiciary

NAME: Rupal Gupta, MD, FAAP

TITLE: Pediatrician, Kansas Citizen

EMAIL ADDRESS: rupalpinto@gmail.com

BILL NUMBER: HB 2062 Providing for Child Support Orders from the Date of Conception

PROPONENT, OPPONENT, or NEUTRAL: OPPONENT

ORAL or WRITTEN ONLY TESTIMONY: WRITTEN ONLY

Chair Humphries & members of the committee,

As a physician and mother, I urge you to please vote no on HB 2062. The bill would limit healthcare access and options for pregnant women. When fetal rights are elevated above the rights of pregnant women, healthcare providers and medical settings may withhold life-saving medical care to the mother.

At its surface, the bill would allow pregnant women to claim child support for medical and pregnancy-related expenses, starting any time after the date of conception. However, it is simply a thinly-veiled attempt to pass a fetal personhood law, which would allow the state to regulate pregnant women.

Fetal personhood laws could have major negative implications for pregnant people. If a fetus is legally considered a person, then child endangerment laws can apply. If a pregnant woman must undergo chemotherapy for cancer treatment, she could in theory be told to postpone necessary care because of potential harm to the fetus.

Kansas voters have repeatedly voted in support of reproductive rights and the right to make their own private medical decisions, including the right to choose. People who are pregnant require the autonomy to make their own medical decisions.

Please vote no on bill HB 2062.

Rupal Gupta, MD, FAAP

Pediatrician

Leawood, KS

Legislative Testimony

In **Opposition** to HB2062
House Committee on the Judiciary
January 29, 2025

| WRITTEN ONLY |

Dear Chairman Carpenter and Members of the Committee,

My name is Rashane Hamby, and I serve as the Director of Policy and Research at the American Civil Liberties Union of Kansas. The ACLU of Kansas, a nonpartisan, non-profit organization with over 35,000 supporters statewide, is dedicated to preserving and strengthening the civil rights and liberties of every Kansas resident. We have profound concerns about HB 2062, a bill that seeks to amend K.S.A. 20-165, 23-2205, and 23-3001, fundamentally altering the legal landscape regarding child support, parental relationships, and the definition of a child to include fetuses under the guise of child support reform. HB 2062 poses a direct threat to women's reproductive rights and perilously divides the rights of women and fetuses. This legislation is not just a matter of public policy; it's a matter of civil liberties, deeply entangled with the autonomy and dignity of women and pregnant people across Kansas.

Back Door Attack on Women's Reproductive Rights

Firstly, HB 2062 represents a backdoor assault on women's reproductive rights. By extending child support obligations to fetuses from the moment of conception, this bill stealthily aims to establish legal personhood for fetuses. Such a move is a foundational step towards restricting access to forms of reproductive healthcare, including abortion, that are protected by the Kansas constitution. It sets a dangerous precedent, subtly weaving the notion of fetal personhood into the fabric of law, thereby imposing moral and legal constraints on a woman's constitutional right to make personal healthcare decisions.

Dangerously Separates the Rights of the Fetus and the Woman

Moreover, HB 2062 dangerously separates the rights of the fetus from those of the pregnant woman, creating a dichotomy where the health, well-being, and autonomy of the woman are overshadowed by the rights attributed to the fetus. This separation is not only philosophically troubling but also practically hazardous. Such legislation disregards the complex, nuanced realities of pregnancy and childbirth, reducing women to mere vessels for procreation, stripping them of their agency and rights.

Implications for Women's Health and Autonomy

The bill's narrow definition of "elective abortion" further exemplifies its attempt to curtail women's autonomy. By disallowing considerations of mental health or life circumstances in decisions about abortion, HB 2062 undermines the principle that pregnant people should make informed choices about their bodies and futures. It dangerously oversimplifies the myriad reasons behind the deeply personal decision to terminate a pregnancy, dismissing the socio-economic, health-related, and personal factors that are weighed in making such decisions.

www.aclukansas.org
913-490-4100
Post Office Box 13048
Overland Park, KS 66282

ACLU
Kansas

Legislative Testimony

In **Opposition** to HB2062

House Committee on Federal and State Affairs

February 15, 2024

In conclusion, HB 2062 is not merely a proposal about child support; it is a calculated move to undermine women's rights . As such, it raises grave concerns about its consistency with the Kansas state constitution. This bill, if passed, would set a dangerous precedent, not just in Kansas but potentially across the nation, inviting further encroachments on women's reproductive freedoms. It is imperative that we recognize and resist such attempts to infringe upon women's autonomy and rights. I urge you to oppose HB 2062, standing firm in the defense of civil liberties and the rights of women and pregnant people to make autonomous decisions about their bodies and lives.

Thank you.

Rashane Hamby
Director of Policy and Research

www.aclukansas.org
913-490-4100
Post Office Box 13048
Overland Park, KS 66282

ACLU
Kansas

January 29, 2025

Testimony to the House Committee on Judiciary

NAME: Bethany Hanson, PhD

TITLE: Kansas Citizen

EMAIL ADDRESS: beforseth@gmail.com

BILL NUMBER: HB 2062 Providing for Child Support Orders from the Date of Conception

PROPONENT, OPPONENT, or NEUTRAL: Opponent

ORAL or WRITTEN ONLY TESTIMONY: Written only testimony

Chair Humphries & members of the committee,

I am writing to voice my opposition to bill HB 2062.

Kansas residents have, in multiple elections, supported women in making their own decisions, supported women's right, & women's access to healthcare (this includes access to abortions). This in effort, please vote no on HB 2062. This bill would limit healthcare access and options for pregnant women. When fetus "rights" are elevated above the health and rights of a pregnant woman, healthcare professionals and settings may withhold life-saving medical care.

In aligning with what KANSAS RESIDENTS HAVE ALREADY VOTED FOR, I urge you to vote no on bill HB 2062.

Bethany Hanson, PhD

Lenexa, KS

January 29, 2025

Testimony to the House Committee on Judiciary

NAME: Brittany Harbuck

TITLE: Kansas Citizen

EMAIL ADDRESS:

BILL NUMBER: HB 2062 - Providing for Child Support Orders from the Date of Conception

PROPONENT, OPPONENT, or NEUTRAL: Opponent

ORAL or WRITTEN ONLY TESTIMONY: Written

Chair Humphries & members of the committee,

I am writing to voice my opposition to bill HB 2062.

I am afforded a unique opportunity to speak to this bill. In summer 2023, my wife and I made the decision to uproot our lives and our two young daughters to leave the only home we've known in Jackson, Mississippi to relocate to Kansas. If Jackson sounds familiar, it's because it's home to the named plaintiffs in *Dobbs v. Jackson* and the decision to overturn reproductive rights for an alarming number of Americans. We know all too well the far-reaching impact such a decision has on a state, and such decision was the final deciding factor in our choice to leave.

Mississippi is a case study in the failure of the people by their elected officials. It is a state with failing schools, food insecurity, abysmal infrastructure, and the poorest healthcare for the unhealthiest state in the nation. But their focus has been undermining the bodily autonomy of their constituents for the 30-something years I was a resident. And they did so with such success, it has touched the majority of the country. And the impacts have been immediate and will touch Mississippians for generations to come. They did so despite the rising poverty rates. They did so despite an overburdened department of human services and a lack of licensed foster homes. They did so despite the alarmingly high maternal mortality rate, of which Black women were most vulnerable. Let me be perfectly clear, this bill will kill women. It has already done so nationwide.

When we made the decision to leave, we were lucky enough to work in fields that could have afforded us the opportunity to move anywhere in the country. But we chose to become Kansans. This state has welcomed us with open arms, and we have fallen deeply in love with its people and landscape. When we chose Kansas, it was with the comfort of knowing that just the year prior KANSANS spoke and overwhelmingly decided to protect the right to choose what women do with their own bodies. We, as parents, have the right to help guide our young daughters in the decisions

they make about their own health. Just as we do about ear piercings or haircuts or the choice to vaccinate them. Attempting to undermine the voice of your constituents when they have spoken is a weak attempt to hold power. If this were truly about respecting life, Mississippi would not be experiencing both a collective brain drain and unnecessary suffering and death of their women.

Kansans deserve better and deserve representation that respects what they have loudly, repeatedly spoken with their votes. We want the right to make our own private medical decisions. Please vote NO on HB 2062.

Brittany Harbuck, mom of two.

Gleefully a Kansan, former Mississippian

Shawnee

Amy Hartman

Kansas Citizen, mom, teacher

amyhartmantwins@gmail.com

BILL NUMBER: HB 2062 Providing for Child

Opponent

Chair Humphries & members of the committee,

I am writing to voice my opposition to bill HB 2062.

Please consider the grave impact this will have on women. Women are dying in parking lots because they can not get the life saving care they need because of similar bills.

Please vote no on bill HB 2062

Amy Hartman

Overland Park

January 29, 2025

Testimony to the House Committee on Judiciary

NAME: Brigitte Hartman

TITLE: Kansas Citizen

EMAIL ADDRESS: briggettehartman@gmail.com

BILL NUMBER: HB 2062 Providing for Child Support Orders from the Date of Conception

PROPONENT, OPPONENT, or NEUTRAL: Opponent

ORAL or WRITTEN ONLY TESTIMONY: Written Only

Chair Humphries & members of the committee,
I am writing to voice my opposition to bill HB 2062.

This bill seems good on the surface, as a way to help pregnant women with the costs associated with pregnancy. However, it is an attempt to create a fetal personhood law. If a fetus is considered legally a person, then abortion would not be allowed. In 2022, Kansans voted to keep abortion legal in the state, and this is an underhanded way of trying to get around the will of the people as expressed by the majority who voted to keep abortion legal in our state. In other states where abortion has been outlawed, such as Texas and Georgia women with wanted pregnancies have died after having pregnancy complications that required abortions because doctors were afraid to act for fear of prosecution under strict abortion laws. I do not want this to happen to women in the great state of Kansas.

Kansas voters have repeatedly voted in support of reproductive rights and the right to make their own private medical decisions, including the right to choose. Please vote no on HB 2062.

Brigitte Hartman
Lifelong Kansas Citizen
Larned, KS

January 28, 2025

Testimony to the House Committee on Judiciary

Jenney Hatcher

Kansas Citizen, Nurse Practitioner, and life-long Catholic

HB 2062 Providing Child Support Orders from the Date of Conception

OPPONENT

Chari Humphries & members of the committee,

I am writing to voice my opposition to bill HB 2062.

Kansans spoke loud and clear on this topic in 2022. Abortion is healthcare. Leave the decision to women and their doctors. There is much nuance and complexity to this topic, and women deserve autonomy over their bodies! What Kansas legislators are attempting to do goes against rights to privacy and control over one's body, reproductive autonomy, anti-sex discrimination laws, and medical expertise.

No male would EVER stand for having his rights to bodily autonomy, healthcare, and well-being taken away from him. How dare you all consider that women do not deserve the same. The law currently allows room for the complexities of reproduction. HB 2062 is a devious and underhanded attempt to strip women of their constitutional rights. We demand you vote no on bill HB 2062.

Jenney Hatcher

Wichita, Kansas

January 29, 2025

Testimony to the House Committee on Judiciary

NAME: Deborah Headley-Johanning

TITLE: Kansas citizen

EMAIL ADDRESS: debjohanning@hotmail.com

BILL NUMBER: HB 2062 Providing for Child Support Orders from the Date of Conception

PROPONENT, OPPONENT, or NEUTRAL: Opponent

ORAL or WRITTEN ONLY TESTIMONY: Written only

Chair Humphries & members of the committee,

I am writing to voice my opposition to bill HB 2062.

On the surface, the bill appears to allow pregnant women to request child support for medical and pregnancy-related expenses after the date of conception. However, this bill is a blatant attempt to sneak “fetal personhood” into state law and put the rights of embryos and fetuses above the rights of pregnant women. It will also jeopardize IVF services for families- like mine- who very much want children. We have seen this happen already in Alabama.

My son was born in 2011 after years of attempting to get pregnant. My first embryo transfer failed, through no fault of my own or the doctor's. Giving an embryo rights as a person could potentially criminalize naturally-occurring miscarriages, or women like me whose embryo simply failed to implant. I am eternally grateful for the doctors who practice reproductive healthcare and were able to help me become pregnant and have a child, and I want them to continue to be able to help other families like mine.

The state cannot grant legal rights to a fetus or embryo without subjugating the rights of the pregnant woman. Why does my- or any other woman's- right to life matter less than the potential future life of an embryo?

Kansas voters have repeatedly voted in support of reproductive rights and the right to make their own private medical decisions, including the right to choose. I urge you to listen to the will of the people of Kansas, who have already made their support of reproductive rights clear. Please vote no on HB 2062.

Deborah Headley-Johanning
Lawrence, KS

January 29, 2025

Testimony to the House Committee on Judiciary

NAME: Stephanie Heckart

TITLE: Kansas Citizen

EMAIL ADDRESS: stephanieheckart@gmail.com

BILL NUMBER: HB 2062 Providing for Child Support Orders from the Date of Conception

PROPOSER, OPPOSER, or NEUTRAL: Opponent

ORAL or WRITTEN ONLY TESTIMONY: Written

Chair Humphries & members of the committee,

I am writing to voice my opposition to bill HB 2062.

Please vote no on HB 2062. This bill would limit healthcare access and options for pregnant women. When fetus “rights” are elevated above the health and rights of a pregnant woman, healthcare professionals and settings may withhold life-saving medical care.

If fetal personhood is recognized, pregnant women and other pregnant people will lose control over decisions related to their pregnancies and be forced to accept medical interventions against their will.

Kansas voters have repeatedly voted in support of reproductive rights and the right to make their own private medical decisions, including the right to choose. Please vote no on HB 2062.

Stephanie Heckart

Kansas Citizen

Overland Park

January 29, 2025

Testimony to the House Committee on Judiciary

NAME: Jessica Hein

TITLE: Kansas Citizen & mother of three

EMAIL ADDRESS: jclairefloral@gmail.com

BILL NUMBER: HB 2062 Providing for Child Support Orders from the Date of Conception

PROPONENT, OPPONENT, or NEUTRAL: Opponent

ORAL or WRITTEN ONLY TESTIMONY:

Please vote NO on HB 2062. This bill would put mothers' lives at risk and tie the hands of medical professionals, preventing them from performing life-saving measures on a mother. It is a blatant attempt at sneaking "fetal personhood" into state law. "Fetal personhood" laws treat embryos and fetuses the same as living children, and put their rights above the rights of pregnant women. The result could be coerced medical interventions or unnecessary risk to the pregnant woman's life.

Chair Humphries & members of the committee,

I am writing to voice my opposition to bill HB 2062.

On the surface, the bill would allow pregnant women to claim child support for medical and pregnancy-related expenses, starting any time after the date of conception. However, it is merely a thinly-veiled attempt to pass a fetal personhood law, which would allow the state to regulate pregnant women.

In other states, law enforcement and prosecutors have used these laws to police pregnant women's conduct, treating fetuses legally the same as children. It would be a travesty to see the same happening to Kansans.

Additionally, personhood laws have concerning implications on women's access to birth control, IVF, and medical care after a miscarriage.

Kansans have repeatedly voted to uphold abortion rights and a woman's right to choose. Trying to sneak this into law is in clear opposition to Kansas voters and as such is undemocratic.

I beg you: vote no on bill HB 2062.

Jessica Hein

Kansas Citizen & Mother of 3

Shawnee

January 29, 2025

Testimony to the House Committee on Judiciary

Rebecca A Hoge

Kansas Citizen

bechoge@gmail.com

HB 2062 Providing for Child Support Orders from the Date of Conception

PROPONENT, OPPONENT, or NEUTRAL: Opponent

ORAL or WRITTEN ONLY TESTIMONY: Written Only Testimony

Chair Humphries & members of the committee,

I am writing to voice my strong opposition to bill HB 2062. I do not appreciate attempts to sneak in the concept of “fetal personhood” into bills that on the outside seemingly support pregnant people, when on the inside a law such as this would allow the state to regulate pregnant people. Fetal personhood laws treat embryos and nonviable fetuses the same as living children and put their rights above the rights of pregnant people. Fetal personhood laws could negatively impact or halt the use of in vitro fertilization, as has been seen in Alabama. I am 41 years old and have been blessed with two beautiful children and had no pregnancy or birth complications, however many of my family and friends struggled to conceive and/or experienced miscarriages, and birthing complications. I am writing to protect ALL pregnant people, and I would like my daughter to have the same rights to choose her reproductive journey in the future. Please vote no on bill HB 2062.

The people of Kansas have repeatedly voted in support of reproductive rights and the right to make our own private medical decisions, including the right to choose. You must continue to uphold our voices and vote NO.

Rebecca A Hoge

Lenexa, Kansas

January 29, 2025

Testimony to the House Committee on Judiciary

NAME: Veronica Holtz

TITLE: Kansas citizen

EMAIL ADDRESS: veronicaleeholtz@gmail.com

BILL NUMBER: HB 2062 Providing for Child Support Orders from the Date of Conception

PROPONENT, OPPONENT, or NEUTRAL: Opponent

ORAL or WRITTEN ONLY TESTIMONY: written only

Chair Humphries & members of the committee,

I am writing to voice my opposition to bill HB 2062.

This bill is a thinly veiled attempt at putting rights of an embryo above the rights of pregnant Kansans. This bill also challenges the legality of IVF and birth control. Why are we trying to control the reproductive process so much? Just let women make choices about their own bodies.

Again, please VOTE NO on HB 2062.

Thank you,

Veronica Holtz

Wichita, KS

January 28, 2025

Testimony to the House Committee on Judiciary

NAME: Megan Hoover

TITLE: Kansas Resident, voter, tax payer

EMAIL ADDRESS: mah Hoover@gmail.com

BILL NUMBER: HB 2062 Providing for Child Support Orders from the Date of Conception

PROPONENT, OPPONENT, or NEUTRAL: Opponent

ORAL or WRITTEN ONLY TESTIMONY: Written only testimony

Chair Humphries & members of the committee,

I am writing to voice my opposition to bill HB 2062.

I write this as I watch the clock tick down to 9 a.m. when I need to be at the hospital for surgery.

Today, despite wishing to have children, I am having a voluntary tubal ligation ending my chances of pregnancy and traditional motherhood. I am undergoing an unnecessary medical procedure because of bills like this.

I have a rare congenital condition called a bicornuate uterus which puts me at high risk for (late term) miscarriages or need of medical intervention to save my life during pregnancy.

I don't want to die. And I don't want a lawyer making that choice for me because a hospital or doctor is too scared to provide medical care to me as a pregnant person.

This bill is a thinly veiled attempt to thwart the will of Kansas voters and take away the rights of women and to radically truncate the ability of our medical professionals to care for us.

Please vote no on HB 2062. This bill could criminalize naturally-occurring miscarriages, thus dissuading pregnant women from seeking medical care to save their life and future fertility. It negatively impacts IVF services for families that very much want children and forces women like me to take drastic measures and abandon their dreams of motherhood to ensure they can continue to live.

Megan Hoover

Kansas resident, voter and tax payer

Lawrence, KS

January 28, 2025

Testimony to the House Committee on Judiciary

NAME: Cheryl Kelley

TITLE: Kansas Citizen

EMAIL ADDRESS: cbornheimer@gmail.com

BILL NUMBER: HB 2062 Providing for Child Support Orders from the Date of Conception

PROPONENT, OPPONENT, or NEUTRAL: Opponent

ORAL or WRITTEN ONLY TESTIMONY: Written only

Chair Humphries & members of the committee,

I am writing to voice my opposition to bill HB 2062.

I was a lucky one. I had a relatively easy and healthy pregnancy. But not everyone is as lucky as I. Pregnancy is a risky endeavor with a multitude of potential complications. Please vote no on HB 2062. This bill is a blatant attempt to sneak the concept of “fetal personhood” into state law. “Fetal personhood” laws treat embryos and fetuses the same as living children, and put their rights above the rights of pregnant women. The result could be coerced medical interventions or unnecessary risk to the pregnant woman’s life. There's enough risk in pregnancy as it is.

The state cannot bestow legal rights onto a fetus or embryo without subjugating the rights of the pregnant woman.

This bill is a step toward fetal personhood and could impact or halt the use of in vitro fertilization (IVF). We saw the result of this disastrous outcome in Alabama.

In other states, law enforcement and prosecutors have used these laws to police pregnant women’s conduct, treating fetuses legally the same as children.

Kansas voters and the Kansas Supreme Court have repeatedly voted and ruled in support of reproductive rights and the right to make their own private medical decisions, including the right to choose. Voting yes would be a waste of our tax dollars, not to mention be inhumane. Please vote no on HB 2062.

Cheryl Kelley
Kansas Citizen
Olathe

NAME: Shelly Kirkpatrick
EMAIL ADDRESS: 14shellyk@gmail.com
BILL NUMBER: HB 2062 Providing for Child Support Orders from the
Date of Conception
PROPOSER, OPPOSER, or NEUTRAL: **Opponent**
ORAL or WRITTEN ONLY TESTIMONY: Written

Chair Humphries & members of the committee,

I am writing to voice my opposition to bill HB 2062.

Please vote no on HB 2062. This bill could criminalize naturally-occurring miscarriages, thus dissuading pregnant women from seeking medical care to save their life and future fertility.

Please vote no on HB 2062 as it jeopardizes IVF services for families that very much want children.

Please vote no on HB 2062 as it limits family-planning services, including contraception access.

Please vote no on bill HB 2062.

Shelly Kirkpatrick
Leawood, KS

January 29, 2025

Testimony to the House Committee on Judiciary

NAME: Karen Knappenberger

TITLE: Kansas Citizen, Registered Voter

EMAIL ADDRESS: Karen.knappenberger@gmail.com

BILL NUMBER: HB 2062 Providing for Child Support Orders from the Date of Conception

PROPONENT, OPPONENT, or NEUTRAL: Opponent

ORAL or WRITTEN ONLY TESTIMONY: Written Only

Chair Humphries & members of the committee,

I am writing to voice my opposition to bill HB 2062.

I have been a medical social worker for 20 years. I am also a woman, and a woman to 2 children. I had one smooth pregnancy and one difficult pregnancy, requiring intervention to make it to full term. I have sisters, who unfortunately miscarried. One had natural miscarriage in her home as she was early in the term. The other, was later in her term and required emergency intervention to stop hemorrhaging. This saved her life and she was able to have 2 more children. All of us were able to get the care that we needed without hesitation from our competent providers. I want the same for my daughter. States that have adopted this are turning away women who need medical care to save their lives. We don't need child support for our fetuses. We need insurance to do a better job of covering pre-natal, hospital and post-natal care. This bill focuses on the money, but FAILS to take into account the health and wellbeing of the mother. The intended, and unintended consequences of scaring providers into refusing care, and criminal persecution of women who spontaneously abort (a medical term for a miscarriage) are dangerous.

I am asking you to vote NO on HB2062 for the reason that it fails to protect the mother or the baby. It leads to a withholding of care.

Karen Knappenberger, LSCSW

Kansas Resident, Registered Voter, parent

Topeka

January 29, 2025

Testimony to the House Committee on Judiciary

NAME: Jeanne Koontz

TITLE: Private Citizen

EMAIL ADDRESS: koontz.jeanne@gmail.com

BILL NUMBER: HB 2062 providing for Child Support Orders from the Date of Conception

PROPONENT, OPPONENT, or NEUTRAL: Opponent

ORAL or WRITTEN ONLY TESTIMONY: Written Only

Chair Humphries & members of the committee,

I am writing to voice my opposition to bill HB 2062.

This bill would limit healthcare access and options for pregnant women. When fetus “rights” are elevated above the health and rights of a pregnant woman, healthcare professionals and settings may withhold life-saving medical care.

The state cannot bestow legal rights onto a fetus or embryo without subjugating the rights of the pregnant woman. If fetal personhood is recognized, pregnant women will lose control over decisions related to their pregnancies and be forced to accept medical interventions against their will.

Kansas voters have repeatedly voted in support of reproductive rights and the right to make their own private medical decisions, including the right to choose.

Please vote NO on House Bill 2062.

Jeanne Koontz
Hutchinson