

January 29, 2025

Testimony to the House Committee on Judiciary

NAME: Megan Langford

TITLE: Kansas Citizen

EMAIL ADDRESS: langford.megan@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 another attack on reproductive rights. The idea that legal rights extend to an embryo or fetus before viability is dangerous. These types of laws allow the state to regulate pregnant people and infringe on their bodily autonomy.

If this bill becomes law, there would be several terrible consequences, including: 1) putting the rights of a fetus above the rights of the pregnant person; 2) jeopardizing the legality of IVF and contraception, which are both widely popular and medically accepted; 3) criminalizing miscarriage; 4) coerced medical interventions; and 5) the closure of women's health clinics in Kansas and mass exodus of doctors, who do not want to practice in states with these restrictions.

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

Megan Langford
Lenexa, Kansas

January 29, 2025

Testimony to the House Committee on Judiciary

NAME: Jacqueline Lightcap

TITLE: Kansas Citizen

EMAIL ADDRESS: jacquelightcap@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 HB 2062. Please vote no on HB 2062 as it is full of unintended consequences, including limiting family-planning services, which has the potential of limiting contraception access.

While it appears to be a straightforward bill, allowing pregnant women to claim child support for medical and pregnancy-related expenses starting any time after the date of conception, in reality, this bill would ultimately allow the state to regulate pregnant women. By bestowing legal rights onto a fetus or embryo, the pregnant woman's ability to make her own healthcare decisions is essentially an afterthought.

Fetal personhood laws, like this one, could also impact contraception access, since some argue that IUDs and emergency contraception can prevent the implantation of a fertilized egg, potentially violating fetal personhood.

Kansans do not support government interference in their healthcare decisions and voters have repeatedly supported reproductive rights. The bill runs counter to one of our highest values— the right to make our own private medical decisions. I urge you to vote no on HB 2062.

Thank you for your time and willingness to consider the voice of all Kansans.

Jacqueline Lightcap
Topeka

NAME: Brianna Lynch

TITLE: Kansas Citizen

EMAIL ADDRESS: briannly.day1@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 would decrease OB services in the 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.

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.

Brianna Lynch

Chanute, Kansas

January 29, 2025

Testimony to the House Committee on Judiciary

NAME: Carolyn Martin

TITLE: Kansas Citizen

EMAIL ADDRESS: cmartinweb@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.

This bill could criminalize naturally-occurring miscarriages, thus dissuading pregnant women from seeking medical care to save their life and future fertility.

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.

Fetal personhood laws could also have major 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 dangerously delay care until she gives birth so she does not harm the fetus. This routinely occurs in Poland.

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.

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 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.

Please vote no on HB 2062

Carolyn Martin
Kansas Citizen
Parsons, Kansas

January 29, 2025

Testimony to the House Committee on Judiciary

NAME: Kathleen Martinez

TITLE: Overland Park, KS resident

EMAIL ADDRESS: katieraff@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 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.

Fetal personhood laws could also have major 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 dangerously delay care until she gives birth so she does not harm the fetus. This routinely occurs in Poland.

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.

In conclusion, I am asking you to vote no on bill HB 2062.

Kathleen R. Martinez
Overland Park, KS

January 29, 2025

Testimony to the House Committee on Judiciary

NAME: Erin McAdoo

TITLE: Kansas Citizen & mother of three

EMAIL ADDRESS: keltner.erin@yahoo.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.

Erin McAdoo

Kansas Citizen & Mother of 2

Shawnee

Mindy McCarthy

Kansas Citizen

mindymccarthy@ymail.com

HB 2062 Providing for child support orders from date of conception

Opponent

Written only opposition testimony

Chair Humphries and members of the committee,

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

Only women should have the right to make a medical health decision about her own body, not the government.

Please vote no on Bill HB 2062.

Mindy McCarthy

DeSoto, KS

January 29, 2025

Testimony to the House Committee on Judiciary

NAME: Debby McDonald

TITLE: Kansas Citizen/voter

EMAIL ADDRESS: dmcdpv@yahoo.com

BILL NUMBER: 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 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.

Seriously, this bill is ludicrous.

It’s obvious that this bill is simply yet ANOTHER attempt to overturn the will of the people.

KANSAS VOTERS SAID NO. KANSAS VOTERS BELIEVE IN AND VOTED FOR A
WOMAN’S RIGHT TO CHOOSE, TO KEEP ABORTION SAFE AND LEGAL.

A fetus is not a child. An embryo is not a child.

Of course, fathers should pay CHILD support for CHILDREN. But this bill isn’t really about holding fathers accountable. It’s about controlling women and interfering in their health care.

You are REPRESENTATIVES of Kansas taxpayers/voters. 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.

Debby McDonald

8115 Nall Ave

Prairie Village, KS 66208

Lifelong Kansas resident and property owner



January 28, 2025

Subject: Opposition to HB2062: Concerns About Child Support for Unborn Children

Dear ,

On behalf of Family Reunion, a 501(c)(3) nonprofit organization dedicated to supporting children and families, I am writing to express our opposition to HB2062. While we appreciate the intent to support pregnant women and unborn children, we have significant concerns about the bill's premise of assigning child support obligations starting from conception.

Here are three key reasons why HB2062 does not make sense in practice:

1. No Required Costs for an Unborn Child

While pregnancy-related medical expenses are a legitimate concern, there are no direct costs that an unborn child incurs before birth. The financial needs associated with a child begin at birth, when there are tangible costs such as food, clothing, housing, and care. Assigning child support prior to birth conflates these two stages of life and risks creating unnecessary legal and financial complications.

2. Existing Mechanisms Already Address Medical Costs

Pregnant women's medical expenses are already addressed through other means, including private insurance, Medicaid, or other financial assistance programs. HB2062 redundantly shifts these costs into the child support framework, which is designed to address the expenses of raising a child—not pregnancy. Expanding child support in this way could set a precedent for future legal ambiguities.

3. Practical and Legal Challenges

Implementing child support from conception introduces significant challenges, including establishing accurate timelines for conception and addressing disputes over paternity prior to birth. These legal uncertainties create a burden on both the courts and the involved parties, potentially delaying rather than resolving financial support.

We recognize the importance of ensuring that pregnant women have access to the resources they need for a healthy pregnancy. However, HB2062 is not the appropriate vehicle for this

goal. Instead, focusing on existing programs to directly assist pregnant women and families would more effectively address their needs without introducing legal or financial complications.

Thank you for considering these concerns. We urge you to vote against HB2062 to ensure Kansas child support laws remain focused on their intended purpose: supporting children and families after birth in a clear and practical manner.

Sincerely,

Karen Renee Merwin
Director of Policy
Family Reunion USA
www.familyreunionUSA.org

Family Reunion is a national, non-profit 501(c)(3) organization that works with lawmakers, existing organizations, and experts dedicated to making much-needed changes to the family court system so the best interests of children can be supported. We focus on positively influencing family laws and policies that often discount one parent and ultimately harm the children. We believe the best parent is both parents.

January 29, 2025

Testimony to the House Committee on Judiciary

NAME: Suni Michaelson

TITLE: Kansas Citizen

EMAIL ADDRESS: smp314@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 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. 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 decrease OB services in the 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. This bill could criminalize naturally-occurring miscarriages, thus dissuading pregnant women from seeking medical care to save their life and future fertility. It jeopardizes IVF services for families that very much want children and it limits family-planning services, including contraception access.

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.

Suni Michaelsen

Lenexa, KS

January 29, 2025

Sally Molnar

Kansas Citizen

birdnut19@yahoo.com

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

Stance: Opponent

Written Only Testimony

Chair Humphries & members of the committee,

I am writing to voice my opposition to bill HB2062. 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.

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

Fetal personhood laws could also have an impact on contraception access, given that some members of the anti-abortion movement argue that IUDs and emergency contraception can prevent the implantation of a fertilized egg and violate fetal personhood.

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!

January 29, 2025

Tamara Molnar

Kansas Citizen

tamaralmolnar23@gmail.com

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

Stance: Opponent

Written Only Testimony

Chair Humphries & members of the committee,

I am writing to voice my opposition to bill HB2062. 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.

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

Fetal personhood laws could also have impact contraception access, given that some members of the anti-abortion movement argue that IUDs and emergency contraception can prevent the implantation of a fertilized egg and violate fetal personhood.

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!

January 29, 2025
Testimony to the House Committee on Judiciary

Adrienne Newlin
Kansas citizen
adrienne.newlin@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 voice my opposition to bill 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.

Fetal personhood laws could also have major 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 dangerously delay care until she gives birth so she does not harm the fetus. This routinely occurs in Poland.

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.

Adrienne Newlin
Kansas taxpayer
Overland Park

January 29, 2025

Testimony to the House Committee on Judiciary

NAME: Ann Norbury

TITLE: Kansas citizen

EMAIL ADDRESS: annknorbury@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 and members of the Committee

I am writing to voice my opposition to HB 2062.

Please vote NO on HB 2062. This bill could criminalize treatment of naturally occurring miscarriages, where medical care is necessary to control bleeding and save the mother's life. This concerns me as my daughter suffered a miscarriage & and thankfully she received needed medical care. Kansas should not consider putting restrictions on doctors providing medical care.

I'm also concerned that the unintended consequences of this bill might jeopardize IVF services for families who want to conceive a child. A similar bill in Alabama led to a disastrous outcome with much negative publicity.

Kansas voters have voted in support of reproductive rights and the right of women to make their own private medical decisions. Please vote NO on HB 2062.

Ann Norbury

Shawnee, Kansas

January 28, 2025

Testimony to the House Committee on Judiciary

NAME: Mackenzie Oakley

EMAIL ADDRESS: mackenzie.j.oakley@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. This bill is a blatant attempt to sneak the concept of “fetal personhood” into state law. It would also limit healthcare access and options for pregnant people, criminalize naturally-occurring miscarriages, and reduce access to family-planning services and contraception.

Fetal personhood laws could also have major implications for pregnant people and the state cannot bestow legal rights onto a fetus or embryo without subjugating the rights of the pregnant woman.

Among other things, fetal personhood laws could also impact contraception access, given that some members of the anti-abortion movement argue that IUDs and emergency contraception can prevent the implantation of a fertilized egg and violate fetal personhood.

Please vote NO on HB 2062. 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.

Mackenzie Oakley
Olathe, Kansas

January 28, 2025

Testimony to the House Committee on Judiciary

SUBMITTED BY: Sara Oberle, B.A., M.M. , Kansas citizen

EMAIL: sarabande36@gmail.com

SUBJECT:

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

WRITTEN TESTIMONY ONLY

Chair Humphries & Members of the Committee:

I am writing to voice my opposition to HB 2062.

While at face value, this bill gives the appearance of providing pregnant women support for medical expenses, the implications are more draconian. This bill opens the door to the state regulating pregnant women, and women, for that matter, at every stage.

Our creator has given us responsibility for, and agency over our own bodies. Rights of a pregnant woman supersede any of a fetus or embryo. The most personal decisions over one's body belong to that person, and they have the right to receive medical care without fear of reprisal from elected officials or law enforcement.

There are any number of naturally occurring problems that can affect any pregnancy, and it is morally wrong to interfere with women's health decisions. Doctors deserve to treat their patients appropriately without fear of prosecution. Kansas continues to lose qualified medical personnel, especially obstetrics specialists, because of the culture of fear that is fomented by anti-abortion activists. This trend does not preserve the health of our citizenry, regardless of personal beliefs.

Kansas voters have voiced their support for reproductive rights and the rights to make their own private medical decisions. Our lawmakers need to accept this and stop attempting to strip women's rights further under the guise of "protecting women."

If the greater concern is making certain that children and their mothers have the resources they need, I respectfully suggest that our representatives examine existing policies for areas of improvement and enforcement.

I urge you to vote NO on HB 2062 for the sake of ALL Kansas women.

Respectfully submitted,

Sara Oberle
Holyrood, Kansas

January 29, 2025

Testimony to the House Committee on Judiciary

NAME: Mandy Pfister

TITLE: Kansas Citizen

EMAIL ADDRESS: mpfister@cox.net

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 PLEASE for the love of God, stop this insanity. Kansas has already overwhelmingly chosen to keep women's rights a top priority and abortion legal, with certain limits in place. Why are we wasting time and resources on this again and again? It's ridiculous. Church and State should be separated, and the arguments of when a baby is a person, is a spiritual and religious one. It has no place in government decisions.

Please vote no on bill HB 2062.

Mandy Pfister
Wichita, KS

January 29, 2025

Testimony to the House Committee on Judiciary

NAME: Haley Pratt

TITLE: Kansas Citizen

EMAIL ADDRESS: haleypratt93@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. 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.

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.

Haley Pratt

Kansas Citizen

Goddard KS

January 28, 2025

Testimony to the House Committee on Judiciary

NAME: Lauren Proffer-Kruse

TITLE: Kansas Citizen

EMAIL ADDRESS: Lolo9955@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 Testimony]

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 hurts IVF services for families that want children more than anything in the world.

On the surface, this bill is phrased in such a way to falsely lead people to believe it allows pregnant women to claim child support for medical and pregnancy-related expenses, starting any time after the date of conception. However, it is an extremely tired attempt that we've seen so many times to pass a fetal personhood law, which would allow the state to regulate pregnant women.

If fetal personhood is recognized, pregnant women and other pregnant people would lose control over decisions related to their pregnancies and be forced to accept medical interventions against their will. This bill is a step toward fetal personhood and would impact or halt the use of in vitro fertilization (IVF). We saw the result of this heartbreaking outcome in Alabama.

I'm concerned at the willful choice to ignore Kansas when we voted to protect the right to choose just a couple years ago. You're wasting our time, energy, and tax money. If you want restricted healthcare access, you can choose that for your own body only. Your body is the only one you are in charge of. Kansas once again affirms healthcare rights for all including pregnant people as well as any people who could become pregnant in the future.

The next time you want to ignore the voice of Kansas and bring this topic up yet again, choose instead to look into how the Colorado Family Planning Initiative increased access to contraception which in turn lowered the number of abortions in Colorado. The teen birth rate was nearly cut in half for example. I'd like you all to pivot and study this. LARC – Long Acting Reversible Contraception.

In conclusion, please vote no on bill HB 2062.

Lauren Proffer-Kruse

Manhattan, KS