

January 29, 2025

Testimony to the House Committee on Judiciary

NAME: Leah Allen

TITLE: Kansas Citizen

EMAIL ADDRESS: [leahtallen89@gmail.com](mailto:leahtallen89@gmail.com)

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

PROPPONENT, 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. “Fetal personhood” laws treat embryos and fetuses the same as living children and put their rights **above** the rights of pregnant women. When fetal “rights” are elevated above the health and rights of a pregnant woman, healthcare professionals and settings may withhold life-saving care. Furthermore, 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.

On the surface, the bill would allow pregnant women to claim child support for medical and pregnancy-related expense, 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. 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. Fetal personhood laws could also impact contraception access and the use of in vitro fertilization (IVF).

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

NAME: Rachel Allen

TITLE: Kansas Citizen, Married and Mother of two daughters, Catholic, Artist and Graphic Designer

EMAIL ADDRESS: 9429 Lee Blvd. Leawood, Ks 66206

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.

As a Catholic and mother of two daughters I am writing today voice my concerns about Bill HB 2062. To be clear I am Pro Choice, I believe in a womans sovereignty over her own body, life and choices. No one understands pregnancy, child birth and motherhood more than a mother who has physically, spiritually and emotionally experienced it. I also believe that the people most able to address needs are the people closest to it, which would be the woman, her doctor and support system. Not the Government. I believe this bill is not only harmful to women but is a blatant misuse of our Governments authority into our individual rights and oversteps into our personal lives in a alarming way. It will also harm the medical community and women health as it will create fiction in an already broken and under served area in our healthcare system.

I do believe that abortion should be regulated. I believe that it is harmful to women as well, but the HB 2062 threatens women and could be harmful too women and their care providers in ways that are startling. This is not the answer. We need common sense laws that create REASONABLE barriers - something closer to elected abortions can not be performed after the child is viable out of the womb, and clauses that protect women if they miscarry due to no fault of their own or need an abortion for a medical reason (ex. if the life or the child life is at risk). These difficult and life altering decisions should be made on the level of an individual and their medical providers - not by politicians pushing an agenda from their white stone buildings completely detached from the needs of their constituents.

I ask you vote NO on this bill - if a bill like this comes to pass I will not feel safe in this state and will seriously consider moving my family to a place of safety. If this bill passes it would also effect my decision (and others like me with daughters) on weather this State is a safe place to send a child to college, to live or to work in.

Rachel Allen -

Leawood, KS

**January 29, 2025**

**Testimony to the House Committee on Judiciary**

**NAME:** Shelby Austin

**TITLE:** Kansas Citizen

**EMAIL ADDRESS:** Shelby.austin@me.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. “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. 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. 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 and other pregnant people will 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 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 bill HB 2062 for the people of Kansas.

Shelby Austin  
Kansas Citizen  
Overland Park, KS

**January 29, 2025**

**Testimony to the House Committee on Judiciary**

**NAME:** Jaclyn Baker

**TITLE:** Shawnee, Kansas Citizen

**EMAIL ADDRESS:** bakerjackie.a@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. Do you really want Kansas to become the next Alabama?

If you supposedly want to support pregnant women and families, HB 2062 would do the exact opposite.

Kansas voters overwhelmingly voted to keep YOUR hands off WOMEN's bodies and out of our healthcare choices in 2022 when we enshrined the right to abortion in the state constitution.

Stop going against the wishes of your constituents with these stupid bills. Vote no on HB 2062.

Jaclyn Baker

Kansas Citizen

Shawnee, Kansas

**January 29, 2025**

**Testimony to the House Committee on Judiciary**

**NAME:** Rebecca Bishop

**TITLE:** Kansas Citizen, 43 years

**EMAIL ADDRESS:** rbishop1213@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 strongly oppose bill HB 2062.

Kansas HB 2062 is a blatant attempt to introduce “fetal personhood” into state law, treating embryos and fetuses as if they are equal to living children. They are not. This bill places the rights of embryos and fetuses above the rights of pregnant women, undermining fundamental reproductive rights and personal autonomy. The consequences of this could be life-threatening for some women.

The state has no right to grant legal personhood to an embryo or fetus at the expense of a pregnant woman's rights. If fetal personhood is recognized, pregnant women will lose control over critical decisions regarding their own pregnancies and could be subjected to unwanted medical interventions. Moreover, if a fetus is legally considered a person, pregnant women could face criminal prosecution under child endangerment laws, as has happened in other states where women were charged for actions based on the notion that a fetus has the same legal status as a child.

It is also important to highlight that the state has failed to ensure the basic financial support for actual children through child support enforcement programs. To prioritize a bill like HB 2062, when there are far more urgent issues facing children and families, is both misguided and reckless.

Kansas voters have consistently supported reproductive rights and the right to bodily autonomy. This bill directly contradicts those values. I urge you to respect the will of the people and vote NO on HB 2062.

Rebecca Bishop  
Manhattan, Kansas

**January 29, 2025**  
**Testimony to the House Committee on Judiciary**

**NAME:** Kristen Blackton

**TITLE:** Private Citizen

**EMAIL ADDRESS:** krosekauf@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,

Thank you for taking the time to read my testimony. I am writing to voice my **opposition** to bill HB 2062. This bill is a stepping stone to enshrining “fetal personhood” into law, which would grant fetuses the same rights as living children. Such laws will naturally lead to much more dangerous legislation and overreaching state regulation of women.

At first glance, this bill may seem like it will help pregnant women. Unfortunately, that is far from the truth. If we begin granting fetuses rights at the moment of conception, we are now allowing the state to regulate pregnant women and insert itself into her care. How can a woman be in control of her own body if the rights of the fetus supersede her own? If fetal personhood makes its way into Kansas law, then we will have a legal problem with IVF treatments. We saw this very outcome in Alabama just last year when the Alabama Supreme Court ruled that embryos were children. Immediately, women across the state of Alabama had their IVF treatments halted. I believe in the right of every American to start a family in the way that they choose. This bill will be the first step toward banning IVF treatments right here in our own state by saying that conception equates to personhood.

I know that the members of the committee remember that Kansans made their voices heard in August of 2022 when they overwhelmingly voted to keep access to reproductive healthcare in our state. I was assured by legislators throughout election season that they would honor Kansans’ vote and stay out of reproductive healthcare regulations. I hope that the members of the committee will honor their word and not pass this bill out of committee.

I urge you to vote NO on HB 2062 to protect pregnant women.

Thank you for your time,

Kristen Blackton  
Shawnee, KS

**NAME:** Jenae Bluhm, M.S.

**TITLE:** Kansas Citizen

**EMAIL ADDRESS:** jenaebbluhm@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. As both a health educator and someone who treasures motherhood, I ask you to please consider the dangerous nuances of this bill and the associated implications.

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 (which is often rather hard to pinpoint). However, this would allow the state to regulate pregnant women.

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. This is not “valuing them both”, to quote the slogan from the last Kansas reproductive rights vote.

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. **As a professional with relevant expertise, I can confidently state that these claims are not consistent with the nature of IUDs nor emergency contraception (e.g., Plan B).**

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

If Kansas truly “values them both”, we must back this up with action that protects the rights of pregnant people. Kansas voters have repeatedly voted in support of reproductive rights. **Please vote no on HB 2062 and protect the rights of Kansan parents, both current and future.**

Thank you,  
Jenae Bluhm, M.S.

**NAME:** KellyAnn Bonnell

**TITLE:** Instructor – Early Childhood Education

**EMAIL ADDRESS:** kellyann@infspec.com

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

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

**Written Testimony**

Chair Humphries & members of the committee,

My niece Mykayla has been married for about three years now. She and her husband have recently discovered that the only way they can have biological children is via IVF. Mykayla and her husband sought the advice of their pastor and prayed on the decision. They have made the choice to pursue this option.

Bills like HB 2062 could impact or halt the use of IVF. If Mykayla and her husband were in Alabama, where such a bill was passed, they would not have the option.

HB2062, while on its surface is intended to support children and families, is a dangerous path that could impact the ability of good Christian couples of achieving their dreams of becoming parents.

Please vote no on HB2062.

In community,

KellyAnn Bonnell

Great Bend, Kansas 67530



January 29, 2025

Testimony to the House Committee on Judiciary

NAME: Mary Brewster, MSW

TITLE: Executive Director

EMAIL ADDRESS: maryrosebrewster@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. 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.

For all the women that you love please vote no on bill HB 2062.

Mary Brewster, MSW

Executive Director

Lawrence, Kansas

•

January 29, 2025

Testimony to the House Committee on Judiciary

Name: Dawn Brumbley

Email: dawnraeann@gmail.com

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

OPPONENT

WRITTEN TESTIMONY ONLY

Chair Humphries & Members of the Committee,

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

This bill is dangerous to women all across the state of Kansas. This bill would limit healthcare access for pregnant women and decrease OB services in our state. We have seen this happen time and time again across other states that have put these extreme laws into action regarding reproductive care. When state legislatures restrict access to reproductive care, it negatively impacts women and babies by removing access of care. Healthcare providers flee these states for their own safety, which leaves vulnerable women and babies at risk. This bill could criminalize naturally-occurring miscarriages. As a survivor of a severely ectopic pregnancy that nearly took my life, healthcare providers need every possibly moment to support their patients and not wait to see what the law might allow them to do or not do. Women and babies die because of these horrifically restrictive laws, and if I had died due to healthcare not provided, my son would have no mother and my daughter would never exist after that pregnancy. This could also restrict or remove IVF services, and so many of these families want to expand their families.

All this to say, Kansans have already made our voices loud and clear about access to reproductive health. This is a blatant act against the will of the voters, and the majority of Kansans do NOT want anyone to remove or restrict our reproductive care. We want to make our own private medical decisions, including the right to choose.

Please vote NO on HB 2062

Dawn Brumbley

Olathe, KS

**January 29, 2025**

**Testimony to the House Committee on Judiciary**

**NAME:** Martha Brummett

**TITLE:** Mother, Citizen of Kansas and Sales Manager

**EMAIL ADDRESS:** martha.brum@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. 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. For all the women that you love please vote no on bill HB 2062.

Martha Brummett  
Lawrence, Kansas



Laurel Burchfield  
Advocacy Director  
contact@mainstream.vote

January 29, 2025  
House Committee on Judiciary  
Rep. Susan Humphries, Chair

Opponent Testimony, Written

HB2062– Providing for child support orders for unborn children from the date of conception

Chair Humphries and Members of the Committee,

Thank you for the opportunity to provide opponent testimony on HB2062.

**Mainstream OPPOSES HB2062 and other attempts to further establish fetal personhood in Kansas.**

This proposal is another attempt to restrict access to safe and legal reproductive health care. **HB2062 exerts a narrow religious belief that life begins upon inception and would impose this definition upon all Kansans – a clear violation of religious freedom as guaranteed by the First Amendment.**

Instead of dedicating more state general funds (in the identical HB2653 introduced in 2024, this was an estimated annual cost of \$487,561 for new legal, administrative, and medical expenses as identified within the fiscal note), we encourage the committee to pursue opportunities to improve maternal health and reproductive health care services for Kansans.

Kansas voters have already spoken that they support the constitutional right to reproductive health care. Creating more strict definitions and establishing fetal personhood is an attempt to undermine the Kansans' right to legal and safe abortions.

For these reasons, Mainstream opposes HB2062. We urge you to reject this effort to undermine Kansans' constitutional rights to abortion and religious freedom.

Thank you,

Laurel Burchfield  
Mainstream

**January 29, 2025**

**Testimony to the House Committee on Judiciary**

**NAME:** Ashley Carey

**TITLE:** Kansas Citizen & mother of three

**EMAIL ADDRESS:** the.ash.carey@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.

Ashley Carey

Kansas Citizen & Mother of 3

Shawnee

January 29, 2025

Testimony to the House Committee on Judiciary

NAME: Amy Carter

TITLE: Private Citizen

EMAIL: Carteam17@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: 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. “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 withholding of life-saving care.

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, putting their lives in danger. Naturally-occurring miscarriages could result in charges of child endangerment and women may be required to delay life-saving care like chemotherapy. Many women already have children and families already counting on them to be their caregivers. Why would we want to risk children losing their mothers or worse, being orphaned by the state?

This bill would also decrease obstetrician 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. It also jeopardizes IVF services for families that very much want children. We saw the result of this disastrous outcome in Alabama.

The policing of naturally-occurring miscarriages is a horrifying reality of this bill and jeopardizes women’s future fertility. 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 their own medical care. Please vote no on HB 2062.

Amy Carter

Overland Park, Kansas

**HB 2062 Opposition Testimony**

**House Judiciary Committee**

**January 29, 2025**

**Rebecca Cohenour, spudgirl80@gmail.com**

Johnson County woman, mother and grandmother

Chair Humphries & members of the committee,

Thank you for the opportunity to weigh in on this issue. I am writing to voice my **opposition** to bill HB 2062.

This bill is a wolf in sheep's clothing. Following are several serious issues with HB 2062:

1. Put the rights of an embryo or fetus above the rights of the pregnant woman
2. Allow the state to regulate pregnant women
3. Limit or jeopardize the legality of IVF and contraception
4. Criminalize miscarriages
5. Result in coerced medical interventions
6. Lead to the closure of women's health clinics as doctors do not want to practice in states with these restrictions

Women have died, have been seriously harmed, and have been forced to face unimaginable trauma in states that have interfered in the course of medical care for a pregnant patient. Kansans and the courts have spoken – respect our choice!

In closing, I urge you to reject HB 2062.



**January 29, 2025**

**Testimony to the House Committee on Judiciary**

**NAME:** Colleen Cunningham

**EMAIL ADDRESS:** colleen@demod.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 today to voice my opposition to bill HB 2062. This bill has, in what I'm sure must be unintended, the consequence of making 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 are a number of other potential unintended consequences of this bill, which I think are important to keep in mind when making informed decisions about this legislation.

- 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.
- 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.
- 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.
- 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.

Besides hampering the ability of Kansas women to have healthy pregnancies, Kansas voters have repeatedly voted in support of reproductive rights and the right to make their own private medical decisions. Please vote no on HB 2062.

Colleen Cunningham  
Overland Park

**January 29, 2025**

**Testimony to the House Committee on Judiciary**

**NAME:** Amity Dannefer

**TITLE:** Kansas Citizen,

**EMAIL ADDRESS:** amityfile@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 do not pass this bill.

Please vote no on bill HB 2062

Amity Dannefer

Overland Park

**January 29, 2025**

**Testimony to the House Committee on Judiciary**

**NAME:** Anna DeBarthe

**TITLE:** Kansas Citizen

**EMAIL ADDRESS:** [annadebarthe@gmail.com](mailto:annadebarthe@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 ask that you please vote no on HB 2062. It is a gross attempt at trying to sneak the concept of "fetal personhood" into Kansas law. This bill would be damaging to women's reproductive healthcare. It would result in the loss of life-saving medical care for women. It also could criminalize miscarriage, which is in no way the pregnant person's fault. Kansas clearly voted for abortion rights and strong reproductive healthcare in the past.

Again, please vote NO on HB 2062.

Anna DeBarthe

Kansas Citizen

Olathe

**January 29, 2025**

**Testimony to the House Committee on Judiciary**

**NAME:** Kimberly Drake

**TITLE:** Kansas Citizen

**EMAIL ADDRESS:** kdrake1007@aol.com

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

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

**WRITTEN ONLY 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 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.

As a mother to two young women of child-bearing age, with one currently pregnant, I am very concerned about the potentially life-threatening situations that my daughters may be subject to in the state of Kansas if our lawmakers continue to move towards restricting reproductive healthcare. The fetal personhood status aspect of this bill is the first step to counteracting the will of the voters in Kansas who overwhelmingly voted in August 2022 to keep abortion legal and give women the right to make their own health care decisions. The state cannot bestow legal rights to a fetus or embryo without subjugating the rights of the pregnant woman.

Please respect the voice of the voters in Kansas and vote on HB 2062.

Kimberly Drake

Stilwell, KS

**January 29, 2025**

**Testimony to the House Committee on Judiciary**

**NAME:** Stevie Drost

**TITLE:** Kansas Citizen

**EMAIL ADDRESS:** eviefiasco@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:** Written Only 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 is a blatant attempt to sneak the concept of “fetal personhood” into Kansas state law. This treats embryos and fetuses the same as living children and prioritizes their rights above the rights of pregnant people. The result will be coerced medical interventions or unnecessary risk to the pregnant person’s life.

This bill would allow the state to regulate pregnant people’s bodies. The state cannot bestow legal rights onto a fetus or embryo without subjugating the rights of the pregnant person.

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.

Do not allow Evangelical extremists to control any living, breathing human’s body.

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. Do not ignore your constituents. Please vote no on HB2062.

Stevie Drost

Kansas Citizen

Gardner, KS

---

January 29, 2025

Sarah Emmons

Kansas Citizen

[sejemmons@gmail.com](mailto:sejemmons@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 impact contraception access, given that some members of the anti-abortion movement argue IUDs and emergency contraction 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 HB2062.

**January 29, 2025**

**Testimony to the House Committee on Judiciary**

**NAME:** Caroline Faulkender

**TITLE:** Kansas Citizen

**EMAIL ADDRESS:** csfaulkender@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:**

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. Just as with the “Value Them Both” amendment, which voters resoundingly voted down in 2022, this bill does not uphold the rights of women and mothers. “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.

We’ve already said NO to measures that take away a woman’s right to make her own health care decision. I would gladly support efforts to increase medical assistance for pregnant mothers, but I do not support veiled attempts to regulate pregnant women and limit or jeopardize the legality of IVF and contraception. If you want more babies, make it easier to have a wanted and planned baby by providing support during the pregnancy and postpartum, but not at the expense of a woman’s right to make her own private medical decisions. Please vote no on HB 2062.

Caroline Faulkender

Olathe

January 29, 2025

Testimony to the House Committee on Judiciary

**NAME:** Shannon Forsythe

**TITLE:** Kansas Citizen

**EMAIL ADDRESS:** [shannonkaforsythe@gmail.com](mailto:shannonkaforsythe@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 bill HB 2062. The provisions of this bill will be devastating to the people of Kansas, especially those who are capable of becoming pregnant and carrying children. This bill criminalizes miscarriages and puts the legality of family planning services such as IVF and contraception at stake. The people of Kansas overwhelmingly spoke by ballot in August 2022, refusing government overreach into their healthcare and family planning.

I ask for you to vote no on bill HB 2062. Thank you for your public service.

Shannon K. A. Forsythe

Kansas Citizen

Overland Park



**Testimony to the House Committee on Judiciary**

**NAME:** Sheena Foye Wilson

**TITLE:** Attorney, IVF Mom, Overland Park Resident

**EMAIL ADDRESS:** sfoye@whmlaw.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 Only

Chair Humphries & members of the committee,

I am writing to voice my opposition to bill HB 2062. I am urging you to 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. Do not be fooled. 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. 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 legislature restricts medical professionals’ ability to perform healthcare, many medical professionals flee the state, resulting in the closure of delivery rooms and OB services. We have seen this happen in Texas and Idaho where OB’s are leaving the state. It also jeopardizes IVF. As we have seen in Alabama, fetal personhood impacts those who are trying to grow families. Conception is not a baby. As someone who went through secondary infertility and spent tens of thousands of dollars to have our second son, I know this pain all too well. This bill would not only jeopardize those families in the throws of infertility it also places women at risk. 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. Those decisions are between a women and her doctor. This could impact that choice and further this goes against the will of people who clearly VOTED NO on the recent attempt to take right to choose out of the KS constitution. Don’t be fooled by this attempt to disguise fetal personhood as a benefit to pregnant women seeking financial support. This bill will only harm pregnant women.

I urge you to vote no on bill HB 2062

Sheena Foye Wilson

Attorney, IVF Mom, and Overland Park resident