
Planned Parenthood Advocates of Kansas & Mid-Missouri**Testimony of Elise Higgins****Kansas Manager of Government Affairs****Planned Parenthood Advocates of Kansas & Mid-Missouri****Opposing Senate Bill 95****House Federal and State Affairs Committee****March 9, 2015**

Senate Bill 95 will harm Kansas women, create inappropriate interference of politicians into the doctor-patient relationship, and cost Kansas taxpayers. This bill fails to improve women's health, and instead substitutes the will of politicians for the expertise of doctors, tying doctors' hands and denying the patients relying on them the safest care available.

Planned Parenthood Advocates of Kansas and Mid-Missouri opposes Senate Bill 95 for the following reasons:

It will harm Kansas women:

- With 3 abortion providers in Kansas, only one of which is outside of the Kansas City Metro area, many women in our state already struggle to access safe, legal abortion. Narrowing women's options for needed health care will disproportionately affect rural women, potentially making care inaccessible to them altogether.
- Because the bill uses inflammatory, non-medical language, it could have broad and unintended consequences, including on the management of miscarriages. When tragic complications arise in pregnancies, there's nothing a woman needs more than to trust her physician to provide her with the best and safest medical care possible. Senate Bill 95 creates a dangerous environment for patients that could prevent doctors from having every option available when providing a woman with the best possible care in any given situation—including when necessary to protect a woman's health.
- Dilation and evacuation abortion is the safest method of second trimester abortion according to every major medical authority including the American College of Obstetricians and Gynecologists and the World Health Organization. It should remain legal and part of basic health care for women if and when they need it.
- Women — not politicians — should be making personal, medical decisions.

Because of its extremity, it could cost Kansas taxpayers:

- SB 95 raises serious constitutional concerns; the bill's proponents' promotional materials acknowledge the likelihood of court battles.
- From 2004 to 2010, the state spent hundreds of thousands of dollars fighting Phill Kline's personal anti-abortion legal crusade. From 2011 to February 2015, taxpayers have spent an additional \$1.2 million defending Kansas' 14 extreme abortion restrictions, the most in the country, tied with Oklahoma and Mississippi. Additionally, SB 95 comes with a \$550,000 fiscal note for likely legal expenses.
- At a time when Kansas' ability to pay state employees is in question, and the state faces a several hundred million dollar budget hole and is raiding state agency budgets to make it through the end of this fiscal year, taxpayers need legislators to focus on fiscal solutions and preventing unintended pregnancy.

Planned Parenthood has concerns about many provisions within the bill, only a few of which are highlighted here. Women seeking reproductive health care in Kansas need the best care they can get from providers in their community. They do not need interference and judgment from politicians. We urge the Committee on Federal and State Affairs to advance the health of women and families first by passing prevention legislation increasing access to affordable birth control and comprehensive, age-appropriate sex education.