

5 March 2022

Chairman Hilderbrand and Distinguished Members of the Public Health and Welfare Committee,

I am a proponent of SB 489, and believe it makes important changes that are essential to maintain liberty for Kansans when it comes to health decisions. Chapter 65 issues have a profound impact on businesses, and therefore, Kansans, so it's really important that we take logic, reasoning, and research into account.

This bill modifies 65-101 to prevent the Secretary of the Kansas Department of Health and Environment from taking action to prevent the introduction of infections or contagious disease. We know that following the CDC guidelines was not effective for the state or the nation, and the appointed KDHE Acting Secretary has already admitted she'll continue to follow them, so removing this portion is essential and smart!

SB 489 also wisely removes power from the county or joint board of health or local health officer to prohibit public gatherings as it pertains to attempting to control contagious disease.

Because the KDHE is taxpayer funded, the changes that require the secretary to present a report to both House and Senate leadership providing recommendations for legislation, this makes sense. The job of the KDHE is to educate, inform, and recommend. No more than that. No mandates. No requirements, no imperatives. SB 489 makes important changes that protect God-given and Constitutionally granted freedoms.

This is a perfect segway into 129-b, which is a statute that overreaches to a degree I've never seen before. As it is written, it appears that both the KDHE Secretary and the local health officer have the authority to require the sheriff to remove an adult and minor child from their home for refusing vaccination, a medical exam, treatment, or testing when the Secretary or Health Officer believes it is medically necessary. Thankfully, this bill removes the Secretary from having this kind of power. It also removes the Sheriff from doing what I believe to be unconstitutional removing of citizens from their homes.

I believe this bill could go farther. It's concerning to me that an unelected official (one of whom was just moved out of this very committee last week **without** recommendation) would ever have this kind of power. He or she, as it is written, is an unelected person who can imprison a citizen acting as judge and jury. We need ONE body/authority in charge of these decisions, not multiple organizations who can blame-shift!

The secretary of the KDHE and local health officer position should be a medical doctor, not a nurse, medical coordinator, or otherwise. Also, I believe that if a health leader is issuing edicts, rules, mandates, or recommendations, he or she should live in the county or state respectively, being subject to their own rules. In Johnson County, we have Dr. Joseph LeMaster, who lives in Wyandotte, as our local health officer. Because of the immeasurable damage we've seen in the last two years from local health officers, we cannot elevate or enshrine them. If the bill was changed to empower elected county health boards, it could slightly improve it. Honestly, though, the entire section of 129-b should be deleted. It is not an essential piece, and for an unelected official to have the power to decide when/if I am no longer a risk to the public if I refuse a test or treatment (which may have side effects and risks!) is egregious overreach. It's allowing my taxpayer dollars to be used against me, including payment for the courts I'd be using for the unelected official to prove I was a health threat if I didn't want a particular health intervention. **Where there is risk, there should always be choice.**

It is imperative to pay attention to the language that says on page 3, in lines 29-32 that an individual will remain in a place of quarantine "until the local health officer determines that the individual no longer poses a substantial risk of transmitting disease or condition to the public." By whose standards is this decision being made?! A health officer who follows the CDC that is the marketing arm of Pharma? We have two years of experience with the CDC handling health situations, and that hasn't worked well at all.

There is nothing in 129-b explaining where the place of quarantine might be, but if it isn't my house, it sounds like concentration camps which have no time restriction given. This is a free country, and after seeing countries fining and arresting citizens for going outside for fresh air in the height of the pandemic hype, I urge you to support shutting down this loophole with SB 489.

Chapter 65 statutes are to educate, to inform, and to recommend, which should be done by an elected group. Help us remain free by supporting SB 489!

Thank you for your service to our great state!

Melissa Campbell
Senate District 9
Johnson County