

Senate Health & Welfare Committee

Thursday, February 20, 2025 - 3:00 P.M.

TESTIMONY ON: All Subjects

Written Testimony

Name (First & Last)	Subject	Manner Testifying	Representing Company/Organization	City	For / Against	Wish to Testify	District #
Lyn McArthur	S 1088	IP	Idaho Psychological Association	Inkom	For	Y	35

Madame Chairwoman VanOrden and members of the committee,

My name is Dr. Lyn McArthur, and I am from Inkom. I am representing the Idaho Psychological Association. I am in favor of this bill because it will eliminate confusing or unnecessary laws, decrease barriers of entry into the marketplace, and will also allow for continuity of care for Idahoans receiving treatment as they travel out of state.

I frequently see patients who travel out of state, sometimes for long periods of time. Before PSYPACT, I could not see them while they left Idaho for college, the winter, or work. This interrupted their care and sometimes jeopardized their mental health. PSYPACT allows me to see my patients when they travel to 41 other states. I was surprised to discover that Idaho did not require background checks upon initial licensure. While this bill is being heard to comply with PSYPACT, it would also give parents and caregivers peace of mind to know that the psychologists working one-on-one with their children or family members with disabilities for an hour or more at a time do not have a history of harming people.

The proposed changes to the prescribing psychologist statutes are also vital to growing this field and providing more access to care. I have followed this legislation since it was originally passed. Since then, finding supervision has been extremely challenging for various reasons, causing some providers to be unable to provide the care they have been trained to give. The proposed changes would result in strong collaborative relationships between prescribing psychologists and a variety of healthcare providers, resulting in safe, quality care. Clarifying the terms of specialization is helpful as it was previously confusing. Since the Advisory Panel has not met in over two years, sunseting it seems appropriate and removes the related language from statute. Finally, adding psychopharmacology representation on the Board of Psychologist Examiners is necessary, as having someone who understands the standards of care for prescribing psychologists would be vital to complaints and investigations.

Thank you for your time and consideration.

Report Printed: Friday, February 21, 2025 9:05 AM

Page 1 of 23

Name (First & Last)	Subject	Manner Testifying	Representing Company/Organization	City	For / Against	Wish to Testify	District #
Lance Sayers	S 1089	IP	AIC	Kuna	For	Y	23

Madam Chair and members of this committee, thank you for this opportunity to testify today. I am Lance Sayers and I'm here on behalf of the Association of Idaho Cities and the 197 cities that we represent. I'm here to testify in support of Senate Bill 1089.

AIC believes that effective collaboration is the key to crafting any good bill that goes through the legislature. This legislation is a great example of that. It comes after several extensive discussions between almost a dozen stakeholders for the past two years. While there are many reasons why support for a waste tire recycling program is growing, one of the most important is that there is not enough funding currently available for cities and local jurisdictions to handle the waste tire problem.

Each year, the number of waste tire piles continues to grow. For instance, DEQ recently shared with our working group that there are at least 154,000 waste tires scattered throughout the Gem State. The number of tires found at each of these site ranges between 3,000 to 5,000 tires!

As this problem continues to go unaddressed and funding remains inadequate to address it, these tires pose a significant issue to our communities. Whether it's the increased threat of wildfires or the potential for contamination of Idaho waters, waste tire piles create a major health and safety hazard for Idahoans.

Perhaps more important, this policy method is not new. For example, as of last year 35 states have implemented a waste tire recycling program to address properly disposing waste tires. This program has been very successful in several states that border Idaho such as Utah and Nevada. The need for this program is great and cities and counties aren't in a position to be able to afford paying for the transport and recycling of hundreds of thousands of waste tires. Please send this bill to the Senate floor with a "Do Pass" recommendation so that cities can have the resources they need to be able to address such a significant burden on their communities. Thank you and I look forward to answering any questions this committee might have.

Joseph Crupper	H 59	W	self	POCATELLO	Against	N	29
----------------	------	---	------	-----------	---------	---	----

If there is a Christian doctor that wants to deny people healthcare, they should quit their job. The legislature shouldn't be making carve-outs for them to discriminate and perpetuate the creation of a lower class of individuals that do not deserve care.

Gross.

Report Printed: Friday, February 21, 2025 9:05 AM

Page 2 of 23

Name (First & Last)	Subject	Manner Testifying	Representing Company/Organization	City	For / Against	Wish to Testify	District #
------------------------	---------	----------------------	--------------------------------------	------	------------------	--------------------	---------------

Jennifer James	H 59	W	Self	Boise	Against	N	17
----------------	------	---	------	-------	---------	---	----

I urge you to vote against this bill because it is an outrageous overreach that will allow medical providers to potentially do immeasurable harm against individuals based on rights that are legally protected. An ambulance driver should not be allowed to refuse to take someone to the hospital because they saw a political sign in the yard of the patient that they disagreed with. A doctor should be allowed to refuse a life-saving referral because they don't agree with their patient's identity or lifestyle. "Personal morals" are an extremely diverse range of individualized beliefs and should have no place in determining whether they will provide healthcare. In fact, the American Medical Association directly supports this, stating "being a conscientious medical professional may well mean at times acting in ways contrary to one's personal ideals in order to adhere to a general professional obligation to serve patients' interests first." No matter who you are or what you believe in, there will be someone in the industry who disagrees with you, so this bill could negatively affect literally anyone.

Please reject this bill as it is extremely detrimental to every single person in the state of Idaho.

Jack Quigley	H 59	W	Seld	Pocatello	Against	N	29
--------------	------	---	------	-----------	---------	---	----

I am strongly against the passing of House Bill 59. This is, frankly, an absurdly dangerous bill.

The language of the bill is vague enough to encompass every individual who works in the health profession, from the receptionist at the front of the doctor's office, to the people running samples in labs, and to the doctor themselves. It also allows for any individual health professional to deny a person healthcare for literally any reason. If this bill is passed, then it would allow someone to deny care to someone wearing campaign merchandise for Donald Trump, because they are wearing that merchandise. Doctors, and any other individual working in the healthcare, would be allowed to refuse life saving care to an LDS missionary, just because that doctor finds that religion morally reprehensible.

Imagine attempting to apply this bill to any other arena of life. Could teachers refuse to have certain children in their classrooms due to the religion of that child? Could employees at the DMV refuse to allow citizens to renew their licenses and registration because they believe that person exists in a way they disagree with? Does that sound ridiculous? Good. Because it is.

I am firm advocate for protecting people's rights and liberties. This bill does not do that. Instead, it would create an institutional anarchy that anyone, on either side of the aisle, on any side of any debate, could find themselves on the "wrong" end of.

Finally, I ask the members of the committee to entertain the idea that passing this bill would make it much harder to find healthcare

Report Printed: Friday, February 21, 2025 9:05 AM

Page 3 of 23

Name (First & Last)	Subject	Manner Testifying	Representing Company/Organization	City	For / Against	Wish to Testify	District #
------------------------	---------	----------------------	--------------------------------------	------	------------------	--------------------	---------------

Jack Quigley	<i>cont.</i>						29
--------------	--------------	--	--	--	--	--	----

in their respective districts because of the work they do on behalf of their constituents.

This is a destructive, and to be quite frank, reckless bill. I am asking the members of the committee to block this bill here and now, and keep Idahoans safe.

Alex Kuyper	H 59	W	Self	Pocatello	Against	N	29
-------------	------	---	------	-----------	---------	---	----

Representatives, this legislation will not only cause unintended harm, it won't achieve what it is aiming to address. This bill will allow for ANY moral objection to prevent healthcare. Man wearing a MAGA hat, no health care for him. Woman with blue hair, no health care for her. Not only do your constituents not want this, the medical community is united against this bill. Fail this legislation if you actually want to make Idaho a state where people want to live.

Erin Burleson	H 59	W	self	Boise	Against	N	18
---------------	------	---	------	-------	---------	---	----

House Bill 59 is extreme and will cause harm to patients in Idaho.

HB 59 is so broad that virtually any person who participates in any health care services could object for essentially any reason, so long as the person claims it goes against their moral beliefs. All people in Idaho should be able to access the care they need, when they need it, without fear that their provider will withhold evidence-based care, coverage, or information. Especially for the people in small towns or rural areas of Idaho, this bill could mean that they cannot get the health care they need if their local providers object to care. This could cause long-term, irreversible harm to patients.

This bill even allows people and institutions to deny care based on their objection to the patient themselves – such as denying contraception to an unmarried woman, or refusing to provide pediatric care to a child with gay or lesbian parents. Health care entities should not be able to pick and choose who gets to receive critical medical care based on personal or religious beliefs. Bills like HB 59 are not supported by leaders in the healthcare field.

The American Congress of Obstetricians and Gynecologists (ACOG) ethics opinion states that "in an emergency in which referral is not possible or might negatively affect a patient's physical or mental health, providers have an obligation to provide medically indicated and requested care regardless of the provider's personal moral objections. The American Medical Association's (AMA) constitution and bylaws state "being a conscientious medical professional may well mean at times acting in ways contrary to one's personal ideals in order to adhere to a general professional obligation to serve patients' interests first." and that "having discretion to follow conscience with respect to specific interventions or services does not relieve the physician of the obligation to not abandon a patient."

This bill allows virtually anyone in a health care setting to refuse to provide a range of services and prescriptions based on nothing

Report Printed: Friday, February 21, 2025 9:05 AM

Page 4 of 23

Name (First & Last)	Subject	Manner Testifying	Representing Company/Organization	City	For / Against	Wish to Testify	District #
------------------------	---------	----------------------	--------------------------------------	------	------------------	--------------------	---------------

Erin Burleson *cont.* 18

more than their own morals. If enacted, HB 59 would become one of the most extreme refusal laws in the country. Please put Idaho patients first and oppose this dangerous legislation.

Megan Brown H 59 W Self Boise Against N 15

I strongly oppose HB 59, a dangerously broad refusal bill that prioritizes personal beliefs over patient care. This legislation allows health care providers to deny essential, evidence-based medical services, information, and even referrals for virtually any reason, putting patients—especially those in rural areas—at risk of serious harm. Under HB 59, a pharmacist could refuse to dispense life-saving medications, a doctor could deny care to a child because of their parents' sexual orientation, or an insurance company could withhold coverage for critical procedures. Patients deserve timely, unbiased medical care—not discrimination masked as "conscience rights." I am a health care provider and as all health care providers, we take an oath to do no harm. This bill will cause great harm. Idaho must reject this bill to protect access to safe, ethical, and inclusive health care for all.

Karen Cuellar H 59 IP self, Humanists of Idaho Boise Against Y 17

I would like to discuss the human race and the spectrum of who we are and the science behind this, and the futility of laws that are anti-science. It weakens our state from a public policy and economic perspective.

Judy Thorne H 59 W Self Boise Against N 19

I'd like to go on record in opposition of this bill. The Idaho legislature should stop wasting taxpayer time and money on bills that interfere in personal choices; related to this bill, specifically, are private discussions between providers and patients. Providers sign a Hippocratic Oath to serve their patients without judgement and to do no harm. None of these private/protected conversations are your business nor your area of expertise. To my knowledge, most of you are not physicians and I would challenge that if any of you are, you should be ashamed of yourselves if you support this bill. Please stay out of the private lives of Idaho citizens! There are far more important matters that you should be tending to in our great state: education, infrastructure, taxes/economy, safety; those are issues for which you have been placed in office. Please stop these wasteful endeavors and focus on the reasons you hold the position you are in.

Judy Thorne  
Boise, ID

Name (First & Last)	Subject	Manner Testifying	Representing Company/Organization	City	For / Against	Wish to Testify	District #
------------------------	---------	----------------------	--------------------------------------	------	------------------	--------------------	---------------

Steven Shapiro H 59 IP Self Boise Against Y 15

Will Submit with Testimony

Angela Matson H 59 W Self Boise Against N 19

I am against this bill because discrimination and hate have no place in the medical field, in fact the Hippocratic oath is based on the principles of medical confidentiality and non-maleficence. To forego any medical procedures, at will, goes the hippocratic oath and should not be legal. It's a slippery slope to get to "I won't save this person's life because they are gay", that cannot be tolerated.

Joy Huffman H 59 IP Self Homedale For Y 23

Madam Chair and Committee Members:

My experience has been told several times in committee, so in brief:

In the summer of 2021, I was working on the med-surg unit at a Nampa hospital when they underwent a rapid turnover of nurses. I saw travel and FEMA nurses replace regular staff upwards of 50% on some shifts. I was shocked when my Nurse manager told me that over 200 nurses had recently left their jobs in the system. You might recall the news showing nurses outside hospitals protesting mandates 18 months into the pandemic. I can tell you in staff meetings, nurse's questions and concerns were minimized.

You should have an infographic titled "The Need for the MED ACT". It was researched by the Alliance Defending Freedom and explains perhaps why so many nurses left their jobs then. Turns out, a majority of HCP's would rather stop practicing medicine than violate their ethical, moral, or religious beliefs.

Disregarding conscience rights hurts retention of medical providers, and with provider shortages forecasted, this issue affects every provider and consumer of health care in our state.

To paraphrase James Madison: if a man cannot be loyal to conscience, the government cannot expect loyalty to less compelling obligations. In other words, if the law demands we betray our conscience, our moral basis for obeying any law has been hindered.

This bill doesn't elevate 1 belief system over another. Rights of conscience apply across ideologies.

Thank you for consideration and passage of H59.

Name (First & Last)	Subject	Manner Testifying	Representing Company/Organization	City	For / Against	Wish to Testify	District #
Joy Huffman	<i>cont.</i>						23

Katie McCollum	H 59	W	Self	Coeur d'Alene	For	N	3
----------------	------	---	------	---------------	-----	---	---

Please vote FOR H59! Idaho has a reputation of being a State of freedom. What was perpetrated against Idahoans during Covid did not sit well with the majority of Idahoans which voiced their concerns. You need to help to keep Idaho freedoms by voting FOR H59!

Thank you,  
Katie McCollum

Xiaomeng Xu	H 59	W	Self	Pocatello	Against	N	29
-------------	------	---	------	-----------	---------	---	----

This bill if passed would allow healthcare providers to withhold care for virtually any reason. For example, if someone is ethically opposed to guns and war, they could legally refuse to provide care to active duty personnel, veterans, hunters, police officers etc.

Hallie Fox	H 59	W	Self	Boise	Against	N	16
------------	------	---	------	-------	---------	---	----

I stand strongly against this bill. As a healthcare worker at a nonprofit hospital, I see firsthand how important it is for individuals to get unbiased care no matter who they are. As healthcare workers, we take on our positions knowing that it is our duty to treat each patient with dignity and respect, despite any personal differences. This should continue to be the standard of care. Giving healthcare providers at any level, insurers, and institutions the ability to turn away individuals in need of care due to "conscious" opens a terrifying crack in the healthcare system that patients will fall into, especially underserved patients who often need care the most and are discriminated against the most. Patients all over the state would be in danger if this bill became a law as we have so many rural regions that are severely lacking in healthcare and there are very limited healthcare providers.

I am applying to medical school in just a few months and the process is grueling, and that is just to be accepted. Then, physicians must undergo a rigorous academic education for four years and at least another long four years (and often more) of residency and many board exams to practice medicine. I cannot fathom a physician undergoing all of this effort, sacrificing so much to get to practice medicine, and then wanting to turn their backs on patients in need. This bill undermines the very core of medicine and the empathy all medical providers should have.

Take a moment to consider what it would be like to be a patient being denied care and how that would affect you. Imagine you come to the emergency room for an acute injury and your emergency room physician refuses to give you care because they know who you are

Report Printed: Friday, February 21, 2025 9:05 AM

Page 7 of 23

Name (First & Last)	Subject	Manner Testifying	Representing Company/Organization	City	For / Against	Wish to Testify	District #
------------------------	---------	----------------------	--------------------------------------	------	------------------	--------------------	---------------

Hallie Fox	<i>cont.</i>						16
------------	--------------	--	--	--	--	--	----

and the policies you have approved go against their morals. Imagine this happens to one of your constituents in a rural setting where this is the only healthcare provider to give them care...now what? Please have empathy and consideration for others when considering this bill; put yourself in another's shoes and consider what it would be like to be denied care for something that is a core value of yours such as your religion or something you cannot control such as your ethnicity or race.

Peggy McFarland	H 59	IP	Self	Homedale	For	Y	23
-----------------	------	----	------	----------	-----	---	----

1. Protecting speech and conscience rights helps good ideas come to the surface and bad ideas fall away.
2. A "social justice" (DEI) ideology has captured our profession.
3. Social justice prohibits free speech.
4. Social justice limits informed consent based on true science.
5. Social justice requires us to push children into a sexualized "cultural identity" that is based on a "born that way" myth. We are to tell parents who do not support these ideologies that they are oppressive.
6. Parents have the right to make informed choices.
7. Protecting the moral and ethical rights of professionals preserves informed consent and scientific integrity in the healthcare professions.

Elena Vorm	H 59	W	Self	Sun Valley	Against	N	26
------------	------	---	------	------------	---------	---	----

Health care refusal laws like HB 59 allow individuals and health care institutions to deny patients health care services, information, or referrals that would normally be required to provide under the law on the basis of religious, moral, or ethical objection. I am against this bill because all Idahoans should be able to access the care they need, when they need it, without fear that their provider will withhold evidence-based care or information or their insurance will deny coverage simply because they disagree with some aspect of their care or their mere existence.

Dr. Renata Moon MD	H 59	V	Self	Hayden	For	Y	3
--------------------	------	---	------	--------	-----	---	---

Free speech, open debate & discussion are the foundation of a healthy medical community & thriving nation. When the freedom to speak is stripped away, all citizens suffer.

Report Printed: Friday, February 21, 2025 9:05 AM

Page 8 of 23

Name (First & Last)	Subject	Manner Testifying	Representing Company/Organization	City	For / Against	Wish to Testify	District #
Dr. Renata Moon MD	<i>cont.</i>						3

I was raised in Idaho and have strong connections to this state. I practiced pediatric medicine for almost two decades in the State of Washington with a clean record of patient care. Despite caring for my region's sickest hospitalized children, I never had any actions, investigations or lawsuits against any state medical license until I spoke at a US Senate hearing.

In December 2022, I spoke as a private citizen at a Senate hearing in Washington DC where I expressed my legitimate concerns about the dangers of administering the Covid-19 shots to our nation's children. As a direct result of my testimony at this Senate hearing, my Washington State medical school employer terminated my position as a Clinical Associate Professor of medicine and then reported my testimony to the Washington State Medical Commission alleging "unprofessional conduct" for the simple act of speaking. My medical license was investigated and I now spend countless hours defending myself and explaining this mark on my career record when I apply for new hospital or clinic privileges.

This tyrannical suppression of free speech must never again be allowed to happen in the United States of America. The weaponization of our regulatory agencies against its citizens and professionals simply for the act of speaking is dangerous and must be stopped in its tracks. Idaho is wise to consider a bill that will defend this fundamental right to engage in free speech without threat of retaliation.

Please support our Constitutional First Amendment right to free speech and protect all of our civil liberties.

World history has clearly demonstrated the outcome when freedoms are lost; our nation was built on a foundation of freedom and this freedom must be fiercely protected.

Silentmajorityfoundation.org  
Look under "Free Speech" on this link for further details

Thank you-

Renata S. Moon MD  
Pediatrician

Name (First & Last)	Subject	Manner Testifying	Representing Company/Organization	City	For / Against	Wish to Testify	District #
Katie Thompson	H 59	V	Self	Meridian	For	Y	21

Good afternoon, Mr. Chairman and Members of the Committee. My name is Katie Thompson, a resident of Meridian Idaho and Marketing Manager for Silent Majority Foundation, a non-profit organization fighting to protect constitutional rights of Americans including free speech rights and medical freedom. I'm here to express my strong support for the Medical Ethics Defense Act, Bill H0059.

After escaping the mess that is Washington state in 2024, I am here to shed light on critical issues concerning the censoring and persecution of physicians in Washington state who dared to share relevant data and research that was not in alignment with the Washington State Medical Commission COVID-19 Position Statement. Through my work with the team at SMF and through personal experience in the medical environment in a state such as Washington, I have experienced firsthand the far-reaching consequences of suppressive medical policies imposed by the state commissions and legislators. The commission's "COVID-19 Misinformation Position Statement," which was enforced without following due legal process, has targeted physicians who have simply exercised their professional judgment and spoken freely about issues affecting the safety and effective care of their patients.

Physicians like Dr. Michael Turner, Dr. Renata Moon, Dr. Ryan Cole and Dr. Richard Wilkinson have been persecuted by the WMC for voicing dissenting perspectives or treating patients with methods that fell outside the "accepted narrative." These respected professionals were investigated, fined, and even had their licenses endangered, not because of harm caused to patients, but because they spoke up or took actions contrary to the WMC's unilaterally imposed position.

I have provided specific examples from their cases in my written testimony. (source links provided):

- Dr. Michael Turner prescribed off-label treatments like Ivermectin, which his patients expressed gratitude for, only to face unsubstantiated complaints and punitive action by the WMC (source).
- Dr. Renata Moon, a veteran pediatrician, lost her job and faced license investigations simply for raising legitimate concerns about untested medical interventions during Senator Ron Johnson's Senate roundtable (source).
- Dr. Richard Wilkinson was fined, placed on probation, and required to undergo reeducation—not for harming anyone, but for speaking and treating patients using his professional judgment (source).

These actions show the absolute necessity to ensure Physicians are able to speak freely and avoid a state using its authority to enforce compliance with a single narrative, rather than allowing physicians the freedom to discuss or act upon diverse, evidence-based approaches to care. This is a dangerous precedent that must not extend beyond the mess of Washington state.

This is not just a question of physician rights; it directly affects patients. I have personally been on the receiving end of a climate of fear where doctors were too afraid to discuss alternative treatments or provide me with the care I needed. These physicians worried about being reported or persecuted by the medical commission, and that fear compromised the quality of their care. It was only when I moved to Idaho that I was able to receive the medication I needed and that has made a huge impact on my ability to function with an autoimmune disorder.

When physicians are silenced, patients are denied access to diverse opinions, treatments, and options—rights guaranteed under the

Name (First & Last)	Subject	Manner Testifying	Representing Company/Organization	City	For / Against	Wish to Testify	District #
Katie Thompson	<i>cont.</i>						21

First Amendment. The very foundation of informed consent is rooted in a patient's ability to hear differing perspectives from their doctors. Restricting what physicians can say erodes our ability to make fully informed decisions about our health.

The First Amendment protects the speech of every U.S. citizen, including physicians. It also protects our right as patients to hear evidence-based speech that may not fit into a state-pushed narrative. When agencies like the WMC overstep their authority and punish doctors for lawful speech, they strip away both doctor and patient rights, leaving us with a chilling environment of fear and compliance rather than discovery, debate and effective care.

Idaho has the opportunity to set an example by ensuring this type of overreach does not happen here. Protecting physicians' ability to speak freely promotes better care for patients, encourages innovation in medicine, and strengthens trust between doctors and the public.

I urge you to consider this issue seriously and to support policies that protect medical freedom and uphold the First Amendment within Idaho's healthcare system. Free speech

must remain a cornerstone of both our legal and medical frameworks, ensuring doctors and patients alike can discuss, innovate, and make decisions without fear of persecution.

Thank you for your time, and I am happy to take any questions or provide additional information.

Steven Shapiro	H 59	IP	self	Boise	Against	Y	15
----------------	------	----	------	-------	---------	---	----

This is a resubmission that includes a copy of my testimony that was not available yesterday evening:

Madam Chair, members of the committee. My name is Steven Shapiro, I live in Boise and I am representing myself.

I would like to address the HB59 clauses that would enable health care professionals to deny treatment due to religious objection.

The religious issue is not what any one specific version of the Bible contains, but rather, how those writings are interpreted.

For example, the Bible does not explicitly prohibit abortion. Numerous passages in the Bible have been interpreted to mean that abortion is wrong. Over the centuries, these interpretations have resulted directly or indirectly in anti-abortion laws.

But abortion is not why I am here.

Name (First & Last)	Subject	Manner Testifying	Representing Company/Organization	City	For / Against	Wish to Testify	District #
Steven Shapiro	<i>cont.</i>						15

I have an autoimmune disease called Pemphigus. My immune system attacks my one layer of my skin, causing it to blister and fall off. When I was admitted to the Methodist Hospital in Houston, Texas, I had what looked like 2nd degree burns over about 40% of my skin surface, including the inside of my mouth.

Pemphigus is one of several dozen illnesses classified as a bullous disease.

Job of the Old Testament probably had a bullous disease. Under the religious exemption clause of HB59, instead of being prescribed Prednisone to treat my illness, I could have been turned away because God was testing me, just like he tested Job.

Similarly, I am Jewish, left handed and have imperfect eyesight. Biblical interpretations have resulted in religious persecution of people like myself and some of you over the last several thousand years.

Therefore, I urge you to vote against this bill. Thank you

Appendix I – Verses commonly interpreted as opposing abortion (NKJV)

Commandment 5 (Exodus 20:13) 13 You shall not murder.

Genesis 1:26-27 26 Then God said, "Let Us make man in Our image, according to Our likeness; let them have dominion over the fish of the sea, over the birds of the air, and over the cattle, over all the earth and over every creeping thing that creeps on the earth." 27 So God created man in His own image; in the image of God He created him; male and female He created them.

2 Kings 22:16 16 Moreover Manasseh shed very much innocent blood, till he had filled Jerusalem from one end to another, besides his sin by which he made Judah sin, in doing evil in the sight of the LORD.

Job 10:7-12 7 Although You know that I am not wicked, And there is no one who can deliver from Your hand? 8 'Your hands have made me and fashioned me, An intricate unity; Yet You would destroy me. 9 Remember, I pray, that You have made me like clay. And will You turn me into dust again? 10 Did You not pour me out like milk, And curdle me like cheese, 11 Clothe me with skin and flesh, And knit me together with bones and sinews? 12 You have granted me life and favor, And Your care has preserved my spirit.

Job 31:15 15 Did not He who made me in the womb make them? Did not the same One fashion us in the womb?

Psalms 22:9-10: 9 But You are He who took Me out of the womb; You made Me trust while on My mother's breasts. 10 I was cast upon You from birth. From My mother's womb You have been My God.

Psalms 106:37-38 38 They even sacrificed their sons And their daughters to demons, 38 And shed innocent blood, The blood of their sons and daughters, Whom they sacrificed to the idols of Canaan; And the land was polluted with blood

Psalms 127:3-5 3 Behold, children are a heritage from the LORD, The fruit of the womb is a reward. 4 Like arrows in the hand of a warrior, So are the children of one's youth. 5 Happy is the man who has his quiver full of them; They shall not be ashamed, But shall

Name (First & Last)	Subject	Manner Testifying	Representing Company/Organization	City	For / Against	Wish to Testify	District #
------------------------	---------	----------------------	--------------------------------------	------	------------------	--------------------	---------------

Steven Shapiro

*cont.*

15

speak with their enemies in the gate.

Psalms 139:13-16 13 For You formed my inward parts; You covered me in my mother's womb. 14 I will praise You, for I am fearfully and wonderfully made; Marvelous are Your works, And that my soul knows very well. My frame was not hidden from You, When I was made in secret, And skillfully wrought in the lowest parts of the earth. 16 Your eyes saw my substance, being yet unformed. And in Your book they all were written, The days fashioned for me, When as yet there were none of them.

Isaiah 44:2 2 Thus says the LORD who made you And formed you from the womb, who will help you: 'Fear not, O Jacob My servant; And you, Jeshurun, whom I have chosen.

Jeremiah 1:4-5 4 Then the word of the LORD came to me, saying: 5 "Before I formed you in the womb I knew you; Before you were born I sanctified you; I ordained you a prophet to the nations."

Luke 1:41 41 And it happened, when Elizabeth heard the greeting of Mary, that the babe leaped in her womb; and Elizabeth was filled with the Holy Spirit.

Acts 17:25 25 "Nor is He worshiped with men's hands, as though He needed anything, since He gives to all life, breath, and all things.

**Appendix II - Bullous diseases (AI Summary)**

There are many types of bullous diseases, including pemphigus, bullous pemphigoid, and epidermolysis bullosa. Bullous diseases are a group of skin disorders that cause blisters. They can be autoimmune, mechanical, metabolic, or allergic.

Autoimmune bullous diseases: Pemphigus: Includes pemphigus vulgaris, pemphigus foliaceus, paraneoplastic pemphigus, and IgA pemphigus (standardized prevalence is 5.2 per 100,000 adults); Bullous pemphigoid: An autoimmune subepidermal blistering dermatosis; Pemphigoid gestationis: (occurs during pregnancy); Linear immunoglobulin A disease; Dermatitis herpetiformis

Mechanical bullous diseases: Epidermolysis bullosa simplex; Junctional epidermolysis bullosa; Dystrophic epidermolysis bullosa

Other bullous diseases Bullous erythema multiforme, Toxic epidermal necrolysis, Porphyria, Diabetic bullae, and Bullous amyloidosis. Bullous diseases can affect the skin and/or oral mucosa. They can be life threatening because the skin is a vital organ that protects the body from dehydration and infection.

Approximately 50 out of every 1 million people have a bullous disease, so there are probably between 50 and 150 people currently living in Idaho with one of these conditions.

**Appendix III – God tests Job; Job has a bullous disease**

Job 2:3-6 3 Then the LORD said to Satan, "Have you considered My servant Job, that there is none like him on the earth, aa blameless and upright man, one who fears God and shuns evil? And still he holds fast to his integrity, although you incited Me against

Report Printed: Friday, February 21, 2025 9:05 AM

Page 13 of 23

Name (First & Last)	Subject	Manner Testifying	Representing Company/Organization	City	For / Against	Wish to Testify	District #
------------------------	---------	----------------------	--------------------------------------	------	------------------	--------------------	---------------

Steven Shapiro

*cont.*

15

him, to destroy him without cause." 4 So Satan answered the LORD and said, "Skin for skin! Yes, all that a man has he will give for his life. 5 "But stretch out Your hand now, and touch his bone and his flesh, and he will surely curse You to Your face!" And the LORD said to Satan, "Behold, he is in your hand, but spare his life."

Job 2:7 7 So Satan went out from the presence of the LORD, and struck Job with painful boils from the sole of his foot to the crown of his head.

Job 23:10 10 But He knows the way that I take; When He has tested me, I shall come forth as gold.

**Appendix IV – Eyesight**

Leviticus 21:20 20 'or is a hunchback or a dwarf, or a man who has a defect in his eye, or eczema or scab, or is a eunuch. (Leviticus 21 mentions several other factors, including divorce, that can defile a person)

Matthew 6:22-23 22 "The lamp of the body is the eye. If therefore your eye is good, your whole body will be full of light. 23 "But if your eye is bad, your whole body will be full of darkness. If therefore the light that is in you is darkness, how great is that darkness!

**Appendix V – Left handed**

Genesis 48:13-18 13 And Joseph took them both, Ephraim with his right hand toward Israel's left hand, and Manasseh with his left hand toward Israel's right hand, and brought them near him. 14 Then Israel stretched out his right hand and laid it on Ephraim's head, who was the younger, and his left hand on Manasseh's head, guiding his hands knowingly, for Manasseh was the firstborn. 15 And he blessed Joseph, and said: "God, before whom my fathers Abraham and Isaac walked, The God who has redeemed me all my life long to this day, 16 The Angel who has redeemed me from all evil, Bless the lads; Let my name be named upon them, And the name of my fathers Abraham and Isaac; And let them grow into a multitude in the midst of the earth." 17 Now when Joseph saw that his father laid his right hand on the head of Ephraim, it displeased him; so he took hold of his father's hand to remove it from Ephraim's head to Manasseh's head. 18 And Joseph said to his father, "Not so, my father, for this one is the firstborn; put your right hand on his head."

Exodus 15:6 6 Your aright hand, O LORD, has become glorious in power; Your right hand, O LORD, has dashed the enemy in pieces.

Psalms 118:16 16 The right hand of the LORD is exalted; The right hand of the LORD does valiantly.

Matthew 25:31-33 31 "When the Son of Man comes in His glory, and all the holy angels with Him, then He will sit on the throne of His glory. 32 "All the nations will be gathered before Him, and He will separate them one from another, as a shepherd divides his sheep from the goats. 33 "And He will set the sheep on His right hand, but the goats on the left.

Acts 2:33 33 "Therefore being exalted to the right hand of God, and having received from the Father the promise of the Holy Spirit, He poured out this which you now see and hear.

Galatians 2:9 9 and when James, Cephas, and John, who seemed to be pillars, perceived the grace that had been given to me, they gave me and Barnabas the right hand of fellowship, that we should go to the Gentiles and they to the circumcised.

Report Printed: Friday, February 21, 2025 9:05 AM

Page 14 of 23

Name (First & Last)	Subject	Manner Testifying	Representing Company/Organization	City	For / Against	Wish to Testify	District #
Steven Shapiro	<i>cont.</i>						15
Nissa Nagel	H 59	W	self	Boise	Against	N	19
Amy Dundon	H 59	W	ACLU of Idaho	Boise	Against	N	19

Written testimony in opposition to House Bill 59, Submitted to the Idaho Senate Health and Welfare Committee on February 20, 2025, by the American Civil Liberties Union of Idaho

Chair VanOrden and Members of the Committee,

The ACLU and ACLU of Idaho oppose House Bill 59 (HB 59), a bill that weaponizes the principles of religious liberty protections to effectuate discrimination – and circumvent health care laws. Medical care should be guided by medical and scientific standards, not religious beliefs. What’s more, we are troubled the state legislature has in recent years encroached on Idaho healthcare providers right to perform standard medical care, offering no similar “conscience” exemptions for providers that wish to uphold their sworn obligations under the Hippocratic oath for gender affirming care or reproductive care. Effectively compelling some healthcare providers to abandon their duty to provide standard treatment to patients while simultaneously allowing other providers to skirt responsibility under the guise of religious freedom is not liberty. Legislation like HB 58 pits religious ideals against constitutional obligations to equal treatment and fairness. Such discriminatory policies have no place in Idaho.

Patient needs, not personal beliefs, should always be the foundation of medical treatment. Policies like HB 59 would severely limit already uneven access to healthcare in our state. The bill’s disregard for harm to patients is alarming, but, unfortunately, not surprising – Idaho has, time and again, legislated medical treatment parameters in ways that ignore both the advice and research-backed findings of the medical community and the needs of Idahoans.

The bill before you today further erodes establishment clause precedent – and, through its radical reinterpretation of the free exercise clause doctrine, shows blatant favor towards those that object to public health measures, antidiscrimination laws, and indeed

Report Printed: Friday, February 21, 2025 9:05 AM

Page 15 of 23

Name (First & Last)	Subject	Manner Testifying	Representing Company/Organization	City	For / Against	Wish to Testify	District #
Amy Dundon	<i>cont.</i>						19

the broader health and wellbeing of Idahoans across our state.

HB 59 likely conflicts with federal civil rights protections, including anti-discrimination laws (e.g., Title VII of the Civil Rights Act, the Affordable Care Act’s non-discrimination provisions). These federal laws prohibit discrimination based on sex, race, religion, and other protected categories in healthcare. If the bill permits healthcare providers to refuse service based on personal beliefs, it could potentially violate federal non-discrimination standards, especially if patients are denied care or face discrimination.

To place the moral and religious beliefs of a healthcare provider above the safety of a patient violates that patient’s right to treatment. HB 59 raises serious concerns about matters of emergency medical treatment – an issue already embroiled in legal challenges (see: *Moyle v. United States*).

Should it pass, HB 59 would protect providers’ rights but with much weaker protections for patients’ rights. We fear patients could be denied necessary, standard care and that new barriers to accessing care would disproportionately affect vulnerable groups, including women, LGBTQ+ folks, and low income and rural folks across Idaho that are already having trouble accessing healthcare. To that end, we also fear the bill would exacerbate the already dire state of healthcare in Idaho by allowing institutions to implement hiring practices in ways that discriminate against employees who do not share the same conscience-based objections.

To be clear: limiting hiring based on different beliefs is unconstitutional. There is no apparent enforcement mechanism in HB 59, so institutions could implement some kind of “religious” or “moral” test as an employment requirement. We also know creating a right to refuse services based on beliefs would create tension in healthcare settings, potentially leading to a hostile work environment for employees who are asked to perform duties that conflict with their ethical or religious views. It would also violate privacy because it would force employees to disclose deeply personal beliefs.

HB 59 also threatens speech and professional protections. That is, the bill provides protections for healthcare providers’ free speech rights in ways that could conflict with professional ethical standards. Healthcare providers have a duty to provide comprehensive medical care and refusal to offer certain information or treatment (based on belief rather than medical assessment) would likely violate medical ethics, particularly when such refusals could harm patients’ health or limit their access to critical services.

While HB 59 includes whistleblower protections that appear to shield providers who report violations, we have significant concerns that such provisions may be wielded to protect individuals that refuse essential services or fail to follow medical protocols. This provision would stymie any meaningful attempt to ensure accountability in the professional standards and medical ethics of providers in healthcare

Report Printed: Friday, February 21, 2025 9:05 AM

Page 16 of 23

Name (First & Last)	Subject	Manner Testifying	Representing Company/Organization	City	For / Against	Wish to Testify	District #
Amy Dundon	<i>cont.</i>						19

settings.

To be clear, HB 59 does not override the requirement for emergency medical treatment under federal law (42 U.S.C. 1395dd) but given Idaho's already precarious relationship to emergency healthcare treatment provisions, the bill would likely create confusion around how healthcare providers are expected to apply their conscience-based objections in emergency situations. If healthcare workers exercise their right of conscience, it could lead to delays or denials of emergency care, which might jeopardize patients' civil rights to receive immediate and necessary medical treatment.

Given real concerns over discrimination, access to healthcare, and potential conflicts with anti-discrimination laws engendered by HB 59, we urge your opposition to this bill.

Respectfully submitted,  
Amy Dundon, Legislative Strategist  
ACLU of Idaho

Rachel Van Blankenship	H 59	W	Self	Boise	Against	N	15
---------------------------	------	---	------	-------	---------	---	----

This is one of the worst bills I've seen this session. It's so blinded in hate towards women and trans individuals, the author of the bill doesn't even realize it could impact literally everyone who tries to get healthcare or see a doctor. What if a doctor doesn't believe in the MAGA agenda? They could refuse care. What if a doctor believes in an assault weapons ban and sees a loud, proud gun owner with cancer, but refuses their care due to moral issues? This bill goes against every oath a doctor takes before they enter the profession. This isn't a cake some baker can refuse to make because a gay couple is wanting to get married; this is about people's literal lives. You're seriously proposing a doctor can refuse life-saving care to an individual for moral reasons?! You are seriously proposing insurance companies can deny coverage for birth control, vaccines and cancer screenings for personal reasons?! Or an ambulance driver can refuse to drive a dying person to a hospital because they happen to have a tattoo or hair style the driver doesn't "morally" approve of? Who is this bill supposed to protect? Big business? Insurance companies? Because it certainly doesn't protect any Idahoan, no matter what you believe in. What's worse, this bill allows those who refuse to provide care to sue if their so-called "conscience rights" are violated and shields these individuals from liability if a patient is injured as a result of their refusal. So if my daughter is rushed to the ER and needs life saving surgery and a doctor refuses to treat her and she dies because of it, that doctor is allowed to sue our family and is shielded

Report Printed: Friday, February 21, 2025 9:05 AM

Page 17 of 23

Name (First & Last)	Subject	Manner Testifying	Representing Company/Organization	City	For / Against	Wish to Testify	District #
Rachel Van Blankenship	<i>cont.</i>						15

from wrongful death lawsuits?

Can you all please, at least THINK about the bills you are bringing into this legislation before you waste tax-payer dollars. This is the most extreme refusal law in the country and would hurt every citizen who lives here.

Shane Macaulay	H 59	V	self	Worley	For	Y	5
----------------	------	---	------	--------	-----	---	---

My name is Dr. Shane Macaulay. I am a physician who has practiced for more than 30 years, mostly in Washington State, where I served as president of the Washington State Medical Association. I also worked for several years at the American Medical Association on the Washington state AMA delegation. I have a long time interest in medical ethics and medical policy. I strongly support the Medical Ethics Defense Act, H0059. Unfortunately, because of the growth of ethically and morally problematic areas in medicine, the freedom of conscience of physicians, pharmacists, nurses and other healthcare professionals is under increasing pressure. Additionally, as the whole country observed in the controversies surrounding the COVID pandemic, the free speech rights of healthcare professionals who disagreed with the often improper recommendations of the CDC and its suppression of scientific evidence were attacked, to the detriment of true scientific inquiry and of patients' ability to get truthful medical information. Even today, physicians are having their licensure and livelihoods threatened for challenging the doctrinaire and often ideologically-based positions of organized medical groups and licensing bodies.

Attached is a recently-filed lawsuit (<https://aapsonline.org/judicial/aaps-v-abim-amended-complaint-10-21-2024.pdf>) documenting numerous egregious examples of specialty boards retaliating against physicians for free speech that did not align with the boards' positions on COVID, abortion, or other issues. Some of these sanctioned physicians are highly renowned experts. Pages 1-3 of the attached lawsuit give a summary of the concerted actions taken by specialty boards to revoke the certification - and therefore to intentionally severely impair the ability to practice medicine - of physicians using disfavored free speech. Page 13 details how the revocation of board certification by specialty board monopolies may lead to loss of medical licensure and loss of hospital privileges.

Even leading public medical experts like Stanford's Dr. Jay Bhattacharya, who dared to question CDC and its public health mandates, were roundly attacked and discredited for spreading "disinformation and misinformation". The Department of Homeland Security called "COVID disinformation" (that is, contrary information) a terrorism threat for "undermining trust...in government" (<https://www.dhs.gov/ntas/advisory/national-terrorism-advisory-system-bulletin-february-07-2022>). As it turned out, Dr. Bhattacharya was correct in nearly all his positions, while the CDC positions often could not be supported by scientific evidence; ironically, Dr. Bhattacharya has now been nominated by President Trump to head the National Institutes of Health.

Report Printed: Friday, February 21, 2025 9:05 AM

Page 18 of 23

Name (First & Last)	Subject	Manner Testifying	Representing Company/Organization	City	For / Against	Wish to Testify	District #
------------------------	---------	----------------------	--------------------------------------	------	------------------	--------------------	---------------

Shane Macaulay	<i>cont.</i>						5
----------------	--------------	--	--	--	--	--	---

Closer to home, at the state level just across the border, the Washington State Medical Association (WSMA) recently (2022) adopted the policy below ("B-16") to label physicians' speech that does not parrot the majority position as "misinformation" that could result in loss of medical licensure:

"WHEREAS, Federation of State Medical Boards (FSMB), which supports its member state medical licensing boards, issued a statement saying that providing misinformation about the COVID-19 vaccine contradicts physicians' ethical and professional responsibilities, and therefore may subject a physician to disciplinary actions, including suspension or revocation of their medical license. The American Board of Family Medicine (ABFM), the American Board of Internal Medicine (ABIM), and the American Board of Pediatrics (ABP) support FSMB's position [7. Newton W, Baron RJ, Nichols DG. Joint statement on dissemination of misinformation. Philadelphia: American Board of Internal Medicine, September 9, 2021

(<https://www.abim.org/media-center/press-releases/joint-statement-on-dissemination-of-misinformation/>); and THEREFORE BE IT...

RESOLVED, the Washington State Medical Association recognizes that providing misinformation regarding the COVID-19 vaccine, and other vaccines in general, contradicts physicians' and other healthcare professionals' ethical and professional responsibilities. (New HOD Policy)"

Labeling statements of contrary fact or opinion about the very new and incompletely understood COVID vaccine in 2022 as "misinformation" - many of which statements were subsequently shown to be true, such as vaccine complications and the inability of the vaccine to prevent infection and spread of the disease - as "unethical and unprofessional conduct" was completely inappropriate and served to intimidate physicians into silence by exposing them to sanctions by licensing bodies, including loss of licensure, and by specialty boards that control livelihoods. The WSMA policy endorses the position of the FSMB and specialty boards in their intention to revoke licensure of physicians who, in trying to serve their patients and provide them with full and truthful information, dare to challenge the dogma of the moment, even when the information they are providing is based on fact and scientific evidence. This ugly impulse to destroy the livelihoods and careers of physicians is the same impulse we have seen in government censorship schemes in news media and social media over the last several years, and it should be strongly rejected. Suppression of free speech should have no place in Idaho or America.

Finally, regarding medical specialty boards, they are essentially private monopolies that exert nearly complete control over a physician's ability to obtain hospital privileges, insurance contracts and sometimes, as below, medical licensure. Specialty boards were originally established to try to improve the quality of medicine but have in many cases become ideologically captured by left-leaning social interests, and have used their monopoly status to pressure and control physicians' behavior and speech. The behavior of these

Report Printed: Friday, February 21, 2025 9:05 AM

Page 19 of 23

Name (First & Last)	Subject	Manner Testifying	Representing Company/Organization	City	For / Against	Wish to Testify	District #
------------------------	---------	----------------------	--------------------------------------	------	------------------	--------------------	---------------

Shane Macaulay	<i>cont.</i>						5
----------------	--------------	--	--	--	--	--	---

boards should not be tolerated or rewarded in Idaho.

Thank you for your commitment to preserving the First Amendment rights to free speech of healthcare professionals and, by extension, preserving patients' rights to access truthful, apolitical and unbiased information.

Rosann and Mike Mathews	H 59	W	Myself and husband	Rockland	Against	N	28
-------------------------	------	---	--------------------	----------	---------	---	----

My husband and I writing today in opposition to H59 Medical Ethics Defense Act. We believe this legislation is unnecessary and detrimental to Idaho citizens, especially in rural areas. This bill is taking families out of their right to healthcare, especially women and children, as many in rural areas have limited options.

Section (4) " As the right of conscience is fundamental, no healthcare professional, health care institution, or healthcare payer should be required to participate in, or pay for any medical procedure, treatment, or service, or prescribe or pay for any medication, to which he objects on the basis of conscience, whether such conscience is informed by religious, moral, or ethical beliefs or principles.

Our understanding of this bill is that anyone in the medical field, even insurance companies, can deny us services based on gender, age, ethnicity, and even the religion we chose to practice if it differs from theirs.

This bill will impact those in rural communities as they have limited healthcare options, sometimes having only one clinic, doctor, pharmacy, or hospital to choose from. Healthcare providers in rural communities are more likely to know their patients outside of their practice including age, religion, ethnicity, and gender. It would make it extremely difficult for those seeking healthcare in rural areas if the healthcare providers chose to refuse service based on their "Right of Conscience".

My husband and I live in Rockland, ID and the closest healthcare provider and pharmacy are 15 miles away. If they chose to deny us care and medication we would be forced to drive 40 miles to Pocatello, an 80-mile round trip. This bill would require over 5000 residents in Power County to find healthcare miles away from their homes, putting a greater financial burden on their families.

People pay for and rely on their health insurance for medical care. If health insurance providers can deny services based on their "Right of Conscience" Idahoans could be strapped with overbearing health care bills, making it even more difficult for them to afford the necessities they need to raise their families.

Report Printed: Friday, February 21, 2025 9:05 AM

Page 20 of 23

Name (First & Last)	Subject	Manner Testifying	Representing Company/Organization	City	For / Against	Wish to Testify	District #
Rosann and Mike Mathews	<i>cont.</i>						28

Women would be impacted at higher levels than anyone if insurance companies deny services including birth control and hormone treatments for menopause and cancer. This bill is ultimately attacking families who support their children seeking gender affirming care. I've heard over and over from the Idaho Legislature that they believe in parental rights, but with every healthcare bill I've seen introduced over the past two years, they have stripped a large group of parents of the right to seek healthcare for their children.

The message you are sending to us is that you only want a government that mandates laws that take the rights of Idahoans away instead of working on solutions that are best for all Idahoans.

This bill should receive a No Vote today. Take care of the citizens of Idaho and their families.

Roddy White	H 59	W	Self	Boise	Against	N	17
-------------	------	---	------	-------	---------	---	----

Good day everyone. I am Roddy White, a Navy veteran. I live on the Depot Bench in Boise. I send this statement in writing as I fundamentally oppose House Bill 59. It undermines the medical rights of the average Idahoan.

The broad and nonspecific description of the "right of conscience" enables arbitrary discrimination against patients by healthcare companies and workers.

I read it as justifying a doctor denying me any number of non-emergency services as their conscience prevents them from aiding a veteran like myself.

I read it as justifying a healthcare company's refusal to pay for the skin transplant of an 8-year old burn victim, because the company's ethos states that an organ transplant is a moral crime.

Specifically, not requiring future disclosure of such conscious objections allows healthcare workers and companies to abuse this law to their own fiscal benefit, with workers denying lengthy but critical medical service to people in favor of serving more non-critical patients or companies utilizing automatic writing software to create justification for denying claim submissions on-demand.

Please vote no on House Bill 59, as it is extremely short-sighted, violates our natural human right to healthiness, and enables legal discrimination with no recourse.

Name (First & Last)	Subject	Manner Testifying	Representing Company/Organization	City	For / Against	Wish to Testify	District #
Roddy White	<i>cont.</i>						17

Thank you for your time.

Sheila Weaver	H 59	V	Self	Boise	Against	Y	17
---------------	------	---	------	-------	---------	---	----

Dear Senate Health and Welfare Committee -

My name is Sheila Weaver. I am a Licensed Clinical Social Worker and Advanced Certified Alcohol and Drug Counselor. I was born in Mountain Home and I now live in District 17. I'm honored to have the education, professional skills, and training to serve Idahoans at some of the toughest times in their lives.

I ask you to vote no on House Bill 59. Idahoans are already often facing lengthy wait times for healthcare services, and this is not a bill that encourages healthcare providers to come to Idaho

What comes of our fellow Idahoans who finally work up the strength to ask for help and are turned away? What about people that are involuntarily working with social workers due to child protection or legal concerns? I'm a former child welfare social worker. Families involved in the child welfare system come to us with complex, urgent matters. This bill will allow a receptionist (or any other person involved in the healthcare system) who objects to anything about a family's lifestyle to turn them away. While not a life-threatening emergency, a social worker denying services could delay (or even prevent) families from reunifying, individuals being freed from incarceration, or just people trying to get their basic needs met.

The bill emboldens professionals to withhold their knowledge, skills, and abilities when people need them the most. Even if the social worker makes a referral elsewhere, the likelihood of a person following through is significantly diminished. Particularly when we know that 100% of Idaho is considered to be a Health Professional Shortage Area for mental health and 98.7% for primary care, it seems particularly cruel to turn Idahoans away when their ability to seek help elsewhere is hobbled by a statewide lack of resources.

The providers in this room represent a small minority of the workforce. The majority of us are not asking for this legislation and personal conscience should not be prioritized over an Idahoan's health and well-being. Before pursuing their education—many at public universities—or accepting a job, every healthcare provider understood their duty to serve the public. It is deeply concerning to see them now turn their backs on the people they pledged to care for. This bill harms Idahoans.

Name (First & Last)	Subject	Manner Testifying	Representing Company/Organization	City	For / Against	Wish to Testify	District #
Sheila Weaver	<b>cont.</b>						17

Again, I ask you to vote no on HB 59.

1. <https://healthandwelfare.idaho.gov/providers/rural-health-and-underserved-areas/rural-health-and-underserved-areas>