I oppose SB172.

Let me make this very simple.

Would you like your children, your grandchildren to be given medical treatment without your knowledge? If they can be given birth control or hormone blockers, how about other medications or medical treatments. How about vaccines? How about transgender surgery? How about euthanasia for a depressed child? Should that be allowed? How do you define “medical care” and where do you draw the line? It is not difficult to see the consequences of opening this door.

Would you like your children or grandchildren to be exposed to pornographic material in the school library without your knowledge? If you cannot tolerate having those books read in an open session of the legislature, then it most certainly does not belong in a school library.

Would you like your children, your grandchildren to be exposed to people encouraging them to be confused about their gender without your knowledge? So much for the childhood innocence which I, and presumably you, enjoyed. Puberty is difficult enough without government meddling.

Rather than attempting to drive a wedge between parents and children, school authorities should be required to immediately inform parents so that parents can exercise their fundamental rights to be parents. These are your children and my children - they do not belong to the State, whether in the form of a government school or otherwise. If you feel otherwise, then you had better be prepared to surrender your children and your grandchildren to the collective wisdom of bureaucrats. Are you ready do to that? Are you really ready to put your children and grandchildren where your mouth is? Do your children or grandchildren go to public or private school? We should, and we will all know before the next election.

David A. Tilem
Normally, if a child aged 8 comes to their pediatrician and has signs of a STD or is asking for birth control and doesn't want their parent to know, they would be flagged for a mandatory report of potential sexual abuse.

Under SB172, they would get their medication given to them in secret, and turned back over to whomever brought them to the doctors office. Potentially a parent. More likely, a pimp.

If it sounds horrifying, it's because it is horrifying. Nevada is already the #1 location for human trafficking of abused minors. This bill makes our state a haven for predators.

SB172 removes the required parental consent or notification for any minor (girls OR boys) under the age of 18 to receive a contraceptive drug or device, and funnels taxpayer money to provide treatment for STDs. This is not the state's responsibility - it is fundamentally the right of a parent to make medical decisions for their children. That is part of the joy of being a parent - raising your children to be healthy, productive human beings. Parents rights and responsibilities - not the role of the government.

Finally, the sponsors of this bill are attacking one of their own - former Democrat Senator Mo Denis - who passed SB314 in 2015 (NRS 126.036), which protects the fundamental rights of parents. "The liberty interest of a parent in the care, custody and management of the parent’s child is a fundamental right.”

Please protect our children, and vote NO on SB172.

Laura Mancuso
March 6, 2023

To Senate Judiciary Chairman and committee,
As a concerned Nevadan, I ask that you oppose SB172 to preserve a parent’s right to protect their children from medical procedures, and to prevent minors from being able to make dangerous decisions without parental knowledge or consent. This bill completely removes any age of consent for certain medical treatments. It allows a minor child the ability to agree to contraception without parental knowledge or consent, and it allows a child of any age to consent to prevention and treatment of STDs, which may include vaccines and potentially dangerous medications.

Who will pay for injuries or side effects from these treatments if the parents have not consented? If you’re saying a minor has the capacity to legally consent to a medical treatment, doesn’t that capacity apply to other areas of consent? If they truly have the capacity to consent, you’re violating their other rights by treating them as a minor in other areas. This bill is unnecessary because we already have a process for situations where the minor does have the capacity to consent; they can become emancipated and permanently bypass parental consent. This bill attempts to take a narrow view of a massive and complex legal issue, and if you decide to pass it, there will be unintended consequences.

In addition to being bad public policy, this bill also sets a dangerous precedent that endangers not just children, but also the sacred relationship between a parent and a child. Why would the state want to come between a child and their parents? Why would you want to pass a law that says you believe children know better than their parents? These are questions to be answered!

As parents, we do everything we can to protect our children from making harmful decisions. When it comes to medical treatments, it is a parent’s right to make medical choices for ourselves and our dependent children. Nevadans will not consent to this infringement on their parental right to direct the care and upbringing of our children. This bill violates parental rights, religious freedom, and the right to fully informed consent. Please vote no on SB172.

Thank you for your time,
Timothy Shearer
Sparks, Nevada, 89436
Senate Judiciary Committee,

My name is Timothy Shearer and I am concerned Nevada parent. Many Nevada parents believe SB172 violates our parental rights and it’s extremely dangerous. I am particularly concerned, because this proposed bill actually violates a previous statute, and two Nevada Supreme Court decisions.

In 2013, Senator Mo Dennis put forward a bill which passed the senate anonymously, and the house in a bipartisan manner, codifying parental rights in Nevada law. Senate Bill 314 passed the Senate unanimously on April 22 and the House by a 27-14 vote (1 excused) on May 24. It was signed into law by the Governor June 5.

The statute is now NRS 126.036.

Section one of the bill reads as follows:

“The liberty interest of a parent in the care, custody and management of the parent’s child is a fundamental right.”

Not only would SB 172 be in direct violation of SB 314, but additionally Nevada supreme court decisions provide precedents in our state that strongly supports parental rights. If this committee passes SB 172, parents could sue based on Supreme Court precedents here in the state.

Below are the two Supreme Court decision supporting parental rights and the need for any proposed statute violating these rights be placed under extreme scrutiny and specificity and narrowly tailored.

Existing court precedent in Nevada already affirms parental rights.

* In Rico v. Rodriguez, 121 Nev. 695, 704, 120 P.3d 812, 818 (2005) (citing Troxel v. Granville, 530 U.S. 57, 65 (2000) (plurality opinion), the Nevada Supreme Court affirmed that parents have a “fundamental interest” . . . in the care, custody, and control of their children.”

* In addition, in In re J.L.N., 118 Nev. 621, 625, 55 P.3d 955, 958 (2002), the Nevada Supreme Court held that “[s]tatutes that infringe upon [the fundamental right of parents to care for and control their children] are . . . subject to strict scrutiny and must be narrowly tailored to serve a compelling interest.” Therefore, in order to “terminate a parent’s rights, a petitioner must prove, by clear and convincing evidence, that termination is in the child’s best interests and that there is parental fault.” Id. (quoting In re N.J., 116 Nev. 790, 801, 8 P.3d 126, 133 (2000)). In light of Nevada revised statute, and these Supreme Court cases, I would urge this committee to reconsider SB172. Nevada parents do not consent to SB 172, and previous legislators and judges have agreed.

Thank you,
Timothy Shearer
Sparks, NV
To Senate Judiciary Chairman and committee,
As a concerned Nevadan, I ask that you oppose SB172 to preserve a parent’s right to protect their children from medical procedures, and to prevent minors from being able to make dangerous decisions without parental knowledge or consent.
This bill completely removes any age of consent for certain medical treatments. It allows a minor child the ability to agree to contraception without parental knowledge or consent, and it allows a child of any age to consent to prevention and treatment of STDs, which may include vaccines and potentially dangerous medications.

Who will pay for injuries or side effects from these treatments if the parents have not consented? If you’re saying a minor has the capacity to legally consent to a medical treatment, doesn’t that capacity apply to other areas of consent? If they truly have the capacity to consent, you’re violating their other rights by treating them as a minor in other areas. This bill is unnecessary because we already have a process for situations where the minor does have the capacity to consent; they can become emancipated and permanently bypass parental consent. This bill attempts to take a narrow view of a massive and complex legal issue, and if you decide to pass it, there will be unintended consequences.

In addition to being bad public policy, this bill also sets a dangerous precedent that endangers not just children, but also the sacred relationship between a parent and a child. Why would the state want to come between a child and their parents? Why would you want to pass a law that says you believe children know better than their parents? As parents, we do everything we can to protect our children from making harmful decisions. When it comes to medical treatments, it is a parent’s right to make medical choices for ourselves and our dependent children. Nevadans will not consent to this infringement on their parental right to direct the care and upbringing of our children. This bill violates parental rights, religious freedom, and the right to fully informed consent. Please vote no on SB172.

Thank you for your time,
Alyse Cowan
Sparks, NV 89436
I strongly oppose SB172

- SB 172 goes against Nevada existing law NRS 126.036 which states: “The liberty interest of a parent in the care, custody and management of the parent’s child is a fundamental right.” SB 172 infringes on those fundamental rights and aims to circumvent existing statues and preemptively replace the existing legal pathway of parental rights suspension by a court order.

- In March 2022 Federal Court granted a preliminary injunction against a similar, newly adopted DC law that allowed doctors to perform a medical procedure (vaccination) to children 11 and older without parental consent or knowledge. The plaintiff’s attorney Aaron Siri, on behalf of the consumer protection rights nonprofit group ICAN, has pledged to challenge any new such laws, using the precedent win in DC. The passing of this bill is illegal, and will be a waste of taxpayer money and resources. (JOSHUA A. MAZER, individually and on behalf of his minor child, Plaintiff, v. THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, et al.,)

- NRS 129.060 has been a slippery slope since its adoption. What started as a circumvention of parental decisions with limited scope (sexually transmitted diseases and contraceptives) is now turning into an egregious grab of state power, zealously looking to expand its reach over ALL children by removing ANY age limit; by adding more medical procedures – vaccinations and dental work, AND by expanding the organizations authorized to circumvent parental consent to include “employee or volunteer at a family resource center which has received a grant from the Director of the Department of Health and Human Services” – i.e. using the parents tax dollars to take away parental rights. This law will be back for more, as it has in other states – and it will try to expand its scope again - to include all infections diseases and beyond.

- The bill undermines the welfare of all children by stripping them from parental protection. It puts our children in a room, with a stranger, a person of authority, a legally unaccountable individual, any “health officer” who will not know all of her/his medical history. As a person of authority, he/she WILL sway the child's decision making. Healthy children could easily be stripped down and examined for “a suspected infection.” What is to stop a scenario where my child is in school and is summoned by the school’s medical practitioner, alone, and told “We need to do this procedure, or this exam, and we don’t need your parent’s approval for this.” A child does not have the maturity to protect its own rights, or object to a person of authority.

- A child is robbed of the opportunity to get 2nd or 3rd medical opinion and to choose the best course of action – a further deterioration in medical care. Medical opinions differ widely and so do treatments.

- Bills like these deteriorate our children's health and the parents’ trust in medical professionals. I, as a parent, would be much less likely to look for medical services, knowing that I could be kicked out of a doctor’s office, under the guise perceived or imagined potential harm. The law will open up the doors for lawsuits against governmental agencies. We are already hearing horror stories like these in other jurisdictions. Bills like these undermine the public trust in government and make us question whose interests is the government protecting.

Concerned Parent,
Anelia Mollova
Las Vegas, Clark County
03/09/2023
Name: Angie Dowers
Senate Bill SB172 sponsored by Senator Dallas Harris, Senator Melanie Scheieblue, Senator Fabian Donate, Senator James Ohrenshall and Senator Julie Pazini.

The five individuals above will act as "Parents" of other people's children in the State of Nevada. In their "wisdom" they have decided that ALL children under 18 know best and should decide/deal with the prevention and treatment of STDs as well as contraception without parental consent because "hiding things from your parents is always better." This is actually promoting fear and lies, blocking the actual people ie parents that care for the child and may be able to help them. If this bill passes it will be a gateway for even further deterioration of the moral and mental state of the children of Nevada. Therefore, deterioration in the communities of Nevada because these children will eventually become adults. Five individuals are deciding for thousands of parents and children. Children that they do not have any ties with and in turn, get to decide what kind of Nevada this will be in the future. This will produce moral and mental decay.

Senator Dallas Harris
Senator Melanie Scheieblue
Senator Fabian Donate
Senator James Ohrenshall and
Senator Julie Pazini

Should be ashamed of what they are sponsoring. It is clear to me that they do not care about our children and instead sponsor evil because it's easy to sponsor this rather than to come up with a REAL solution of how children should not engage in sex before marriage. The eyes of God are observing you and you have acted with evil intent your name on this earth will forever be associated with this bill you have sponsored, shame on all of you.
SB172

This is a bad bill for Nevada as it strips parents of the right to make medical decisions for their children. Parental rights should not be subject to legislation. This bill also makes it easier for sex traffickers to control their victims. If a minor child is seeking contraceptives or treatment for an STD, that should be a red flag to law enforcement. I urge you to vote NO on this bill.

Bruce Parks
Chairman
Washoe County Republican Party
To Senate Judiciary Chairman and committee,

As a concerned Nevadan, I ask that you oppose SB172 to preserve a parent’s right to protect their children from medical procedures, and to prevent minors from being able to make dangerous decisions without parental knowledge or consent.

This bill completely removes any age of consent for certain medical treatments. It allows a minor child the ability to agree to contraception without parental knowledge or consent, and it allows a child of any age to consent to prevention and treatment of STDs, which may include vaccines and potentially dangerous medications.

Who will pay for injuries or side effects from these treatments if the parents have not consented? If you’re saying a minor has the capacity to legally consent to a medical treatment, doesn’t that capacity apply to other areas of consent? If they truly have the capacity to consent, you’re violating their other rights by treating them as a minor in other areas. This bill is unnecessary because we already have a process for situations where the minor does have the capacity to consent; they can become emancipated and permanently bypass parental consent. This bill attempts to take a narrow view of a massive and complex legal issue, and if you decide to pass it, there will be unintended consequences.

In addition to being bad public policy, this bill also sets a dangerous precedent that endangers not just children, but also the sacred relationship between a parent and a child. Why would the state want to come between a child and their parents? Why would you want to pass a law that says you believe children know better than their parents?

As parents, we do everything we can to protect our children from making harmful decisions. When it comes to medical treatments, it is a parent’s right to make medical choices for ourselves and our dependent children.

Nevadans will not consent to this infringement on their parental right to direct the care and upbringing of our children. This bill violates parental rights, religious freedom, and the right to fully informed consent. Please vote no on SB172.

Thank you for your time,

Christina M. Antonucci
Carson City, NV 89703
To Senate Judiciary Chairman and committee,
As a concerned Nevadan, I ask that you oppose SB172 to preserve a parent’s right to protect their children from medical procedures, and to prevent minors from being able to make dangerous decisions without parental knowledge or consent.

This bill completely removes any age of consent for certain medical treatments. It allows a minor child the ability to agree to contraception without parental knowledge or consent, and it allows a child of any age to consent to prevention and treatment of STDs, which may include vaccines and potentially dangerous medications.

Who will pay for injuries or side effects from these treatments if the parents have not consented? If you’re saying a minor has the capacity to legally consent to a medical treatment, doesn’t that capacity apply to other areas of consent? If they truly have the capacity to consent, you’re violating their other rights by treating them as a minor in other areas.

This bill is unnecessary because we already have a process for situations where the minor does have the capacity to consent; they can become emancipated and permanently bypass parental consent. This bill attempts to take a narrow view of a massive and complex legal issue, and if you decide to pass it, there will be unintended consequences.

In addition to being bad public policy, this bill also sets a dangerous precedent that endangers not just children, but also the sacred relationship between a parent and a child. Why would the state want to come between a child and their parents? Why would you want to pass a law that says you believe children know better than their parents?

As parents, we do everything we can to protect our children from making harmful decisions. When it comes to medical treatments, it is a parent’s right to make medical choices for ourselves and our dependent children.

Nevadans will not consent to this infringement on their parental right to direct the care and upbringing of our children. This bill violates parental rights, religious freedom, and the right to fully informed consent. Please vote No on SB172.

Thank you for your time,

Christine M Meagher
Henderson, NV 89014
From the Desk Of:
Darryll F. Brandwine
7270 Fresh Harvest Ave.
Las Vegas, Nevada, 89131

RE: SB172

To Senate Judiciary Chairman and committee,

As a concerned Nevadan, I ask that you oppose SB172 to preserve a parent’s right to protect their children from medical procedures, and to prevent minors from being able to make dangerous decisions without parental knowledge or consent. This bill completely removes any age of consent for certain medical treatments. It allows a minor child the ability to agree to contraception without parental knowledge or consent, and it allows a child of any age to consent to prevention and treatment of STDs, which may include vaccines and potentially dangerous medications.

Who will pay for injuries or side effects from these treatments if the parents have not consented? If you’re saying a minor has the capacity to legally consent to a medical treatment, doesn’t that capacity apply to other areas of consent? If they truly have the capacity to consent, you’re violating their other rights by treating them as a minor in other areas. This bill is unnecessary because we already have a process for situations where the minor does have the capacity to consent; they can become emancipated and permanently bypass parental consent. This bill attempts to take a narrow view of a massive and complex legal issue, and if you decide to pass it, there will be unintended consequences.

In addition to being bad public policy, this bill also sets a dangerous precedent that endangers not just children, but also the sacred relationship between a parent and a child. Why would the state want to come between a child and their parents? Why would you want to pass a law that says you believe children know better than their parents?

As parents, we do everything we can to protect our children from making harmful decisions. When it comes to medical treatments, it is a parent’s right to make medical choices for ourselves and our dependent children.

Nevadans will not consent to this infringement on their parental right to direct the care and upbringing of our children. This bill violates parental rights, religious freedom, and the right to fully informed consent. Please vote no on SB172.

Thank you for your time,

DFB
To Senate Judiciary Chairman and committee,

As a concerned Nevadan, I ask that you oppose SB172 to preserve a parent’s right to protect their children from medical procedures, and to prevent minors from being able to make dangerous decisions without parental knowledge or consent.

This bill completely removes any age of consent for certain medical treatments. It allows a minor child the ability to agree to contraception without parental knowledge or consent, and it allows a child of any age to consent to prevention and treatment of STDs, which may include vaccines and potentially dangerous medications.

Who will pay for injuries or side effects from these treatments if the parents have not consented? If you’re saying a minor has the capacity to legally consent to a medical treatment, doesn’t that capacity apply to other areas of consent? If they truly have the capacity to consent, you’re violating their other rights by treating them as a minor in other areas. This bill is unnecessary because we already have a process for situations where the minor does have the capacity to consent; they can become emancipated and permanently bypass parental consent. This bill attempts to take a narrow view of a massive and complex legal issue, and if you decide to pass it, there will be unintended consequences.

In addition to being bad public policy, this bill also sets a dangerous precedent that endangers not just children, but also the sacred relationship between a parent and a child. Why would the state want to come between a child and their parents?

As parents, we do everything we can to protect our children from making harmful decisions. When it comes to medical treatments, it is a parent’s right to make medical choices for ourselves and our dependent children.

Nevadans will not consent to this infringement on their parental right to direct the care and upbringing of our children. This bill violates parental rights, religious freedom, and the right to fully informed consent. Please vote no on SB172.

Thank you for your time,

Debbie Frigo

Gardnerville, NV 89410
Opposition to SB172

I’m writing this letter in opposition to SB 172. My wife has submitted her concerns but I do have concerns. I feel that SB 172 although well intended does undermine the parents guidance and their authority in the home. It’s our job to make sure that our children are being raised with a good moral conscience and not being given the greenlight to go out and be promiscuous because they will be able to treat a problem behind the backs of their parents. This is a dangerous bill and although I certainly understand statistics, you make it easier for children to disregard parental advice and parental guidance by giving them a safety net to go out and do things that they may not otherwise do because now they have access to an arsenal of things that will treat sexually transmitted diseases etc. And they can do it in secret.
transmitted diseases etc And they can do it in secret. This is completely inappropriate. Children are not fully developed until they hit the age of 25 essentially. They also don’t understand the ramifications of the decisions that they make. So I employ you not to vote for this bill. I think the legislators job is to protect the state and to close the borders and to help maintain the sovereignty of this country but not to take the rights from parents who should be the ones to help Guide their own children in a situation where parental guidance is certainly warranted. Thank you

Fernando Lejardi
To Senate Judiciary Chairman and committee,

As a concerned Nevadan, I ask that you oppose SB172 to preserve a parent’s right to protect their children from medical procedures, and to prevent minors from being able to make dangerous decisions without parental knowledge or consent.

This bill completely removes any age of consent for certain medical treatments. It allows a minor child the ability to agree to contraception without parental knowledge or consent, and it allows a child of any age to consent to prevention and treatment of STDs, which may include vaccines and potentially dangerous medications.

Who will pay for injuries or side effects from these treatments if the parents have not consented? If you’re saying a minor has the capacity to legally consent to a medical treatment, doesn’t that capacity apply to other areas of consent? If they truly have the capacity to consent, you’re violating their other rights by treating them as a minor in other areas. This bill is unnecessary because we already have a process for situations where the minor does have the capacity to consent; they can become emancipated and permanently bypass parental consent. This bill attempts to take a narrow view of a massive and complex legal issue, and if you decide to pass it, there will be unintended consequences.

In addition to being bad public policy, this bill also sets a dangerous precedent that endangers not just children, but also the sacred relationship between a parent and a child. Why would the state want to come between a child and their parents? Why would you want to pass a law that says you believe children know better than their parents?

As parents, we do everything we can to protect our children from making harmful decisions. When it comes to medical treatments, it is a parent’s right to make medical choices for ourselves and our dependent children.

Nevadans will not consent to this infringement on their parental right to direct the care and upbringing of our children. This bill violates parental rights, religious freedom, and the right to fully informed consent.

Please vote no on SB172.

Thank you for your time,

Jack W. Ralph II

Carson City, NV 89701
To Senate Judiciary Chairman and committee,

As a concerned Nevadan, I ask that you oppose SB172 to preserve a parent’s right to protect their children from medical procedures, and to prevent minors from being able to make dangerous decisions without parental knowledge or consent.

This bill completely removes any age of consent for certain medical treatments. It allows a minor child the ability to agree to contraception without parental knowledge or consent, and it allows a child of any age to consent to prevention and treatment of STDs, which may include vaccines and potentially dangerous medications.

Who will pay for injuries or side effects from these treatments if the parents have not consented? If you’re saying a minor has the capacity to legally consent to a medical treatment, doesn’t that capacity apply to other areas of consent? If they truly have the capacity to consent, you’re violating their other rights by treating them as a minor in other areas. This bill is unnecessary because we already have a process for situations where the minor does have the capacity to consent; they can become emancipated and permanently bypass parental consent. This bill attempts to take a narrow view of a massive and complex legal issue, and if you decide to pass it, there will be unintended consequences.

In addition to being bad public policy, this bill also sets a dangerous precedent that endangers not just children, but also the sacred relationship between a parent and a child. Why would the state want to come between a child and their parents? Why would you want to pass a law that says you believe children know better than their parents?

As parents, we do everything we can to protect our children from making harmful decisions. When it comes to medical treatments, it is a parent’s right to make medical choices for ourselves and our dependent children.
Nevadans will not consent to this infringement on their parental right to direct the care and upbringing of our children. This bill violates parental rights, religious freedom, and the right to fully informed consent. Please vote no on SB172.

Thank you for your time,

Jennifer Meyer
7312 Braswell Dr.
Las Vegas, NV 89128
Testimony in Opposition to SB172

Senate Judiciary Committee,

My name is Joey Gilbert, Esq. I am a concerned Nevada parent, as well as an attorney in Reno, Nevada. As an attorney, I feel that I should warn you about the legal ramifications if SB 172 were to pass.

SB 314 passed in 2013, now NRS 126.036, codifies parental rights in Nevada law. Two Nevada supreme court cases further set precedent that parental rights are not to be violated in Nevada.

Passing this bill will unquestionably result in massive litigation against all responsible parties and my firm will see to it that these parents’ rights are protected in a court of law.

Additionally, allowing minors of any age to consent to an ever-growing list of drugs, procedures, vaccinations, and interventions to treat and prevent STDs and for contraceptive purposes sets these children up for all sorts of injuries, damages and side effects. If you pass this bill, you are exposing the State to massive costs, not only in litigation and attorney fees, but in damages caused to these children.

Awards granted for permanent and life altering harm to our children because of a bill like this would be unprecedented; that I can guarantee you.

In 2013, Senate Bill 314 was sponsored by Sen. Mo Denis. It passed the Senate unanimously on April 22 and the House by a 27-14 vote (1 excused) on May 24. It was signed into law by the Governor June 5.

Section one of the bill reads as follows:

“The liberty interest of a parent in the care, custody and management of the parent’s child is a fundamental right.”

Below are the two Nevada Supreme Court decisions supporting parental rights and the need for any proposed statute violating these rights be placed under extreme scrutiny and narrowly tailored.

Existing court precedent in Nevada already affirms parental rights and my firm will see to it that these rights are protected.

• In Rico v. Rodriguez, 121 Nev. 695, 704, 120 P.3d 812, 818 (2005) (citing Troxel v. Granville, 530 U.S. 57, 65 (2000) (plurality opinion), the Nevada Supreme Court affirmed that parents have a "fundamental interest . . . in the care, custody, and control of their children."

• In addition, in In re J.L.N., 118 Nev. 621, 625, 55 P.3d 955, 958 (2002), the Nevada Supreme Court held that "[s]tatutes that infringe upon [the fundamental right of parents to care for and control their children] are . . . subject to strict scrutiny and must be narrowly
tailored to serve a compelling interest." Therefore, in order to "terminate a parent's rights, a petitioner must prove, by clear and convincing evidence, that termination is in the child's best interests and that there is parental fault." Id. (quoting In re N.J., 116 Nev. 790, 801, 8 P.3d 126, 133 (2000)).

In light of Nevada revised statute, and these Supreme Court cases, I would like to put this committee on notice that Nevada parents do not consent to SB 172, and that there will be extensive and exhaustive legal ramifications if this bill is passed.

Respectfully,

Joey Gilbert, Esq
To Senate Judiciary Chairman and Committee,

I’m a concerned voter writing to you from Nevada, and I’m asking that you oppose SB172 which would infringe on a parent’s right to protect their children from medical procedures, and it would allow minors to make dangerous decisions without their parents’ knowledge or consent. SB172 completely removes any age of consent for certain medical treatments such as contraception without parental knowledge or consent. This travesty of a bill would also allow a child of any age to consent to STD treatments, which could include vaccines and other potentially dangerous medications with dangerous side effects.

If parents have not consented to these medical procedures, then who will pay for any child that is injured or experiences any side effects from these treatments? The parents? Why? They were not consulted nor did they give their permission. The State? You bet! If the State is going to tell minors that they have the capacity to legally consent to medical treatment, then doesn’t that same capacity also apply to other areas of consent? However, this bill appears to pick and choose which medical decisions that minors can make and which ones their parents can make. This bill clearly infringes on the rights of parents to raise their children as they see fit and forces children to make their own medical decisions that they do not have the capacity to make. Children are a special class with special rights, and this bill violates those special rights by treating them as a regular adult citizen who is capable of making decisions for themselves while still treating them as a minor in other areas of society. For example, children cannot consent to drink alcohol, view pornography, buy marijuana, get drafted by the military, consent to a job without their parents’ permission, sign contracts or buy a car, etc.

This bill is also unnecessary. We already have a process in place where minors have the capacity to consent; they can become emancipated and permanently bypass parental consent. This bill takes a narrow view of a massive and complex legal issue, and if you decide to pass it, there will be unintended consequences including liability for the State. SB172 also sets a dangerous precedent that endangers not just the lives of children, but also the sacred relationship between a parent and a child.

Why is the State hellbent on inserting itself between a child and his/her parents? It lacks any commonsense to pass a law that tells children that they know better than their own parents. It’s a parent’s job to do everything to protect their children from making harmful decisions – not the State’s! Only parents have the right to make medical decisions for themselves and their children. As a voter and a Nevadan, I will not consent to this blatant attack on parental rights, nor will I support this infringement by the State on the direct care and upbringing of our Nation’s children. This bill violates parental rights, religious freedom, and the right to fully informed consent. Please vote no on SB172.

Thank you,
John Venturini
Las Vegas, NV 89156
Testimony in Opposition of SB172

Senate Judiciary Committee,

My name is Katania Taylor and I am concerned Nevada parent as well as the Executive Director of Health Freedom Nevada. I represent close to 5000 parents in Nevada who are extremely concerned about SB172. We all believe this violates our parental rights and that it is extremely dangerous. I have written to you already about this bill and our concerns. Today I would like to highlight another more pressing issue with this bill.

In 2013, Senator Mo Dennis put forward a bill which was passed the senate anonymously, and the house in a bipartisan manner, codifying parental rights in Nevada law. Senate Bill 314 was sponsored by Sen. Mo Denis. It passed the Senate unanimously on April 22 and the House by a 27-14 vote (1 excused) on May 24. It was signed into law by the Governor June 5. The statute is now NRS 126.036.

Section one of the bill reads as follows:

"The liberty interest of a parent in the care, custody and management of the parent’s child is a fundamental right."

Not only would SB 172 be in direct violation of NRS 126.036, but also in violation of two Nevada supreme court decisions which have set precedents in our state that prohibit the violation of parental rights. If this committee passes SB 172, parents could sue based on Supreme Court precedents. Legislators could be held personally liable for violating parental rights and religious freedom. Additionally, damages or injuries that occur to a minor as a result of these interventions, without parental knowledge, would cost exorbitant amounts in additional fees, over and above the legal fees, as awards for such damage would be large.

Below are the two Supreme Court decisions supporting parental rights and the need for any proposed statute violating these rights be placed under extreme scrutiny and narrowly tailored. Existing court precedent in Nevada already affirms parental rights.

* In Rico v. Rodriguez, 121 Nev. 695, 704, 120 P.3d 812, 818 (2005) (citing Troxel v. Granville, 530 U.S. 57, 65 (2000) (plurality opinion), the Nevada Supreme Court affirmed that parents have a "fundamental interest' . . . in the care, custody, and control of their children."  

* In addition, in In re J.L.N., 118 Nev. 621, 625, 55 P.3d 955, 958 (2002), the Nevada Supreme Court held that "[s]tatutes that infringe upon [the fundamental right of parents to care for and control their children] are . . . subject to strict scrutiny and must be narrowly tailored to serve a compelling interest." Therefore, in order to "terminate a parent's rights, a petitioner must prove, by clear and convincing evidence, that termination is in the child's best interests and that there is parental fault." Id. (quoting In re N.J., 116 Nev. 790, 801, 8 P.3d 126, 133 (2000)).

In light of NRS 126.036, and these Supreme Court cases, I would like to put this committee on notice that Nevada parents do not consent to SB 172, and that there will likely be legal ramifications if this bill is passed.

Thank you,
Katania Taylor
Reno, Nevada
SB172

Hello, I disagree with SB172. There are current laws for kids under the age of 18 not to be able to buy cigarettes, alcohol and fire arms however the legislators feel the kids are responsible enough to make their own decisions for medical care and leave the parents completely out of it. Once again parents’ rights are being threatened to be taken away. Parents carry the health care insurance for their kids and pay the expense and the expense for the visit. Are you going to provide the insurance and pay the expenses?

If kids do something wrong the parents are responsibly for them and can be held liable. There is no difference in the above statement and being there for your kid for medical. Stop playing with our kids’ lives. It is not fear to the kids or the parents. It is my kid not yours.

Thank you,

Kim Scott
March 6, 2023

To the Chair and Members of the Senate Judiciary Committee,

We at the Libertarian Party of Nevada write to you in opposition to SB172. This bill undermines parental rights, puts children at risk, and sets a dangerous precedent in allowing minors to consent to medical procedures and treatments.

Children do not have the capacity to give consent. This bill would allow minors of any age to receive medical and pharmaceutical interventions and treatments that they are not capable of evaluating the costs and consequences of. This places minor children at risk, especially when you consider that they may not be aware of relevant details of their family or individual medical history, and that this bill explicitly places no limitation on which procedures and treatments would become available to them.

Parents have a duty to protect their children, safeguard their rights, and act in their best interest. No other person or institution can usurp that role. This bill would allow unrelated parties (such as nurses or doctors who may have no knowledge of the medical background or personal situation of the child) to apply their judgment in the absence of parental oversight. This bill would also ensure that this is done in secrecy, with parents receiving no notification of any kind.

The state should not sanction or institutionalize any program that undermines or bypasses parental rights and responsibilities towards their children, especially in matters of sexual health and medical decision making. We urge you to reject this proposal and vote against SB172.

Thank you for your consideration.
To Senate Judiciary Chairman and committee, As a concerned Nevadan, I ask that you oppose SB172 to preserve a parent’s right to protect their children from medical procedures, and to prevent minors from being able to make dangerous decisions without parental knowledge or consent. This bill completely removes any age of consent for certain medical treatments. It allows a minor child the ability to agree to contraception without parental knowledge or consent, and it allows a child of any age to consent to prevention and treatment of STDs, which may include vaccines and potentially dangerous medications. Who will pay for injuries or side effects from these treatments if the parents have not consented? If you’re saying a minor has the capacity to legally consent to a medical treatment, doesn’t that capacity apply to other areas of consent? If they truly have the capacity to consent, you’re violating their other rights by treating them as a minor in other areas. This bill is unnecessary because we already have a process for situations where the minor does have the capacity to consent; they can become emancipated and permanently bypass parental consent. This bill attempts to take a narrow view of a massive and complex legal issue, and if you decide to pass it, there will be unintended consequences. In addition to being bad public policy, this bill also sets a dangerous precedent that endangers not just children, but also the sacred relationship between a parent and a child. Why would the state want to come between a child and their parents? Why would you want to pass a law that says you believe children know better than their parents? As parents, we do everything we can to protect our children from making harmful decisions. When it comes to medical treatments, it is a parent’s right to make medical choices for ourselves and our dependent children. Nevadans will not consent to this infringement on their parental right to direct the care and upbringing of our children. This bill violates parental rights, religious freedom, and the right to fully informed consent. Please vote no on SB172. Thank you for your time,
Lisa Wilson
Las Vegas, NV 89129
To Senate Judiciary Chairman and committee,
As a concerned Nevadan, I ask that you oppose SB172 to preserve a parent’s right to protect their children from medical procedures, and to prevent minors from being able to make dangerous decisions without parental knowledge or consent.
This bill completely removes any age of consent for certain medical treatments. It allows a minor child the ability to agree to contraception without parental knowledge or consent, and it allows a child of any age to consent to prevention and treatment of STDs, which may include vaccines and potentially dangerous medications.

Who will pay for injuries or side effects from these treatments if the parents have not consented? If you’re saying a minor has the capacity to legally consent to a medical treatment, doesn’t that capacity apply to other areas of consent? If they truly have the capacity to consent, you’re violating their other rights by treating them as a minor in other areas. This bill is unnecessary because we already have a process for situations where the minor does have the capacity to consent; they can become emancipated and permanently bypass parental consent. This bill attempts to take a narrow view of a massive and complex legal issue, and if you decide to pass it, there will be unintended consequences.

In addition to being bad public policy, this bill also sets a dangerous precedent that endangers not just children, but also the sacred relationship between a parent and a child. Why would the state want to come between a child and their parents? Why would you want to pass a law that says you believe children know better than their parents? As parents, we do everything we can to protect our children from making harmful decisions. When it comes to medical treatments, it is a parent’s right to make medical choices for ourselves and our dependent children.
Nevadans will not consent to this infringement on their parental right to direct the care and upbringing of our children. This bill violates parental rights, religious freedom, and the right to fully informed consent. Please vote no on SB172.

Thank you for your time,
Lorna Butz
Henderson NV  89014
To the Senate Judiciary Chairman and committee,

As a concerned Nevadan, I ask that you oppose SB172 to preserve a parent’s right to protect their children from potentially dangerous medical procedures, and to prevent minors from being able to make dangerous decisions without parental knowledge or consent.

This bill would completely remove any age of consent for certain medical treatments. It allows a minor child the ability to agree to contraception without parental knowledge or consent, and it allows a child of any age to consent to prevention and treatment of STDs, which may include vaccines and potentially dangerous medications.

A very important question arises with this bill: who will pay for injuries or side effects from these treatments if the parents have not consented? If you’re saying a minor has the capacity to legally consent to a medical treatment, doesn’t that capacity apply to other areas of consent? If they truly have the capacity to consent, you’re violating their other rights by treating them as a minor in other areas.

This bill is unnecessary because we already have a process for situations where the minor does have the capacity to consent: they can declare themselves emancipated thereby permanently bypassing parental consent.

This bill attempts to take a narrow view of a massive and complex legal issue, and if you decide to pass it, there will be unintended consequences.

In addition to being bad public policy, this bill also sets a dangerous precedent that endangers not just children, but also the sacred relationship between a parent and a child.

- Why would the state want to come between a child and their parents?
- Why would you want to pass a law that says you believe children know better than their parents what is good for them?

As parents, we do everything we can to protect our children from making harmful decisions. Therefore, when it comes to medical treatments, it is a parent’s right to make medical choices for themselves and their dependent children.

Nevadans will not consent to this infringement on their parental right to direct the care and upbringing of our children. This bill violates parental rights, religious freedom, and the right to fully informed consent.

I respectfully request that you please vote no on SB172.

Thank you for your time,
Marilyn Tenney

281 Glenoaks St
Pahrump NV 89048
To Senate Judiciary Chairman and committee,
As a concerned Nevadan, I ask that you oppose SB172 to preserve a parent’s right to protect their children from medical procedures, and to prevent minors from being able to make dangerous decisions without parental knowledge or consent.
This bill completely removes any age of consent for certain medical treatments. It allows a minor child the ability to agree to contraception without parental knowledge or consent, and it allows a child of any age to consent to prevention and treatment of STDs, which may include vaccines and potentially dangerous medications.

Who will pay for injuries or side effects from these treatments if the parents have not consented? If you’re saying a minor has the capacity to legally consent to a medical treatment, doesn’t that capacity apply to other areas of consent? If they truly have the capacity to consent, you’re violating their other rights by treating them as a minor in other areas. This bill is unnecessary because we already have a process for situations where the minor does have the capacity to consent; they can become emancipated and permanently bypass parental consent. This bill attempts to take a narrow view of a massive and complex legal issue, and if you decide to pass it, there will be unintended consequences.

In addition to being bad public policy, this bill also sets a dangerous precedent that endangers not just children, but also the sacred relationship between a parent and a child. Why would the state want to come between a child and their parents? Why would you want to pass a law that says you believe children know better than their parents?
As parents, we do everything we can to protect our children from making harmful decisions. When it comes to medical treatments, it is a parent’s right to make medical choices for ourselves and our dependent children. Nevadans will not consent to this infringement on their parental right to direct the care and upbringing of our children. This bill violates parental rights, religious freedom, and the right to fully informed consent. Please vote no on SB172.

Thank you for your time,
Maureen White
19 Christy ct
Carson City, NV 89701
To Senate Judiciary Chairman and committee,

As a concerned Nevadan, I ask that you oppose SB172 to preserve a parent’s right to protect their children from medical procedures, and to prevent minors from being able to make dangerous decisions without parental knowledge or consent.

This bill completely removes any age of consent for certain medical treatments. It allows a minor child the ability to agree to contraception without parental knowledge or consent, and it allows a child of any age to consent to prevention and treatment of STDs, which may include vaccines and potentially dangerous medications.

Who will pay for injuries or side effects from these treatments if the parents have not consented? If you’re saying a minor has the capacity to legally consent to a medical treatment, doesn’t that capacity apply to other areas of consent? If they truly have the capacity to consent, you’re violating their other rights by treating them as a minor in other areas. This bill is unnecessary because we already have a process for situations where the minor does have the capacity to consent; they can become emancipated and permanently bypass parental consent. This bill attempts to take a narrow view of a massive and complex legal issue, and if you decide to pass it, there will be unintended consequences.

In addition to being bad public policy, this bill also sets a dangerous precedent that endangers not just children, but also the sacred relationship between a parent and a child. Why would the state want to come between a child and their parents? Why would you want to pass a law that says you believe children know better than their parents? As parents, we do everything we can to protect our children from making harmful decisions. When it comes to medical treatments, it is a parent’s right to make medical choices for ourselves and our dependent children.

Nevadans will not consent to this infringement on their parental right to direct the care and upbringing of our children. This bill violates parental rights, religious freedom, and the right to fully informed consent. Please vote no on SB172.

Thank you for your time,

Meaghan Maillet
Reno, NV 89511
To whom this may concern:
I'm writing this email to oppose SB172. As the parent of a young teen, we worry about the influences and dysfunction permeating our society. I can tell you that both my husband and I work very hard at encouraging our daughter to get good grades, work hard, be earnest and just be an overall good person. We pay the bills, the insurance, the dental insurance, her clothes, her food, her phone, her allowance, and a myriad of other things. The greatest fear we have is having immoral people present immoral bills in the state assembly that infringe on a parent's right to raise morally good kids. This bill undermines a parent's authority, their good intentions and their ability to protect their kids against predators who seek to destroy their innocence, which is essentially what this bill does. This bill takes the medical decision making from our hands and puts it in the care of a child who doesn't fully understand medical consequences or their decisions because they do not have the life experience to make these kinds of important decisions. These bills are usually introduced by childless legislators or legislators who have ulterior motives which do not serve the nuclear family. The fact that it has been introduced is terrifying and nothing good will come from this except kids who will use this decision making propaganda to make poor choices, which could ruin their health, their ability to have children down the road, and it could certainly be detrimental to their mental health.
You as a legislator do not pay the bills in my home. Not my insurance premiums, which are costly, nor do you put the food on my table, pay the electricity, water, mortgage or anything else for that matter. Your job is to protect the State of Nevada, not to regulate parent's decisions about the well being of their families. You do not have the right to legislate any bill that causes the immortalization of young children who are not capable of making such important decisions about their health. On any given day they can't even decide what to wear to school and you want to put health decisions in their incapable hands????? This bill is shameful and those who introduced it should be ashamed that they have nothing better to do but allow groomers to lobby for this kind of crap. And worse, several of your senators actually had the audacity to put their name on this bill. This is truly unbelievable. Shame on anyone who votes on this piece of crap anti-family bill.

--
Mercedes
Mercedes Mendive - opposing SB172

--
Mercedes
Sent from Mercedes' Mobile Account.
Hello,
In regards to SB172
I strongly urge this bill to be opposed.
The government has NO right to deny parental rights.
The Government has NO right to our minors WITHOUT our parental consent.

Thank you,
Natalie Thomas.
District G
Dear Senators,

If a child is in need of treatment for an STD, or pregnancy, or birth control, should this not be a common sense red flag warning that a minor is being abused? Why would anyone propose a bill that focuses on protecting pedophiles and sex traffickers? This is not a bill protecting children at all. Parents make decisions about children, not doctors, pharmacists or PA's. This bill is should be renamed the Child Sex Trafficking Protection Bill as that is what it really is.

Sincerely,

Reva Crump, MS
To Senate Judiciary Chairman and committee,

As a Medical Doctor and a concerned Nevadan, I ask that you oppose SB172 to preserve a parent’s right to protect their children from medical procedures, and to prevent minors from being able to make dangerous decisions without parental knowledge or consent.

This bill completely removes any age of consent for certain medical treatments. It allows a minor child the ability to agree to contraception without parental knowledge or consent, and it allows a child of any age to consent to prevention and treatment of STDs, which may include vaccines and potentially dangerous medications.

Who will pay for injuries or side effects from these treatments if the parents have not consented? If you’re saying a minor has the capacity to legally consent to a medical treatment, doesn’t that capacity apply to other areas of consent? If they truly have the capacity to consent, you’re violating their other rights by treating them as a minor in other areas. This bill is unnecessary because we already have a process for situations where the minor does have the capacity to consent; they can become emancipated and permanently bypass parental consent. This bill attempts to take a narrow view of a massive and complex legal issue, and if you decide to pass it, there will be unintended consequences.

In addition to being bad public policy, this bill also sets a dangerous precedent that endangers not just children, but also the sacred relationship between a parent and a child. Why would the state want to come between a child and their parents? Why would you want to pass a law that says you believe children know better than their parents?

As parents, we do everything we can to protect our children from making harmful decisions. When it comes to medical treatments, it is a parent’s right to make medical choices for ourselves and our dependent children.

Nevadans will not consent to this infringement on their parental right to direct the care and upbringing of our children. This bill violates parental rights, religious freedom, and the right to fully informed consent. Please vote no on SB172.

Thank you for your time,

Rodney Van Pelt M.D.
2821 Table Rock Dr.
Carson City, NV 89706
To the Senate Judiciary Chairman and Committee:

As a concerned Nevadan, I ask that you strongly oppose SB 172, in order to preserve a parent's right to protect their children from dangerous medical procedures, and to prevent minors from being able to make life-altering medical decisions without parental knowledge or consent.

SB 172 completely removes ANY age of consent for certain medical treatments. It allows a minor child the ability to agree to contraception without parental knowledge or consent, and it allows a child of ANY age to consent to prevention and treatment of STDs, which may include vaccines, harmful implanted devices and potentially dangerous medications.

Who will pay for injuries or side effects from these treatments if the parents have not consented? This bill sets a dangerous precedent that endangers not just children, but also the sacred relationship between a parent and a child.

In 2013, the Nevada legislature adopted NRS 126.036 to protect fundamental parental rights. SB 314 was sponsored by Democrat Senator Mo Denis. It passed the Senate unanimously and the Assembly by a 27-14 vote. It was signed into law by the Governor. Section one states: “The liberty interest of a parent in the care, custody and management of the parent’s child is a fundamental right.” SB172 would override this unanimous and bipartisan commitment to parental rights in Nevada.

As parents, we do everything we can to protect our children from making harmful decisions. It is a parent’s job to make careful, thoughtful medical choices not just for ourselves, but also for our dependent children.

We will not consent to this infringement on our fundamental right to direct the care and upbringing of our children. This bill is an extreme violation of parental rights, and the right to fully informed consent. Please vote NO on SB 172!

Thank you,

Sara Yelowitz
Reno, NV 89511
March 7, 2023

RE: Testimony in **Opposition to Senate Bill 172 (SB172)** of the 2023 Nevada Legislature

Members of the Senate Committee on Judiciary:

On behalf of Republicans in the great State of Nevada, I would like to communicate our strong opposition to Senate Bill 172.

SB172, also known as the Predator Protection Bill, is one more bill designed to shield sexual predators from the consequences of their actions - with Nevada’s children being hurt in the crossfire. This bill would allow doctors, pharmacists, and physician assistants to prescribe contraception and STD treatments to minors - **without parental consent**.

If an 8 year old girl needs birth control, that should normally flag mandatory reporter calls for physicians. Under this bill, the abuse would be covered up, and rather than the victim being helped, the trafficker is protected. Which law would the doctor follow? The Federal Child Abuse Prevention and Treatment Act or SB172, which says they should look the other way when a child asks for STD treatments or birth control?

This bill has no age minimum - this is not limited to 17 year olds on the cusp of adulthood. This allows any minor, of any age, to have an outside party give them medication. Parents warn their children about ‘stranger danger’ - how odd that the Democrats wrote a bill to protect the strangers instead of the children. Parents should be the final decision maker on medical decisions for their kids - not doctors and pharmacists in the pockets of Big Pharma.

The government needs to stop attacking parents, and stop trying to replace the family unit. It is a parents responsibility to ensure their children are healthy and strong. The government’s role is to support parents' rights, not undermine them, as established in Nevada statutes.

In 2013, the Nevada legislature adopted NRS 126.036 to protect fundamental parental rights. SB 314 was sponsored by Democrat Senator Mo Denis. It passed the Senate unanimously and the Assembly by a 27-14 vote. It was signed into law by the Governor. Section one states: **“The liberty interest of a parent in the care, custody and management of the parent’s child is a fundamental right.”**

Finally, we would respectfully request that the members under litigation for a Constitutional violation of the separation of powers clause (Article 3, Section 1, Nevada Constitution) for their concurrent employment with government agencies while being state legislators—recuse themselves until the litigation is settled or they have fully resolved their violation of the Nevada Constitution. As this body is well aware:

> The powers of the Government of the State of Nevada shall be divided into three separate departments, the Legislature, the Executive and the Judicial; and no person charged with the exercise of powers properly
belonging to one of these departments shall exercise any functions, appertaining to either of the others, except in the cases expressly directed or permitted in this constitution. Nevada Const. Art. 3, §1, ¶1.

For these reasons, the Nevada Republican Party strongly opposes SB172.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

Sigal Chattah
Republican National Committeewoman, Nevada
To Senate Judiciary Chairman and committee,

As a concerned Nevadan, I ask that you oppose SB172 to preserve a parent’s right to protect their children from medical procedures, and to prevent minors from being able to make dangerous decisions without parental knowledge or consent. This bill completely removes any age of consent for certain medical treatments. It allows a minor child the ability to agree to contraception without parental knowledge or consent, and it allows a child of any age to consent to prevention and treatment of STDs, which may include vaccines and potentially dangerous medications.

Who will pay for injuries or side effects from these treatments if the parents have not consented? If you’re saying a minor has the capacity to legally consent to a medical treatment, doesn’t that capacity apply to other areas of consent? If they truly have the capacity to consent, you’re violating their other rights by treating them as a minor in other areas. This bill is unnecessary because we already have a process for situations where the minor does have the capacity to consent; they can become emancipated and permanently bypass parental consent. This bill attempts to take a narrow view of a massive and complex legal issue, and if you decide to pass it, there will be unintended consequences.

In addition to being bad public policy, this bill also sets a dangerous precedent that endangers not just children, but also the sacred relationship between a parent and a child. Why would the state want to come between a child and their parents? Why would you want to pass a law that says you believe children know better than their parents? As parents, we do everything we can to protect our children from making harmful decisions. When it comes to medical treatments, it is a parent’s right to make medical choices for ourselves and our dependent children.

Nevadans will not consent to this infringement on their parental right to direct the care and upbringing of our children. This bill violates parental rights, religious freedom, and the right to fully informed consent. Please vote no on SB172.

Thank you for your time,

Sonya Dickinson
Reno, NV 89521
Greetings legislature.
Much of the legislative work happens behind closed doors unseen by the people, which means we are unable to adequately hold all our elected officials accountable. Nevertheless, we are of good faith, knowing you have sworn to uphold the Constitution and Government of the United States and the Constitution and Government of the State of Nevada against all enemies, whether domestic or foreign, and that you will bear true faith, allegiance and loyalty to the same, any ordinance, resolution or law of any state notwithstanding, and that you will well and faithfully perform all the duties of your office.

The taking of an oath is a sacred obligation calling upon Almighty God, to whom no heart or action is hidden, to hold the oath taker accountable should they stray from their duty, even if their wrongdoing is hidden from the people.

With this in mind, I cheerfully call upon you to oppose SB172, a bill which wages war against the people of Nevada, threatening to remove the authority of parents over their children, subjecting them to the immoral and evil passions of wicked men.

May you be strong and courageous.

Sincerely,

Steven McFie
March 6, 2023

To Senate Judiciary Chairman and committee,

As a concerned Nevadan, I ask that you oppose SB172 to preserve a parent’s right to protect their children from medical procedures, and to prevent minors from being able to make dangerous decisions without parental knowledge or consent. This bill completely removes any age of consent for certain medical treatments. It allows a minor child the ability to agree to contraception without parental knowledge or consent, and it allows a child of any age to consent to prevention and treatment of STDs, which may include vaccines and potentially dangerous medications.

Who will pay for injuries or side effects from these treatments if the parents have not consented? If you’re saying a minor has the capacity to legally consent to a medical treatment, doesn’t that capacity apply to other areas of consent? If they truly have the capacity to consent, you’re violating their other rights by treating them as a minor in other areas. This bill is unnecessary because we already have a process for situations where the minor does have the capacity to consent; they can become emancipated and permanently bypass parental consent. This bill attempts to take a narrow view of a massive and complex legal issue, and if you decide to pass it, there will be unintended consequences.

In addition to being bad public policy, this bill also sets a dangerous precedent that endangers not just children, but also the sacred relationship between a parent and a child. Why would the state want to come between a child and their parents? Why would you want to pass a law that says you believe children know better than their parents? As parents, we do everything we can to protect our children from making harmful decisions. When it comes to medical treatments, it is a parent’s right to make medical choices for ourselves and our dependent children. Nevadans will not consent to this infringement on their parental right to direct the care and upbringing of our children. This bill violates parental rights, religious freedom, and the right to fully informed consent. Please vote no on SB172.

Thank you for your time,

Suzanne A Jensen
11600 Desert Shadow Dr.
Sparks, NV  89441
To Senate Judiciary Chairman and committee,

As a concerned Nevadan, I ask that you oppose SB172 to preserve a parent’s right to protect their children from medical procedures, and to prevent minors from being able to make dangerous decisions without parental knowledge or consent. This bill completely removes any age of consent for certain medical treatments. It allows a minor child the ability to agree to contraception without parental knowledge or consent, and it allows a child of any age to consent to prevention and treatment of STDs, which may include vaccines and potentially dangerous medications.

Who will pay for injuries or side effects from these treatments if the parents have not consented? If you’re saying a minor has the capacity to legally consent to a medical treatment, doesn’t that capacity apply to other areas of consent? If they truly have the capacity to consent, you’re violating their other rights by treating them as a minor in other areas. This bill is unnecessary because we already have a process for situations where the minor does have the capacity to consent; they can become emancipated and permanently bypass parental consent. This bill attempts to take a narrow view of a massive and complex legal issue, and if you decide to pass it, there will be unintended consequences.

In addition to being bad public policy, this bill also sets a dangerous precedent that endangers not just children, but also the sacred relationship between a parent and a child. Why would the state want to come between a child and their parents? Why would you want to pass a law that says you believe children know better than their parents? As parents, we do everything we can to protect our children from making harmful decisions. When it comes to medical treatments, it is a parent’s right to make medical choices for ourselves and our dependent children. Nevadans will not consent to this infringement on their parental right to direct the care and upbringing of our children. This bill violates parental rights, religious freedom, and the right to fully informed consent. Please vote no on SB172.

Thank you for your time,

Terese Salmento
3523 Candelaria Dr.
Sparks, NV  89434
To Senate Judiciary Chairman and committee,

As a concerned Nevadan, I ask that you oppose SB172 to preserve a parent’s right to protect their children from medical procedures, and to prevent minors from being able to make dangerous decisions without parental knowledge or consent.

It is NOT the States responsibility to interfere with the child/parent relationship. How so very arrogant to assume the will of the people would allow for such an outright and blatant disregard for our beloved Nevada families. The state has no jurisdiction here and the people are adamantly against the attempt to strong arm our Nevada families into policies that are not representative or reflective of their beliefs.

This bill completely removes any age of consent for certain medical treatments. It allows a minor child the ability to agree to contraception without parental knowledge or consent, and it allows a child of any age to consent to prevention and treatment of STDs, which may include vaccines and potentially dangerous medications. These serious types of medical decisions are not those of educators and administrators. These decisions belong between medical professionals, the child and their parents.

Who will pay for injuries or side effects from these treatments if the parents have not consented? If you’re saying a minor has the capacity to legally consent to a medical treatment, doesn’t that capacity apply to other areas of consent? If they truly have the capacity to consent, you’re violating their other rights by treating them as a minor in other areas. This bill is unnecessary because we already have a process for situations where the minor does have the capacity to consent; they can become emancipated and permanently bypass parental consent. This bill attempts to take a narrow view of a massive and complex legal issue, and if you decide to pass it, there will be unintended consequences.

In addition to being bad public policy, this bill also sets a dangerous precedent that endangers not just children, but also the sacred relationship between a parent and a child. Why would the state want to come between a child and their parents? Why would you want to pass a law that says you believe children know better than their parents? Its is offensive to me as a lifelong native Nevadan and it is outrageous!

As parents, we do everything we can to protect our children from making harmful decisions. When it comes to medical treatments, it is a parent’s right to make medical choices for ourselves and our dependent children.

Nevadans will not consent to this infringement on their parental right to direct the care and upbringing of our children. This bill violates parental rights, religious freedom, and the right to fully informed consent. Please vote no on SB172.

Thank you for your time,

Toni M. Farkas

Las Vegas, NV 89166
For Health Freedom,

Stand for Health Freedom & Health Freedom Nevada

Stand for Health Freedom is a nonprofit dedicated to protecting basic human rights, constitutional rights and parental rights. We exist to educate people and for people to have the tools to educate their lawmakers.

Please support our work by making a donation today. We rely on the generosity of concerned individuals like you so that together - through education and action - we can see a cultural shift for health freedom.

Don't like these emails? Unsubscribe
To Senate Judiciary Chairman and committee,

As a concerned Nevadan, I ask that you oppose SB172 to preserve a parent’s right to protect their children from medical procedures, and to prevent minors from being able to make dangerous decisions without parental knowledge or consent.

This bill completely removes any age of consent for certain medical treatments. It allows a minor child the ability to agree to contraception without parental knowledge or consent, and it allows a child of any age to consent to prevention and treatment of STDs, which may include vaccines and potentially dangerous medications.

Who will pay for injuries or side effects from these treatments if the parents have not consented? If you’re saying a minor has the capacity to legally consent to a medical treatment, doesn’t that capacity apply to other areas of consent? If they truly have the capacity to consent, you’re violating their other rights by treating them as a minor in other areas. This bill is unnecessary because we already have a process for situations where the minor does have the capacity to consent; they can become emancipated and permanently bypass parental consent. This bill attempts to take a narrow view of a massive and complex legal issue, and if you decide to pass it, there will be unintended consequences.

In addition to being bad public policy, this bill also sets a dangerous precedent that endangers not just children, but also the sacred relationship between a parent and a child. Why would the state want to come between a child and their parents? Why would you want to pass a law that says you believe children know better than their parents?

As parents, we do everything we can to protect our children from making harmful decisions. When it comes to medical treatments, it is a parent’s right to make medical choices for ourselves and our dependent children.

Nevadans will not consent to this infringement on their parental right to direct the care and upbringing of our children. This bill violates parental rights, religious freedom, and the right to fully informed consent. Please vote no on SB172.

Thank you for your time,

Wanda Smith
650 Nadine Drive, Fallon, NV 89406