



MISSOURI HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
WITNESS APPEARANCE FORM

BILL NUMBER: HB 236		DATE: 2/4/2025
COMMITTEE: Children and Families		
TESTIFYING: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> IN SUPPORT OF <input type="checkbox"/> IN OPPOSITION TO <input type="checkbox"/> FOR INFORMATIONAL PURPOSES		
WITNESS NAME		
INDIVIDUAL:		
WITNESS NAME: ARNIE C. "HONEST-ABE" DIENOFF-STATE PUBLIC ADVOCATE		PHONE NUMBER:
BUSINESS/ORGANIZATION NAME:		TITLE:
ADDRESS:		
CITY:		STATE: ZIP:
EMAIL: arniedienoff@yahoo.com	ATTENDANCE: In-Person	SUBMIT DATE: 2/4/2025 11:23 PM
THE INFORMATION ON THIS FORM IS PUBLIC RECORD UNDER CHAPTER 610, RSMo.		

I am in Support of this Bill and the Legislation Intent to protect the children of our State. However, we need to be mindful of Adults right of choice and First-Amendment Rights. Protecting the children of our State lays in the hands of Parent Supervisor of the Internet and Parent Control and School District Officials to provide proper Safe Blocking Software with Internet-Use.



MISSOURI HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
WITNESS APPEARANCE FORM

BILL NUMBER: HB 236		DATE: 2/4/2025
COMMITTEE: Children and Families		
TESTIFYING: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> IN SUPPORT OF <input type="checkbox"/> IN OPPOSITION TO <input type="checkbox"/> FOR INFORMATIONAL PURPOSES		
WITNESS NAME		
REGISTERED LOBBYIST:		
WITNESS NAME: CURT WICHMER		PHONE NUMBER:
REPRESENTING: MISSOURI CATHOLIC CONFERENCE		TITLE:
ADDRESS: 600 CLARK AVE. P.O. BOX 1022		
CITY: JEFFERSON CITY		STATE: MO
		ZIP: 65102
EMAIL: wichmerc@mocatholic.org	ATTENDANCE: In-Person	SUBMIT DATE: 2/3/2025 5:28 PM

THE INFORMATION ON THIS FORM IS PUBLIC RECORD UNDER CHAPTER 610, RSMo.

Modern technology provides unprecedented access to adult content for both adults and minors. Restricting access to adult content will help keep this offensive and damaging material from reaching children.



MISSOURI HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
WITNESS APPEARANCE FORM

BILL NUMBER: HB 236		DATE: 2/4/2025	
COMMITTEE: Children and Families			
TESTIFYING: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> IN SUPPORT OF <input type="checkbox"/> IN OPPOSITION TO <input type="checkbox"/> FOR INFORMATIONAL PURPOSES			
WITNESS NAME			
REGISTERED LOBBYIST:			
WITNESS NAME: EMILY VAN SCHENKHOFF		PHONE NUMBER: 573-826-0031	
REPRESENTING: CHILDREN'S TRUST FUND		TITLE:	
ADDRESS: 301 W. HIGH ST			
CITY: JEFFERSON CITY		STATE: MO	ZIP: 65109
EMAIL:	ATTENDANCE:	SUBMIT DATE: 2/4/2025 12:00 AM	
THE INFORMATION ON THIS FORM IS PUBLIC RECORD UNDER CHAPTER 610, RSMo.			



MISSOURI HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
WITNESS APPEARANCE FORM

BILL NUMBER: HB 236		DATE: 2/4/2025	
COMMITTEE: Children and Families			
TESTIFYING: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> IN SUPPORT OF <input type="checkbox"/> IN OPPOSITION TO <input type="checkbox"/> FOR INFORMATIONAL PURPOSES			
WITNESS NAME			
BUSINESS/ORGANIZATION:			
WITNESS NAME: HEIDI OLSON		PHONE NUMBER: 575-571-8346	
BUSINESS/ORGANIZATION NAME: PARADIGM SHIFT TRAINING AND CONSULTING		TITLE: RN, CPN, SANE-P	
ADDRESS: 16014 RICHMOND AVE			
CITY: BELTON		STATE: MO	ZIP: 64012
EMAIL:	ATTENDANCE:	SUBMIT DATE: 2/4/2025 12:00 AM	
THE INFORMATION ON THIS FORM IS PUBLIC RECORD UNDER CHAPTER 610, RSMo.			



MISSOURI HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
WITNESS APPEARANCE FORM

BILL NUMBER: HB 236		DATE: 2/4/2025
COMMITTEE: Children and Families		
TESTIFYING: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> IN SUPPORT OF <input type="checkbox"/> IN OPPOSITION TO <input type="checkbox"/> FOR INFORMATIONAL PURPOSES		
WITNESS NAME		
BUSINESS/ORGANIZATION:		
WITNESS NAME: JESSICA SEITZ		PHONE NUMBER: 573-415-6228
BUSINESS/ORGANIZATION NAME: MISSOURI NETWORK AGAINST CHILD ABUSE		TITLE: EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR
ADDRESS: 520 DIX ROAD, SUITE C		
CITY: JEFFERSON CITY		STATE: MO
		ZIP: 65109
EMAIL:	ATTENDANCE:	SUBMIT DATE: 2/4/2025 12:00 AM
THE INFORMATION ON THIS FORM IS PUBLIC RECORD UNDER CHAPTER 610, RSMo.		



MISSOURI HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
WITNESS APPEARANCE FORM

BILL NUMBER: HB 236		DATE: 2/4/2025
COMMITTEE: Children and Families		
TESTIFYING: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> IN SUPPORT OF <input type="checkbox"/> IN OPPOSITION TO <input type="checkbox"/> FOR INFORMATIONAL PURPOSES		
WITNESS NAME		
INDIVIDUAL:		
WITNESS NAME: KIMBERLY MARONEY		PHONE NUMBER:
BUSINESS/ORGANIZATION NAME:		TITLE:
ADDRESS:		
CITY:		STATE: ZIP:
EMAIL: Kimashnick@yahoo.com	ATTENDANCE: Written	SUBMIT DATE: 2/4/2025 2:55 PM
THE INFORMATION ON THIS FORM IS PUBLIC RECORD UNDER CHAPTER 610, RSMo.		



MISSOURI HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
WITNESS APPEARANCE FORM

BILL NUMBER: HB 236		DATE: 2/4/2025	
COMMITTEE: Children and Families			
TESTIFYING: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> IN SUPPORT OF <input type="checkbox"/> IN OPPOSITION TO <input type="checkbox"/> FOR INFORMATIONAL PURPOSES			
WITNESS NAME			
BUSINESS/ORGANIZATION:			
WITNESS NAME: LORI ARONS		PHONE NUMBER: 314-471-3486	
BUSINESS/ORGANIZATION NAME: JEFFERSON COUNTY COUNCILWOMAN DISTRICT 3		TITLE:	
ADDRESS: 1031 SCENIC OAKS CT			
CITY: IMPERIAL		STATE: MO	ZIP: 63052
EMAIL:	ATTENDANCE:	SUBMIT DATE: 2/4/2025 12:00 AM	
THE INFORMATION ON THIS FORM IS PUBLIC RECORD UNDER CHAPTER 610, RSMo.			



MISSOURI HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
WITNESS APPEARANCE FORM

BILL NUMBER: HB 236		DATE: 2/4/2025
COMMITTEE: Children and Families		
TESTIFYING: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> IN SUPPORT OF <input type="checkbox"/> IN OPPOSITION TO <input type="checkbox"/> FOR INFORMATIONAL PURPOSES		
WITNESS NAME		
INDIVIDUAL:		
WITNESS NAME: NEIL GETZLOW		PHONE NUMBER:
BUSINESS/ORGANIZATION NAME:		TITLE:
ADDRESS:		
CITY:		STATE: ZIP:
EMAIL:	ATTENDANCE:	SUBMIT DATE: 2/4/2025 12:00 AM
THE INFORMATION ON THIS FORM IS PUBLIC RECORD UNDER CHAPTER 610, RSMo.		



MISSOURI HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
WITNESS APPEARANCE FORM

BILL NUMBER: HB 236		DATE: 2/4/2025
COMMITTEE: Children and Families		
TESTIFYING: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> IN SUPPORT OF <input type="checkbox"/> IN OPPOSITION TO <input type="checkbox"/> FOR INFORMATIONAL PURPOSES		
WITNESS NAME		
REGISTERED LOBBYIST:		
WITNESS NAME: NIKKI STRONG		PHONE NUMBER: 573-634-4876
REPRESENTING: MO COALITION FOR CHILDREN		TITLE:
ADDRESS: 213 E. CAPITOL AVENUE		
CITY: JEFFERSON CITY		STATE: MO
		ZIP: 65101
EMAIL:	ATTENDANCE:	SUBMIT DATE: 2/4/2025 12:00 AM
THE INFORMATION ON THIS FORM IS PUBLIC RECORD UNDER CHAPTER 610, RSMo.		



MISSOURI HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
WITNESS APPEARANCE FORM

BILL NUMBER: HB 236		DATE: 2/4/2025	
COMMITTEE: Children and Families			
TESTIFYING: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> IN SUPPORT OF <input type="checkbox"/> IN OPPOSITION TO <input type="checkbox"/> FOR INFORMATIONAL PURPOSES			
WITNESS NAME			
BUSINESS/ORGANIZATION:			
WITNESS NAME: STEPHANIE (SJ) EVANS		PHONE NUMBER: 402-699-4330	
BUSINESS/ORGANIZATION NAME: EXODUS CRY		TITLE: OUTREACH MANAGER	
ADDRESS: 1607 SW NEW ORLEANS AVE			
CITY: LEE'S SUMMIT		STATE: MO	ZIP: 64081
EMAIL:	ATTENDANCE:	SUBMIT DATE: 2/4/2025 12:00 AM	
THE INFORMATION ON THIS FORM IS PUBLIC RECORD UNDER CHAPTER 610, RSMo.			



MISSOURI HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
WITNESS APPEARANCE FORM

BILL NUMBER: HB 236		DATE: 2/4/2025
COMMITTEE: Children and Families		
TESTIFYING: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> IN SUPPORT OF <input type="checkbox"/> IN OPPOSITION TO <input type="checkbox"/> FOR INFORMATIONAL PURPOSES		
WITNESS NAME		
INDIVIDUAL:		
WITNESS NAME: SUSAN GIBSON		PHONE NUMBER:
BUSINESS/ORGANIZATION NAME:		TITLE:
ADDRESS:		
CITY:		STATE: ZIP:
EMAIL: Onesuegibson@protonmail.com	ATTENDANCE: Written	SUBMIT DATE: 2/1/2025 1:10 PM
THE INFORMATION ON THIS FORM IS PUBLIC RECORD UNDER CHAPTER 610, RSMo.		



MISSOURI HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
WITNESS APPEARANCE FORM

BILL NUMBER: HB 236		DATE: 2/4/2025
COMMITTEE: Children and Families		
TESTIFYING: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> IN SUPPORT OF <input type="checkbox"/> IN OPPOSITION TO <input type="checkbox"/> FOR INFORMATIONAL PURPOSES		
WITNESS NAME		
INDIVIDUAL:		
WITNESS NAME: TIMOTHY FABER		PHONE NUMBER:
BUSINESS/ORGANIZATION NAME:		TITLE:
ADDRESS:		
CITY:		STATE: ZIP:
EMAIL: tfaber@mobaptist.org	ATTENDANCE: In-Person	SUBMIT DATE: 2/1/2025 1:04 PM
THE INFORMATION ON THIS FORM IS PUBLIC RECORD UNDER CHAPTER 610, RSMo.		

Good Morning, and thank you for allowing me to speak with you this morning in favor of HB236. 19 States (AL, AR, ID, IN, FL, GA, KS, KY, LA, MS, MT, NC, NE, OK, SC, TN, TX, UT, AND VA) have already passed laws similar to HB236. This is because these states recognize a very real and vital interest in protecting their children. Missouri also protects our children in many ways. There are age verifications and restrictions for alcohol, tobacco and vaping products, marijuana, gambling, . . . a minor cannot get a tattoo until they are 18 unless they have parental consent, and if a certain bill over in the Senate gets passed and signed into law a person won't even be able to get married until they are 18. Hopefully no one on this committee thinks it would be okay for someone who is a minor to have access to a pornographic website. In fact, RSMo chapter 573.020 and 573.040 already make it a crime to show pornographic material to a minor, or to hand them pornographic material. So if you or I were to hand printed copy of Playboy to a minor we would be guilty of a crime. If we showed a pornographic movie or pictures to a classroom full of kids we would certainly be arrested. The problem before us to today is that these pornographic websites are skirting the law by claiming they are not "providing" their materials to minors per se; but rather are putting them on the internet for adult purposes. The problem is, there is nothing to prevent a minor from accessing them. So, one issue before us is whether such material is being "provided", "promoted", or "furnished to minors"; or whether it is merely readily accessible, and whether that is a problem. I believe it is a problem. Though a person may not "provide or furnish" marijuana or alcohol to a child, we expect them to block access of it from the kids. We must develop a way to block access to minors, not merely refrain from providing it. The second issue here is whether such a restriction and age verifications are overly burdensome to the presumed free speech rights of commercial entities. Perhaps we could debate the very clear free speech rights of individuals compared to the less clear free speech rights of commercial entities. But we should save that for another day. But along the lines of this being an undue burden on these enterprises, we have not found any of the above restrictions or age verifications to be an undue burden on any of those other products or services, so why would they be an undue burden in this case?For those who would argue that age verification tools are not as useful as some claim, that they can be manipulated or over-ridden . . . I don't know, I am not a tech guru. But this I do know A) if they are secure enough when the proponents of sports betting were trying to get that to pass, they should be secure enough for this; and B) Even if not the best means of restricting access for minors, it is definitely a step in the right direction. If we find that it is faulty, or insufficient in some way, way can fix it later, but we cannot leave the door wide open to causing harm for our children now. I strongly urge you to vote in favor of HB236. 573.020. Promoting obscenity in the first degree — penalty. — 1. A person commits the offense of promoting obscenity in the first degree if, knowing of its content and character, such person: (1) Wholesale promotes or possesses with the purpose to wholesale promote any obscene material; or (2) Wholesale promotes for minors or possesses with the purpose to wholesale promote for minors any

material pornographic for minors; or (3) Promotes, wholesale promotes or possesses with the purpose to wholesale promote for minors material that is pornographic for minors via computer, internet or computer network if the person made the matter available to a specific individual known by the defendant to be a minor. 2. The offense of promoting obscenity in the first degree is a class E felony. 3. As used in this section, "wholesale promote" means to manufacture, issue, sell, provide, mail, deliver, transfer, transmute, publish, distribute, circulate, disseminate, or to offer or agree to do the same for purposes of resale or redistribution. 573.040. Furnishing pornographic materials to minors — penalty. — 1. A person commits the offense of furnishing pornographic material to minors if, knowing of its content and character, he or she: (1) Furnishes any material pornographic for minors, knowing that the person to whom it is furnished is a minor or acting in reckless disregard of the likelihood that such person is a minor; or (2) Produces, presents, directs or participates in any performance pornographic for minors that is furnished to a minor knowing that any person viewing such performance is a minor or acting in reckless disregard of the likelihood that a minor is viewing the performance; or (3) Furnishes, produces, presents, directs, participates in any performance or otherwise makes available material that is pornographic for minors via computer, electronic transfer, internet or computer network if the person made the matter available to a specific individual known by the defendant to be a minor. 2. It is not a defense to a prosecution for a violation of this section that the person being furnished the pornographic material is a peace officer masquerading as a minor. 3. The offense of furnishing pornographic material to minors or attempting to furnish pornographic material to minors is a class A misdemeanor unless the person has been found guilty of an offense committed at a different time pursuant to this chapter, chapter 566 or chapter 568, in which case it is a class E felony.



MISSOURI HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
WITNESS APPEARANCE FORM

BILL NUMBER: HB 236		DATE: 2/4/2025	
COMMITTEE: Children and Families			
TESTIFYING: <input type="checkbox"/> IN SUPPORT OF <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> IN OPPOSITION TO <input type="checkbox"/> FOR INFORMATIONAL PURPOSES			
WITNESS NAME			
INDIVIDUAL:			
WITNESS NAME: ALISON BODEN		PHONE NUMBER:	
BUSINESS/ORGANIZATION NAME:		TITLE:	
ADDRESS:			
CITY:		STATE:	ZIP:
EMAIL: alison@freespeechcoalition.com		ATTENDANCE: Written	SUBMIT DATE: 2/3/2025 11:02 AM

THE INFORMATION ON THIS FORM IS PUBLIC RECORD UNDER CHAPTER 610, RSMo.

Dear Chair Jones and Members of the Children and Families Committee, We, the Free Speech Coalition, write to express our serious concern with HB 236, scheduled for consideration in the Children and Families Committee on February 4, 2025. While efforts to keep minors from accessing adult content are extremely important, HB 236 contains a number of serious flaws that may do more harm than good. We believe we can offer a way forward that is more effective at blocking access to “material harmful to minors” and less vulnerable to the loopholes and legal challenges that have plagued similar bills. As you may know, numerous bills similar to HB 236 have been introduced in other states. While some have passed, the majority have failed — and a significant number of those that have gone into effect are currently being adjudicated in federal court. Like those bills, HB 236 contains significant practical, technical and legal problems that undermine its effectiveness, create serious data privacy risks and violate key First Amendment protections for adults. The Free Speech Coalition has been fighting against government censorship, and for the rights of adult businesses and consumers, for more than three decades. Over the past two years, we’ve brought successful legal challenges against laws similar to HB 236. In fact, our Texas case, Free Speech Coalition v Paxton, is being heard by the Supreme Court this term. The Current State of Age-Verification Laws Age-verification for adult websites has now been mandated in more than a dozen states. In many of those states, including Texas, Florida, Tennessee, Indiana, Utah, Louisiana and Montana, the statutes have faced federal lawsuits brought by consumers, websites, educators, civil liberties groups and others. No one involved in these cases believes that minors should have access to adult content. The core issue is the substantial burden these laws place on the ability of adults to access the internet. Despite the rosy claims made by proponents of these laws, age-verification online is much more invasive and risky than flashing an ID at a liquor store. In practice, scanning one’s face, validating identity through a digital ID or uploading a driver’s license to an unfamiliar vendor discourages the vast majority of visitors from complying. When judges have blocked these laws, as they have in Texas, Indiana, and Tennessee, they’ve recognized that, while states do have a compelling interest in preventing minors from accessing adult content, laws like HB 236 are too restrictive on adults’ access — in part, because more effective measures than website-based age-verification exist. AV Laws Have Made Little Impact on Minors’ Access to Adult Content If other states are any indication, HB 236 will have little success in limiting minors’ access to adult content online. Despite headlines heralding Pornhub’s withdrawal from key states, adult content is still easily accessible where age-verification mandates have gone into effect. Social media sites like X/Twitter, Reddit, Telegram, 4chan all have extensive channels dedicated to adult content — many of which are effectively exempted from age-verification under HB 236’s limitation to entities whose “regular course of trade or business” is publishing material harmful to minors. Similarly, searches on Google (specifically exempted by HB 236) return not only adult images, but page after page of websites that are not US-based and do not comply with US law. The verification measures mandated in HB 236

are also shockingly easy to evade. In states where these laws have gone into effect, VPN usage has soared. VPNs (“virtual private networks”) allow residents to easily bypass the age-verification requirements by making it appear as though they are logging in from another state or country. This isn’t complicated or unfamiliar technology. Even before any of these bills went into effect, a 2023 study found that even 41% of middle schoolers already used a VPN to browse the internet.

HB 236 Increases Exposure to Illegal Content Websites that are not bound by U.S. law will be the primary beneficiaries of this bill, much as they have been in other states. The internet is global, and in states that have passed these laws, traffic has simply shifted away from legal sites that comply with US law and to those that do not — and may not comply with laws around illegal content, such as piracy, revenge porn, child sex abuse material. Like other forms of prohibition, the effect has not been to meaningfully limit access, but to grow gray and black markets. In fact, child protection advocates such as ICMEC, the International Centre for Missing and Exploited Children, say that age-verification laws such as these increase danger to minors.

HB 236 Exposes Missourians’ Private Information When confronted with verification measures, most users — more than 90% — simply refuse to comply, choosing instead to use a VPN or access similar content via non-compliant sites, social media platforms or the dark web. Those Missourians who do attempt to comply are faced with significant risk, since compliance with HB 236 requires a user to transmit extremely sensitive data, such as biometrics and government-issued identification, over the internet, linking it to incredibly sensitive websites. While HB 236 theoretically bars companies from retaining this information, it provides little regulation, auditing or oversight to this newly emerging industry. Such promises of data security have proven again and again to be illusory. HB 236’s prohibitions against keeping data does not prevent third-party age-verifiers from monetizing anonymized data — something age-verification companies have expressed interest in doing. Nor does it prohibit the DMV, banks, or employment databases used by the age-verification companies to confirm a visitor’s identity from keeping and recording a history of those visits — a dystopian loophole allowing the government can track our browsing history. These bills also create a massive opportunity for criminals. Personal information regarding sex and sexuality is highly sensitive, and criminals are already adept at exploiting this. Threats to disclose a person’s adult website browsing history are now one of the most common extortion threats monitored by the FTC. Even more troublingly, we are already receiving reports in other states of potential identity theft, as criminals set up phishing scams where they pose as an adult site and solicit the upload of identification documents. FSC itself regularly receives emails containing identifying information from residents in these states who mistakenly believe that we are responsible for verification.

HB 236 Risks Expensive Constitutional Challenges The requirements outlined in this bill are currently before the Supreme Court — and not for the first time. From the earliest days of the internet, legislators have struggled to solve this same issue, but the Supreme Court has been clear: the government can not create unreasonable hurdles that dissuade significant numbers of legal adults from accessing protected speech — whether that be art, literature, news or, even, pornography — when other less-restrictive options exist, such as parental filters. This has been echoed repeatedly in court battles in other states: In granting a preliminary injunction in Texas, US District Court Judge David Ezra noted that the state had other, less restrictive options, including mandating ISPs block adult content, and requiring adults to “opt-in” to access. In a similar order in Indiana, US District Court Judge Richard Young noted that the state could have mandated that minors’ devices come with filters already activated, and had failed to provide evidence that the more burdensome law was actually effective. In granting an injunction in Tennessee, US District Court Judge Sheryl H Lipman wrote that “blocking and filtering controls on individual devices are both more effective and less restrictive than the State’s suppression of speech at the source.” These are, to be sure, expensive legal battles that the state will have to pay to defend. Should the state lose, it may also be required to pay costs of the plaintiffs bringing the suit, potentially millions of dollars.

Legislative Solution to Keeping Children Safe To be clear: neither we, our co-plaintiffs, nor the adult industry more broadly want minors on adult sites. Many of us are parents ourselves and take common sense precautions to keep minors in our homes from accessing age-inappropriate material. In fact, the adult industry pioneered the technology two decades ago, developing the RTA (“Restricted to Adults”) tag that makes it easy for device and internet filters to identify and block adult sites. Filters hold additional advantages: they can block international sites that fail to comply, as well as social media sites with adult content. They can’t be circumvented via VPN. The internet is vast, and no solution is fool-proof. But filters have consistently proven to be effective at limiting minors’ access to adult sites. Several states have already introduced bills that mandate filters come pre-activated on devices intended for minors. Another solution may be age-verification at the device-level, meaning the verification happens on one’s phone, laptop, desktop or tablet. In this case, verification only has to happen once and the sensitive identification information never has to be transmitted outside the device. The device then communicates to each website only whether a visitor is old enough to view it. No scans, no biometrics, no digital ID, no background checks. North Dakota recently introduced legislation of this kind (SB 2380). If your goal is to keep

minors from accessing adult content, our industry is willing and enthusiastic to work with you. We understand the technology, the consumer landscape, and the practical solutions that can keep minors from encountering adult material while preserving the safety and privacy of Missourians. We understand that working with the adult industry may seem unorthodox, but any effective regulation requires industry to be at the table. Over the past two years, we've watched as bills like HB 236 have failed to prevent minors from accessing adult content. We've watched the consumer traffic shift from legal, compliant sites to non-compliant sites overseas. We've watched interest in VPNs soar. And we've watched as our members, attempting to do the right thing, have seen their users migrate to more dangerous parts of the web. We are eager to work with you to find a solution and look forward to discussing the issue further, publicly or privately.

References:

- Spangler, Todd. "Elon Musk's X Now Officially Allows Porn after Update to Policies." *Variety*, Variety, 4 June 2024, variety.com/2024/digital/news/x-twitter-porn-policy-update-1236023536/.
- VPNMentor Cybersecurity and Research Lab (2025). "Age-Verification and the Risks of VPNs," VPNMentor. <https://www.vpnmentor.com/news/vpn-and-adult-sites-report/>
- Ogles, Jacob. "Florida Demand for Vpns Surges by 1,150% after Pornhub Bans Access." *Florida Politics*, 23 Jan. 2025, floridapolitics.com/archives/717229-florida-demand-for-vpns-surges-by-1150-after-pornhub-bans-access/.
- Santer, N. D., Manago, A., Starks, A., & Reich, S. M. (2021). Early Adolescents' Perspectives on Digital Privacy. In *Algorithmic Rights and Protections for Children*.
- Stabile, M. (2024). The Real Effect of Age-Verification Laws. *AgeVerificationPolicy.org*
- A Model Bill for Protecting Children Online: The Digital Age Assurance Act (2024). International Center for Missing and Exploited Children. <https://www.icmec.org/daaa/>
- Small, Bridget. (2020) Scam emails demand Bitcoin, threaten blackmail. Federal Trade Commission. <https://consumer.ftc.gov/consumer-alerts/2020/04/scam-emails-demand-bitcoin-threaten-blackmail->
- *Reno v. ACLU*, 521 U.S. 844 (1997)
- Diaz, Jaclyn. "Supreme Court Weighs First Amendment Rights and Porn in Texas Case." *NPR*, NPR, 15 Jan. 2025, www.npr.org/2025/01/15/nx-s1-5260178/supreme-court-texas-porn-law.
- North Dakota Senate, 69th Legislative Assembly, SB 2380, <https://ndlegis.gov/assembly/69-2025/regular/bill-overview/bo2380.html>



MISSOURI HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
WITNESS APPEARANCE FORM

BILL NUMBER: HB 236		DATE: 2/4/2025
COMMITTEE: Children and Families		
TESTIFYING: <input type="checkbox"/> IN SUPPORT OF <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> IN OPPOSITION TO <input type="checkbox"/> FOR INFORMATIONAL PURPOSES		
WITNESS NAME		
INDIVIDUAL:		
WITNESS NAME: AMBER DAVIDSON		PHONE NUMBER:
BUSINESS/ORGANIZATION NAME:		TITLE:
ADDRESS:		
CITY:		STATE: ZIP:
EMAIL: Amberluye669@gmail.com	ATTENDANCE: Written	SUBMIT DATE: 2/3/2025 4:03 PM
THE INFORMATION ON THIS FORM IS PUBLIC RECORD UNDER CHAPTER 610, RSMo.		



MISSOURI HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
WITNESS APPEARANCE FORM

BILL NUMBER: HB 236		DATE: 2/4/2025	
COMMITTEE: Children and Families			
TESTIFYING: <input type="checkbox"/> IN SUPPORT OF <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> IN OPPOSITION TO <input type="checkbox"/> FOR INFORMATIONAL PURPOSES			
WITNESS NAME			
BUSINESS/ORGANIZATION:			
WITNESS NAME: DAVA-LEIGH BRUSH		PHONE NUMBER: 314-600-6018	
BUSINESS/ORGANIZATION NAME: MISSOURI EQUITY EDUCATION PARTNERSHIP		TITLE: PAL TEAM LEADER	
ADDRESS: PO BOX 1352			
CITY: ST. CHARLES		STATE: MO	ZIP: 63302
EMAIL: dlb@missouriequity.com	ATTENDANCE: Written	SUBMIT DATE: 2/4/2025 3:16 PM	

THE INFORMATION ON THIS FORM IS PUBLIC RECORD UNDER CHAPTER 610, RSMo.

The Missouri Equity Education Partnership opposes this bill. As stated when this bill was brought forward last session MOEEP is concerned that information put forth in an age verification cannot be adequately protected from being used in other ways. We understand the desire to protect Missouri youth, but are not convinced that this bill will do that without creating a host of unintended consequences centering around basic rights to privacy.



MISSOURI HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
WITNESS APPEARANCE FORM

BILL NUMBER: HB 236		DATE: 2/4/2025	
COMMITTEE: Children and Families			
TESTIFYING: <input type="checkbox"/> IN SUPPORT OF <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> IN OPPOSITION TO <input type="checkbox"/> FOR INFORMATIONAL PURPOSES			
WITNESS NAME			
INDIVIDUAL:			
WITNESS NAME: FORMER REP. TONY LOVASCO		PHONE NUMBER:	
BUSINESS/ORGANIZATION NAME:		TITLE:	
ADDRESS:			
CITY:		STATE:	ZIP:
EMAIL: tony@tonylovasco.com	ATTENDANCE: Written	SUBMIT DATE: 2/4/2025 7:52 AM	

THE INFORMATION ON THIS FORM IS PUBLIC RECORD UNDER CHAPTER 610, RSMo.

While this bill is well-intentioned, it is both undesirable in form and unworkable in practice. It purports to provide protection from the liability it imposes if websites verify the ages of those who attempt to access adult content. However it also forbids either the website or third party verification companies from retaining information about the users that have been verified. This makes it impossible for websites to demonstrate that they did in fact verify the age of any particular user – thus making the liability protection it claims to provide meaningless. If websites are subject to unlimited liability even when making a good faith attempt to comply with the law, they will be unable to realistically operate. While this may be considered a positive by many, it would also make this bill unconstitutional. Speech is protected under the 1st Amendment, even when it pertains to adult content. Thus the General Assembly must be extremely careful when passing regulations in such areas as to not run afoul of constitutional guardrails. Finally, it is impossible to ignore the likelihood that this legislation is not designed nor intended to be functional in the real-world. Instead, it appears likely that the intention is simply to provoke adult websites to simply block users in the the State of Missouri at the server level – essentially forcing them to stop doing business in the State under threat of ruinous lawsuits. Whatever one’s position is regarding pornography, it is a vast abuse of government power to coerce an otherwise legal industry to exit the marketplace. Consider the ramifications if similarly structured legislation were applied to the firearms industry, religious organizations, or other constitutionally protected behaviors. Government should not use the civil courts as a weapon to effectively ban commerce that it is constitutionally prohibited from criminalizing. To do so would sidestep the important protections provided by the Bill of Rights and create an environment that chills other types of speech that might one day be targeted by a future legislature or administration. I implore the members of this committee to reject this proposal.



MISSOURI HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
WITNESS APPEARANCE FORM

BILL NUMBER: HB 236		DATE: 2/4/2025	
COMMITTEE: Children and Families			
TESTIFYING: <input type="checkbox"/> IN SUPPORT OF <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> IN OPPOSITION TO <input type="checkbox"/> FOR INFORMATIONAL PURPOSES			
WITNESS NAME			
INDIVIDUAL:			
WITNESS NAME: KORTNIE HUDDLESTON		PHONE NUMBER:	
BUSINESS/ORGANIZATION NAME:		TITLE:	
ADDRESS:			
CITY:		STATE:	ZIP:
EMAIL: kortniehuddleston@gmail.com	ATTENDANCE: Written	SUBMIT DATE: 2/4/2025 9:58 PM	
THE INFORMATION ON THIS FORM IS PUBLIC RECORD UNDER CHAPTER 610, RSMo.			

I urge you to oppose this bill that, if enacted, poses severe threats to intellectual freedom, inclusivity, and the unrestricted access to essential LGBTQ+ materials. HB 236 contains provisions that could lead to censorship, potential discrimination, and the hindrance of educational resources about sexual orientation and gender identity. HB 236 raises concerns about the potential suppression of LGBTQ+ materials in schools. While the bill purports to address the issue of explicit and harmful materials, their language is overly broad, especially in the definition of "harmful to minors," which could be subjectively construed to limit access to educational resources exploring LGBTQ+ topics. The risk of stifling inclusive and diverse educational resources is significant. In conclusion, this bill, if passed, could have severe consequences on the accessibility of LGBTQ+ materials, potentially leading to censorship and discrimination. I urge lawmakers to prioritize intellectual freedom, inclusivity, and the right to information for all individuals by reconsidering and revising this bill. It is essential to ensure that our educational institutions, libraries, and online platforms remain spaces that foster understanding, tolerance, and access to diverse perspectives.



MISSOURI HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
WITNESS APPEARANCE FORM

BILL NUMBER: HB 236		DATE: 2/4/2025
COMMITTEE: Children and Families		
TESTIFYING: <input type="checkbox"/> IN SUPPORT OF <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> IN OPPOSITION TO <input type="checkbox"/> FOR INFORMATIONAL PURPOSES		
WITNESS NAME		
INDIVIDUAL:		
WITNESS NAME: MADELAINE ARCHIE		PHONE NUMBER:
BUSINESS/ORGANIZATION NAME:		TITLE:
ADDRESS:		
CITY:		STATE: ZIP:
EMAIL: madelainearchie@gmail.com	ATTENDANCE: Written	SUBMIT DATE: 2/4/2025 3:50 PM
THE INFORMATION ON THIS FORM IS PUBLIC RECORD UNDER CHAPTER 610, RSMo.		

I want to reaffirm my vote to protect elective abortion access in Missouri. The majority of Missouri voters affirmed this in the November 2024 election to pass amendment 3 and the legislature is obligated to uphold the will of the people.



MISSOURI HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
WITNESS APPEARANCE FORM

BILL NUMBER: HB 236		DATE: 2/4/2025	
COMMITTEE: Children and Families			
TESTIFYING: <input type="checkbox"/> IN SUPPORT OF <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> IN OPPOSITION TO <input type="checkbox"/> FOR INFORMATIONAL PURPOSES			
WITNESS NAME			
INDIVIDUAL:			
WITNESS NAME: MICHAEL DREYER		PHONE NUMBER:	
BUSINESS/ORGANIZATION NAME:		TITLE:	
ADDRESS:			
CITY:		STATE:	ZIP:
EMAIL: mdreyer93@gmail.com		ATTENDANCE: Written	SUBMIT DATE: 2/4/2025 9:57 PM
THE INFORMATION ON THIS FORM IS PUBLIC RECORD UNDER CHAPTER 610, RSMo.			

I urge you to oppose this bill that, if enacted, poses severe threats to intellectual freedom, inclusivity, and the unrestricted access to essential LGBTQ+ materials. HB 236 contains provisions that could lead to censorship, potential discrimination, and the hindrance of educational resources about sexual orientation and gender identity. HB 236 raises concerns about the potential suppression of LGBTQ+ materials in schools. While the bill purports to address the issue of explicit and harmful materials, their language is overly broad, especially in the definition of "harmful to minors," which could be subjectively construed to limit access to educational resources exploring LGBTQ+ topics. The risk of stifling inclusive and diverse educational resources is significant. In conclusion, this bill, if passed, could have severe consequences on the accessibility of LGBTQ+ materials, potentially leading to censorship and discrimination. I urge lawmakers to prioritize intellectual freedom, inclusivity, and the right to information for all individuals by reconsidering and revising this bill. It is essential to ensure that our educational institutions, libraries, and online platforms remain spaces that foster understanding, tolerance, and access to diverse perspectives.



MISSOURI HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
WITNESS APPEARANCE FORM

BILL NUMBER: HB 236		DATE: 2/4/2025	
COMMITTEE: Children and Families			
TESTIFYING: <input type="checkbox"/> IN SUPPORT OF <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> IN OPPOSITION TO <input type="checkbox"/> FOR INFORMATIONAL PURPOSES			
WITNESS NAME			
REGISTERED LOBBYIST:			
WITNESS NAME: SAGE CORAM		PHONE NUMBER:	
REPRESENTING: AMERICAN CIVIL LIBERTIES UNION OF MISSOURI		TITLE:	
ADDRESS:			
CITY: ST. LOUIS		STATE: MO	ZIP: 63101
EMAIL: scoram@aclu-mo.org	ATTENDANCE: Written	SUBMIT DATE: 2/4/2025 9:01 PM	
THE INFORMATION ON THIS FORM IS PUBLIC RECORD UNDER CHAPTER 610, RSMo.			

On behalf of the American Civil Liberties Union of Missouri and our approximately 15,000 members statewide, I would like to express our strong opposition to HB 236. While the ACLU of Missouri is understanding of the overarching intention to increase safety online, this bill raises serious concerns regarding privacy, surveillance, and First Amendment rights of Missourians. By introducing “age verification” requirements to access online materials, barriers are created for both minors and adults that result in a surrender of anonymity and a chilling effect on free speech online. “Reasonable age verification” in the proposed legislation encompass a wide-range of methods—including digitized identification cards, verifying government-issued IDs, and referencing transactional data related to housing, education, and employment—that each carry privacy risks, like data storage and retention. Simply put, determining the age of the user requires collecting sensitive information from all users. Under these measures, adult users would lose access to materials if they do not wish to upload sensitive identification information, or if they do not have access to necessary forms of identification. Required verification would unintentionally impact adult populations that have difficulty obtaining or renewing identification, such as those that do not drive, immigrants, people that are unhoused, elderly individuals, and people with disabilities. If passed, HB 236 would impose an unconstitutional burden on adult access to protected speech. Furthermore, similar legislation has been challenged across the country, including in Texas and Arkansas, with the courts following long-established protections for speech online. The intention to regulate online speech based on “material harmful to minors” or its effects has not saved the regulation itself. Instead, courts have found that these barriers raise constitutional concerns that are compounded by the privacy impacts of age verification. Creating guardrails for safety online is a complex and evolving topic of public policy; however, we have a duty to ensure that solutions do not create unintended consequences or impede the First Amendment rights of minors and adults. For these reasons, the ACLU of Missouri is opposed to this bill, and we urge you to vote no on HB 236.



MISSOURI HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
WITNESS APPEARANCE FORM

BILL NUMBER: HB 236		DATE: 2/4/2025
COMMITTEE: Children and Families		
TESTIFYING: <input type="checkbox"/> IN SUPPORT OF <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> IN OPPOSITION TO <input type="checkbox"/> FOR INFORMATIONAL PURPOSES		
WITNESS NAME		
INDIVIDUAL:		
WITNESS NAME: SCOTT MCMASTERS		PHONE NUMBER:
BUSINESS/ORGANIZATION NAME:		TITLE:
ADDRESS:		
CITY:		STATE: ZIP:
EMAIL: scotty.mcm93@gmail.com	ATTENDANCE: Written	SUBMIT DATE: 1/31/2025 10:09 AM

THE INFORMATION ON THIS FORM IS PUBLIC RECORD UNDER CHAPTER 610, RSMo.

I've watched with growing alarm as states across the country pass bills requiring people to show government ID or other sensitive data in order to access websites with "material harmful to minors" on them. As your constituent, I'm writing to express my deep opposition to these age verification mandates. I believe these laws violate my constitutional right as an adult to access legal speech without government interference or surveillance. At a time of rampant identity theft, I am uncomfortable with any system that requires me to share critical identification data with third-party sites. Showing my ID at a liquor store is simply not the same as linking a digital ID to my browsing history. There have already been reports of identity theft in Louisiana and Utah due to the laws there. There are many tools available for parents to make the internet safer for their children. ISPs, device manufacturers, and operating system developers have ensured an easy route to setting up parental controls. They all use simple step-by-step instructions which a person only needs to follow once, giving that person control over a child's browsing habits beyond simple supervision. There needs to be more focus on education and parental involvement to help protect minors online. Just one-third of parents use any content filters at all — and yet the burden of this law falls on the consumer. It is the duty of parents and guardians to monitor and guide their children's online activity.