

TESTIMONY FOR MAINE LD 1619

Madam Chair, Speaker Talbot Ross, and Honorable Members of the Judiciary Committee,

My name is Colleen Mahan. I am a resident of Greene, and I oppose this bill. Besides being “pro-life,” I have been on the other side of this issue as a “pro-choice” voter. I was once an abortion worker myself and have seen the horrors of that industry. It is not healthcare, in my opinion, and women deserve better. This bill fails the litmus test for acceptance by any Maine voter, be she “pro-life” or “pro-choice.” And our governor, who is championing this bill, promised voters that she would not be doing this very thing, expanding abortion services.

My first objection to the bill is, of course, the removal of a cut off time for legal abortion. Extending legal abortion past the date of viability (which is already a moving target) is so extreme that you will find most voters against it. It is unnecessary as well. OB/GYNs with decades of experience (some former abortionists themselves) have stated that direct killing of the baby is never necessary. So perhaps the definition of “abortion” needs to be clearer in legislation. I see that term as meaning the intentional killing of the fetus/baby in the womb. And as there is already a provision for the life and health of the mother in current law, it seems unnecessary to change that. If the mother’s life is truly in danger, which is very rare, a delivery of the baby is what is called for. This is what former abortionist, Dr. Anthony Levatino asserts in testimony he has given. The baby may or may not live outside the mother, but at least there would be an intention to save both of them, not kill one in deference to the other.

Second, I object to the vague wording of the reasons that could be used for an abortion at any time during the pregnancy. Again, there is already wording in the law that accounts for a physician making a decision that would save the mother’s life. The problem with the vague wording is that unethical physicians who simply want the money could advise the mother that this is necessary. As someone who has been behind the scenes of the abortion industry, I’ve seen firsthand the coercion that can occur and the bending of the term “necessary.” The door is left open for abortionists who are not the patient’s “trusted physician” to put forth this decision as being necessary. To be clear, the “medical provider” in an abortion facility generally walks in for the procedure and walks out after the few minutes it might take.

As for the argument that there are anomalies in certain babies that necessitate the killing of that child, I know several people and have heard of many more who might have been aborted for this reason. They were not aborted and live normal, good lives. Doctors often get things wrong. If the pregnancy is not threatening the mother’s life, the baby could still be brought to term and the condition treated then. Sometimes conditions can even be treated in utero.

Third, I oppose the decriminalization of illegal abortions. This should be just common sense.

If something is illegal, it should be punishable. What is the logic behind this change in the law? Those who uphold abortion as a legal right have maintained in the past that they want it to be “safe, legal, and rare.” It is anything but rare nowadays, and it certainly isn’t safe for the baby. But if this bill passes, it could be equally unsafe for the mother. It is already a procedure that comes with many risks, which increase as the pregnancy progresses. But this removal of penalties for those illegally performing or participating in the performing of an abortion would seem to be a pass for “back alley” abortions, something that abortion supporters have said they want to avoid.

Thank you for your consideration.