

TESTIMONY TO THE JUDICIARY COMMITTEE

RE: L.D. 494 – AN ACT TO CONFORM STATE FUNDING TO THE FEDERAL HYDE AMENDMENT, LIMITING FUNDING FOR SOME ABORTION SERVICES

Senator Carney, Representative Moonen, fellow legal colleagues and Members of the Judiciary Committee:

In 1773, Massachusetts colonists threw tea into the Boston Harbor to protest the heavy taxes being levied on the Colonies. It is in the Spirit of the American Revolution, and based upon my conscientious objection to the use of taxpayer funds for abortion services, that I write in support of L.D. 494.

The British tax schemes found objectionable by the American colonists were largely economic levies. In contrast, there is a strong moral objection to taxation for abortion. The use of public funds for abortion services will impose a tax on a large segment of the Maine population that finds abortion to be morally repugnant. You have heard countless hours of testimony from hundreds of Maine residents on the moral and ethical pitfalls of abortion. There are hundreds of thousands of Catholic, Evangelicals and other Christians who believe it would be a serious sin on their part if they were forced by the sanction of State law to make any financial contribution whatsoever that is utilized to destroy the lives of the unborn.

It is already abhorrent that Maine law allows widespread abortion. If however it is the considered judgment of one political party that widespread abortion represents sound public policy, it should require those who desire the services to pay for the services. The taxpayers did not cause these individuals to become pregnant; most of these couples exercised their free will in engaging in the activity that inevitably results in pregnancy. Only they and their supporters should undertake any expenses associated with termination of pregnancy. If there are poor women who desire abortions, let Planned Parenthood raise the money or provide “charity” care if they deem it a worthy cause.

Likewise the sanction of State law should not indirectly impose this expense of those who conscientiously object to abortion by mandating that insurers provide abortion services. If insurers are required to insure abortion services, this will cause an increase in everyone’s insurance premiums, an indirect tax.

The purpose of taxation is to promote the public good. In light of the serious moral questions around the widespread use of abortion, and the impact of ending viable life on our common soul, the State must not force these abhorrent moral practices in face of the groundswell of opposition that has become evident.

For these reasons, I ask you to vote “ought to pass” on L.D. 494, on L.D. 1197, L.D. 1410 and L.D. 1614 and to vote “ought not to pass” on L.D. 935.

Brett D. Baber, Esq.
Dedham, Maine