

Dear Legislator,

My name is Tyler Wentland, and I live in York. I am writing in opposition to LD 1619.

Friends from our local parish recently celebrated the birth of a beautiful baby girl via emergency c-section, but their hopes quickly gave way to fear when doctors realized her lungs had collapsed, necessitating a helicopter ride from Maine to Boston for emergency treatment. Thankfully, she made it, and got to go home a few days later with her parents and is doing well. Honestly, she's one of the most beautiful babies I've ever seen. I assume you are as relieved with that outcome as our family was.

What then is the qualitative difference between the life of little Amelia who was rushed from one state to the next for life-saving intervention and that of any other baby, from viability to the moment of birth, the time frame to which LD 1619 would allow that same child to be killed for any reason at any time? Who gets to decide? Medical necessity cannot be the reason, as that is already covered under Maine law, putting the issue of risk to the life of the mother aside in this discussion.

Some claim it is to preserve a woman's choice because it is her body that must grow, nurture, sustain, and deliver that child. But if the child can survive outside the womb and must be delivered whether it is wanted or not, why then does the mother, or the father, or the state get to determine that a viable child should not be delivered alive, treated with care, and placed for adoption, if the mother and father cannot or will not care for it? Either way the child must be delivered, and either way the child is no longer a burden to his or her parents. So the reason cannot be the right to choose.

If it is claimed that the child still in the womb is not technically a "person", then one must ask 'what is a person?' By what standard has the state of Maine determined itself the arbiter of who qualifies as a person? In what moral framework is the state operating to make such a determination? And when does this transformation take place? Is this determination made biologically? Socially? Culturally? Spiritually? If these questions cannot be answered, perhaps the state should pause because modern science shows us that at the very least, at the point of viability, what comes from human parents are human beings and human beings are traditionally understood to be persons given our capacity to achieve a rational nature.

Put it this way, in one case, life is valued as a fundamental good and preserved by the state's commitment to that good. In the other, life is deemed arbitrary, subjective, and based on the will and whim of the powerful. History shows that when the powerful take it upon themselves to decide that some members of society are expendable, we are on a very dark road. I ask you not to support LD 1619, for the sake of reason, compassion, and commitment to life as a fundamental good worth preserving - especially when that life can survive outside the womb, must be delivered regardless of whether it is wanted, and be a gift to families who desperately want a child to love and care for.

A society, let alone a state, where a baby on the brink of death will be flown in a personal helicopter across state lines and kept alive using some of the most sophisticated technology available, is

incongruous with a society that determines that same child's life can be ended by the abortionists tools post-viability at any time for any reason. One society is clearly better than the other.

Thank you for your consideration and for voting ought not to pass.

Tyler Wentland