

Senator Bailey, Representative Perry and members of the Health Coverage, Insurance, and Financial Services Committee... I am Rey Dubois, from Bangor, and I am speaking in favor of LDs 995 and 1404.

LD 995 specifies that insurance companies will pay for a second opinion for pregnant mothers who have been told by their provider that they should have an abortion because of the health or safety of the baby or the mother. The mother is not forced to request a second opinion. She may certainly just follow what her practitioner tells her, without question. This won't restrict elective abortions. But, as was described many times during Monday's marathon testimony session in the Judiciary Committee, practitioners do make mistakes, many children born after the "you should abort" recommendation live fruitful lives, and their parents are so glad that they chose life for their unborn child. This legislation simply requires insurance companies to provide second opinion coverage for a mother, like they do for many other surgeries... and I believe that this is a particularly crucial case, when the life of a child and the future of a family are at stake. Now, you know you will hear, from the pro-abortion speakers, that a second opinion is not needed, that their abortion providers don't need second opinions, that they are always accurate when they recommend abortions. Well, I don't believe this, and I know you don't either. They might tell you that they already have options for second opinions, and they may very well. Then they should, if they are truthful, honest and compassionate providers of non-judgemental healthcare services, have no problem with prominently listing the availability of second opinions on their consent forms. That would seem compassionate and reasonable to me.

LD 1404 specifies that insurance companies (and I certainly hope that MaineCare is included in this) pay for prenatal and a year's worth of post-partum care of a mother, when that mother is planning on giving her child up for adoption. The parents who would be adopting the baby would take the mother on their policy. It took me a moment to wrap my mind around this concept, but the more I thought about it, the more sense it made. This makes a lot of sense. This sets up a win-win-win situation in which a mother with an unplanned pregnancy, her unborn child, and the adoptive parents all benefit. The insurance companies will figure out how to work their magic, so that they will distribute costs, or add a "rider policy" cost.

Expect that the Pro-abortion speakers will tell you that coverage for a mother who plans on giving up her child for adoption is a bad idea. Well, it certainly has the potential to cut into their bottom line, as does LD 995. When they speak, they will tell you that they are all about women's rights, providing compassionate, non-judgemental care, etcetera. I would love to hear them testify in favor of these 2 bills, that both seek to provide better, non-judgemental care for a mother with an unplanned pregnancy or who is seeking to give her child up for adoption. To hear them testify in favor of bills that genuinely respect and love women would help restore my faith in people. Contrast these bills, that are intended to support a woman and her pregnancy, with one of last Monday's bills that selfishly seeks 100% insurance coverage to terminate the life of an unborn child, when no one else gets that level of coverage for diagnoses that are not a result of their own making.

Committee members, please support women with unplanned pregnancies, so they (and their child) will have the benefit of a second opinion and insurance coverage if they make the difficult, self-sacrificial decision to give their child up for adoption. Vote "ought to pass" on both of these bills. And, I would also like to ask the Pro-Choice people, if you are truly looking to provide compassionate support for women, speak in favor of these bills.