

## Testimony AGAINST LD 227

Dear Committee Members,

Before beginning my testimony, I would like to recall the Oath of Office which you swore in assuming your role here as officers of the people of the State of Maine. That Oath states:

“I, \_\_\_\_\_ do swear, that I will support the Constitution of the United States and of this State, so long as I shall continue a citizen thereof. So help me God.”

It would therefore be prudent to remind you that the Constitution of the State of Maine recognizes in its preamble the sovereignty and goodness of God. It also explains that the purpose of the formation of our state is “to establish justice, insure tranquility, provide for our mutual defense, promote our common welfare, and secure to ourselves and our posterity the blessings of liberty”. Furthermore, in the very next paragraph, Article 1, Section 1, it enumerates the rights of all persons of “enjoying and defending life and liberty, acquiring, possessing and protecting property, and of pursuing and obtaining safety and happiness.”

These words are all vague and open to various interpretations if one does not define each of the terms. For example, how are we to know whether my right to “liberty” infringes on your right to “happiness”? And where does “justice” come into play? How are we to know whether an action is just? We see here that without a universal standard, there can be no “tranquility” or “common welfare” because the interests of individuals and/or groups would constantly be at odds with one another, whereby the most powerful would get to determine the standards for all, resulting in the oppression of the weak. Clearly, the founders of our State (and the United States, after which our state constitution was modeled) would have been familiar with this tendency, since they considered themselves the victims of an oppressive government, and were explicitly aiming to create a system which prevented such abuses. So did our founders intend that these stated aims of their new governments be open to various interpretations?

The answer is an emphatic “No.” The standard for human behavior at the time of the formation of these governments was based on the natural law: laws for human behavior built into who we are by God. The natural law is best formulated in the Ten Commandments. In the first three Commandments, humanity is to recognize the sovereignty and goodness of God and treat Him accordingly. Then, properly disposed towards his Creator, man would know how best to treat his fellow man. What follow are the remaining Commandments.

This finally brings me to my testimony on the matter at hand today: LD 227. No human, and therefore no State, has the authority to overrule the natural law. The natural law is simply truth. The attempts of human beings to redefine or circumvent God’s designs can only result in chaos and tragedy. One does not have to look very carefully to see that humanity is struggling, especially with regard to happiness. And yet, the more we ignore God and His plan, the unhappier we become. Recall all the “programs” that have been created by governments and “social welfare experts” over the years. And yet what is the trend? Worse school performance, more drug use, more mental health disorders and social problems, more broken families, more violence, more abuse, more suicide. Can we agree that the “experts” have been wrong?

The very foundations of this piece of legislation are gravely flawed. First, it is not the role of government to dictate the morality of healthcare practices and to legally protect certain medical practices without exception. Had this government existed in the medieval period, I imagine it would make the claim that bloodletting was a protected procedure for treating fevers. That was certainly the opinion of “the experts” of the day. I challenge the Committee members to include the term “bloodletting” in this bill’s list of “protected health care” and see if they still feel the same about the State’s authority over medicine.

Most importantly, however, the subject matter of LD227 pertains to gravely sinful - and, I might add, violent - actions being passed off as healthcare. Maiming a human body through surgery or chemicals is hardly an affirmation of that person. Furthermore, we know that the long-term health of persons who have undergone such “treatments” (destructive experiments) is very poor. It is basically a sentence of suffering and death for the person. Meanwhile, activists, pharmaceutical companies, medical providers, and those promoting these atrocities seem to be profiting financially as well as socially. This is a great injustice towards the individuals who are struggling to feel accepted. Will they feel more accepted once they have to face the harsh realities of their “treatments” and are then discarded by the medical professionals who degraded them into merely the means to a profit? Is this the idea of “establishing justice” or of “pursuing and obtaining safety and happiness” intended by our State’s Constitution?

The same arguments apply to another “protected” form of “health care” covered within this amendment: abortion. Obviously, much has been said on abortion historically and particularly with regard to LD1619. Honestly, if you can’t see that violently destroying a human life in the womb is a serious problem and something that should be forbidden by law, there’s nothing I can say to convince you. God commands us not to kill. God alone is the author of life and He alone has the right to determine where and how each life ends. Don’t listen to me; listen to Him. You will not be judged by me, but by Him. Our State should not support, encourage, legalize, protect or in any way have anything to do with this barbaric and gravely sinful action. The Constitution calls for the defense of life, not its destruction.

There are obviously very many other specific problems with LD227. I call on each of the Committee members to throw off the oppression of the forces which seek to legalize such evils. Return to God and His ways. Follow His laws. They are the only laws which result in temporal or eternal happiness.

Sincerely,

Sarah Haywood

Waterford