

Anne M. Gallaudet
Scarborough, Maine

March 24, 2025

Re: LD 682, An Act to Amend Certain Laws Regarding Abortions

Senator Carney, Representative Kuhn and Honorable Members of the Joint Judiciary Committee

I appreciate this opportunity to address you on this important matter. My name is Anne Gallaudet. I am a resident of Scarborough, Maine. I am writing *in opposition of* LD 682

This bill requires that reports of abortions made to the State's Department of Health and Human Services must include data on the person having the abortion, changes the standard for when an abortion may be performed after viability to only when it is medically necessary to preserve the life or health of the mother, rather than when a licensed physician determines it is necessary or when a fetus is diagnosed with a fetal anomaly that will, with a reasonable certainty, result in the death of the child within 3 months after birth. This bill also reestablishes criminal penalties for performing an abortion without a license or after viability.

Abortion is legal in Maine. This bill's intent is to stigmatize people receiving abortions, criminalize abortions, intimidate health care providers and women, and deny women the right to reproductive health care. I believe there is no defensible State interest in such statistics and said would violate the privacy interests of the people obtaining abortions.

Abortion was not legalized until I was in college when the US Supreme Court established a woman's constitutional right to abortion in Roe v. Wade. Before then, the stories about women who had abortions were common, heartbreaking and maddening. People died after experiencing unsafe abortions or endured lifelong injuries. Today we all have heard similar stories from women living in states prohibiting or severely limiting abortions since the overturning of Roe. Such dire circumstances facing women in the states limiting abortion services are enormously varied and specific to the individual; all blindly unseen by the abortion opposition.

Inexplicably, this bill fails to acknowledge the numerous and enormously varied reasons pregnant people need abortion services outside the period this bill envisions as legitimate. This bill wrongly puts the State in the doctor's office and invades the privacy of the pregnant person. This bill stigmatizes an important healthcare service for pregnant people. This bill if enacted will not prevent abortions but instead will force pregnant people, particularly low-income pregnant people and other underserved people, for lack of money or access, to seek abortion services outside the medical establishment and/or use means that are not medically sanctioned. By criminalizing the

abortion services they will seek, this bill puts pregnant people in even more jeopardy, both financially and medically.

I add that focusing on viability is detrimental to this bill as it is a vague term with a constantly change demarcation. By focusing on it, this bill stigmatizes abortions that are medically necessary later in pregnancy, a view reinforced by the American College of Obstetricians and Gynecologists. I add that even if there is a chance the fetus might survive out the womb does not necessarily reflect the value of the fetus or the burden of the pregnancy on the pregnant person – this is a highly personal matter for the pregnant person and her doctor to decide – not the State.

We have lost our communal empathy for others; we are wrongly full of judgment and managing our neighbors' lives.

Thank you for considering my comment. Please vote “ought not to pass” on LD 682.

Anne Gallaudet, Scarborough, ME