

MAINE STATE LEGISLATURE

The following document is provided by the
LAW AND LEGISLATIVE DIGITAL LIBRARY
at the Maine State Law and Legislative Reference Library
<http://legislature.maine.gov/lawlib>



Reproduced from electronic originals
(may include minor formatting differences from printed original)

Senate Legislative Record
One Hundred and Twenty-Eighth Legislature

State of Maine

Daily Edition

First Regular Session
beginning December 7, 2016

beginning at Page 1

Representatives:

GRIGNON of Athens
HARRINGTON of Sanford
ORDWAY of Standish
PICKETT of Dixfield

Reports **READ**.

On motion by Senator **DAVIS** of Piscataquis, the Majority **OUGHT TO PASS AS AMENDED BY COMMITTEE AMENDMENT "A" (S-285)** Report **ACCEPTED**.

Bill **READ ONCE**.

Committee Amendment "A" (S-285) **READ** and **ADOPTED**.

Under suspension of the Rules, Bill **READ A SECOND TIME** and **PASSED TO BE ENGROSSED AS AMENDED BY COMMITTEE AMENDMENT "A" (S-285)**.

Sent down for concurrence.

All matters thus acted upon were ordered sent down forthwith for concurrence.

ORDERS OF THE DAY

Unfinished Business

The following matters in the consideration of which the Senate was engaged at the time of Adjournment had preference in the Orders of the Day and continued with such preference until disposed of as provided by Senate Rule 516.

The Chair laid before the Senate the following Tabled and Later Assigned (5/31/17) matter:

HOUSE REPORTS - from the Committee on **ENERGY, UTILITIES AND TECHNOLOGY** on Bill "An Act To Modernize the Renewable Portfolio Standard"

H.P. 810 L.D. 1147

Majority - **Ought to Pass as Amended by Committee Amendment "A" (H-272)** (11 members)

Minority - **Ought Not to Pass** (2 members)

Tabled - May 31, 2017, by Senator **WOODSOME** of York

Pending - **ACCEPTANCE OF EITHER REPORT**

(In House, the Majority **OUGHT TO PASS AS AMENDED** Report **READ** and **ACCEPTED** and the Bill **PASSED TO BE ENGROSSED AS AMENDED BY COMMITTEE AMENDMENT "A" (H-272)**.)

On motion by Senator **WOODSOME** of York, the Majority **OUGHT TO PASS AS AMENDED** Report **ACCEPTED**, in concurrence.

Bill **READ ONCE**.

Committee Amendment "A" (H-272) **READ**.

On motion by Senator **DION** of Cumberland, Senate Amendment "A" (S-290) to Committee Amendment "A" (H-272) **READ** and **ADOPTED**.

Committee Amendment "A" (H-272) as Amended by Senate Amendment "A" (S-290) thereto, **ADOPTED**, in **NON-CONCURRENCE**.

Under suspension of the Rules, Bill **READ A SECOND TIME** and **PASSED TO BE ENGROSSED AS AMENDED BY COMMITTEE AMENDMENT "A" (H-272) AS AMENDED BY SENATE AMENDMENT "A" (S-290)** thereto, in **NON-CONCURRENCE**.

Ordered sent down forthwith for concurrence.

The Chair laid before the Senate the following Tabled and Later Assigned (6/12/17) matter:

HOUSE REPORTS - from the Committee on **JUDICIARY** on Bill "An Act To Allow a Wrongful Death Cause of Action for the Death of a Viable Fetus"

H.P. 241 L.D. 327

Majority - **Ought Not to Pass** (8 members)

Minority - **Ought to Pass** (5 members)

Tabled - June 12, 2017, by Senator **KEIM** of Oxford

Pending - motion by same Senator to **ACCEPT** the Minority **OUGHT TO PASS** Report in **NON-CONCURRENCE**

(In House, the Majority **OUGHT NOT TO PASS** Report **READ** and **ACCEPTED**.)

On motion by Senator **LIBBY** of Androscoggin, supported by a Division of one-fifth of the members present and voting, a Roll Call was ordered.

THE PRESIDENT: The Chair recognizes the Senator from Kennebec, Senator Katz.

Senator **KATZ:** Thank you, Mr. President. Men and women of the Senate, I take a look at the title of this bill. It seems like that this would be either a choice of pro-choice or pro-life on this bill. Most of us know which side of that aisle we sit on and when you see pro-choice or pro-life it's usually time to go to our corners and defend those corners. I think that would be a mistake, Mr. President, in analyzing this particular bill. I consider myself to be solidly pro-choice and I consider myself to be a supporter and defender of Planned Parenthood, but I believe that this is a sensible bill and I rise in support of the pending motion.

The wrongful death statute in Maine governs the subject of what happens when there is a death and the typical case, say Jane Smith is in an accident caused by the negligence of somebody else and she is killed, the personal representative for her estate, which would usually be her husband if she were married, would bring an action and as part of that action, Mr. President, the heirs would be able to recover for the loss of their wife, the loss of their mother. It's called Loss of Consortium in the law, which is really the major loss, when you think about it. It's not the medical bills. It's not the hospital bills. It's the loss of your loved one. Now, that's the current law but if Jane Smith, at the time of the accident, were, say, 40 weeks pregnant and let's say she did not die but the viability of the fetus was ended, there would be no recovery under current law for either Jane Smith or her husband, the perspective parents, for the loss of their perspective child. This statute in this bill simply creates a cause of action for the grieving parent who has now lost what they were looking forward to more than anything in life, the birth of a child, and it makes good sense, Mr. President, I think, to do this because if that same viable fetus had only been damaged in the accident, and then born alive, current Maine law would provide for a recovery for the injury to the viable fetus who has now been born alive, and that makes sense, and the parents under that case would bring an action on behalf of the injured child, and that's the law in virtually every state.

We had a case dealing with this same situation called Milton vs. Cary in which the court was asked to determine whether, under current Maine law, there was a recovery for the loss of a viable fetus, and it was a 4-3 decision and in his dissent then Chief Justice Wathen said the following about talking about how most courts, including Maine, recognized that the cause of action, if the child is born alive, and he said of those other courts: "Those courts concluded it would be irrational to prohibit recovery for a more severe injury causing the death of a fetus and yet that is the situation that currently exists under Maine law." Judge Wathen, in his court decision, wrote the following: "We are now left - under current Maine law, we are now left with the result that a prenatal injury is actionable, while a prenatal death is not." He goes on to say: "The absurdity of such a result is usually illustrated by the hypothetical of twins suffering simultaneous prenatal injuries, with one dying moments before birth and the other dying moments after birth. Such an extreme case demonstrates the irrationality of the requirement of a live birth." That's what this bill is trying to fix.

This will be characterized, and has been characterized, by some, Mr. President, as a radical assault on the pro-choice movement, and I respectfully disagree, and I just ask everybody to take a careful look at the bill. It provides no rights whatsoever to an unborn fetus. Instead, it only provides rights to the parents, and this was made clear by Maine courts in a separate case, and that is the case of Charmaine Shaw case in which the court talked about that law. It says, 'The wrongful death statute,' and that's what we're talking about here, 'grants no rights to the deceased.' No rights to the deceased. 'The statute provides a cause of action only to the living relatives or heirs.' That's what the court said there, and that is clearly Maine law. Now, the court went on to say: 'The circumstances presented in Milton,' which is really what we're talking about here today, 'did not implicate Maine's abortion law in any way.' I want to emphasize that. Forty other states, Mr. President, including every single other state in New England, the People's Republic of Vermont has this law in place. Every single state has this in place and you've heard criticism

from some, 'Well, that may be true but some of these other states did it by court decision and not by statute,' as if that is somehow not as important as a statute being passed. Well, I'm not sure that Roe v Wade is any less important, and any less the law in this country, because it was done by the Supreme Court as opposed to Congress. So, is this a slippery slope? I hear arguments that this is a slippery slope, that somehow passage of this law will become an argument for those who attempt to chip away at the right to abortion that is guaranteed by Roe v Wade, and I understand that argument. I worry about that argument. But I look with comfort to the other 40 states and, from my research, similar law in those other 40 states has never been successfully used in an attempt to erode women's right to an abortion. This is not about an assault on Roe v Wade. I suggest, Mr. President, it's about justice, justice for the family who made the choice to bear a child and having that choice taken away from them by a wrongful action. All groups, no matter their position on abortion, ought to be able to agree that women who have made the choice to bring a child into the world, and have that choice taken away from them through no fault of their own, deserve justice.

The Maine Medical Association did not testify against this bill. The Maine Osteopathic Association did not testify against this bill. Again, this is a right that women have in Massachusetts, New Hampshire, Vermont, and 37 other states, and we ought to extend that same right to mothers and fathers in Maine. So I'm suggesting, Mr. President, if you are pro-life don't vote against - don't vote for this bill because you're pro-life. Vote for this bill because it makes sense. If you are pro-choice, don't vote against this bill simply because you're pro-choice. Vote for what makes sense for justice in the State of Maine. Thank you, Mr. President.

THE PRESIDENT: The Chair recognizes the Senator from Sagadahoc, Senator Vitelli.

Senator **VITELLI:** Thank you, Mr. President. Men and women of the Senate, I'm not a lawyer, so I am not going to attempt to argue the law that was presented by my esteemed colleague, but I will agree with him on one count. This is a slippery slope. This bill, like other fetal personhood bills around the country, does seek to establish, in its intent, the fetus as a separate and distinct person from the woman who carries it, and I know enough about the law to know that we already have protections in place to protect the woman for the loss of her unborn child in the instance of accidents and other instances that result in the loss of pregnancy. This bill is nearly identical to one that was introduced several years ago that was clearly intended to restrict access to safe and legal abortion. This bill, as presented today, establishing the separate rights of a fetus, will create confusion in existing Maine law, which already, as stated, has clear protections for pregnant women, and it will chip away at our reproductive rights. Further, it opens the door to baseless lawsuits against doctors who provide legal abortions. Although abortion is an exception in the bill, doctors could be sued and then forced to prove in court that the abortion and the informed consent procedures were legal in order to avoid liability. This bill would allow wrongful death lawsuits against any individual or entity that a fetus' heirs may believe caused a second or third trimester pregnancy loss, including a healthcare provider who knowingly treats a pregnant woman, an employer who oversaw a pregnant woman in a specific workplace setting, or a pharmacy that sold an over-the-counter drug. Mr. President, I believe that

this bill is unnecessary and dangerous, and I respectfully ask that you do not support this motion. Thank you.

THE PRESIDENT: The Chair recognizes the Senator from Kennebec, Senator Bellows.

Senator **BELLOWS:** Thank you, Mr. President. I rise in opposition to the pending motion and I would just like to share that while the case of Milton from 1988 is good law to the extent in which it does, in fact, create tort remedies in civil court for the parents who suffer a tragic loss, the Maine Legislature has since updated the law to create additional protections. I was Executive Director of the ACLU of Maine in 2005 when I advocated for the Motherhood Protection Act, which the Maine Legislature passed, to put into law specific protections for women who suffer the tragic loss of wrongful death of her pregnancy, of her child, her fetus; and those protections are in place. What this bill does is seek to amend tort remedies under the probate court and, I point to you, in line 8 of the bill it does, in fact, create fetal personhood, which both the pro-life and pro-choice advocates across the country will agree is the basis for a challenge to Roe v Wade. I would also point to you that the Maine Medical Association member testimony in the record on this bill does speak specifically to opposition from doctors' concerns about the unintended consequences of this proposed statute - doctors and lawyers and the choice coalition. There was extensive testimony in the record and there was not quite as much testimony as there had been two years ago on the same exact issue, on the same exact nature, when L.D. 1193 was before this Body and was defeated; but I would draw your attention to that Legislative Record as well. Those arguments, and in that testimony from that year, for the same exact issue, Maine Medical Association and Maine Section of American College of Obstetricians and Gynecologists testified against L.D. 1193, An Act to Allow a Wrongful Death Cause of Action for the Death of an Unborn Child.

THE PRESIDENT: Senator, can I suggest - I'm just trying to remind folks of the rules that we're not supposed to be referencing other bills that may or may not have been before this Body, but to contain our discussion to the bill that is presently before this Chamber, if you could, please. Thank you.

Senator **BELLOWS:** In summary, I make three arguments. One, this bill is unnecessary because Maine law already provides criminal and civil remedies under the law for harm to a pregnant woman causing damage or loss of her pregnancy. Second, this bill, make no mistake, does convey some rights of personhood to the fetus as a distinct legal entity from the mother. Finally, this bill creates potential unintended consequences for doctors, nurses, and, potentially, mothers. Quoting from an attorney, and former law school professor, from the ACLU, "The language of L.D. 1193 is poorly drafted and could lead to substantial unintended consequences, creating a barrier to a pregnant woman's access to appropriate medical care. L.D. 1193 opens the door to protracted litigation against abortion providers who will be forced to defend in court the legality of the abortion and informed consent in every individual case. That's because the exception in L.D. 1193 from recovering a civil action against an abortion provider is if, and only if, the doctor can prove in court that the abortion and the informed consent procedures were legal. L.D. 1193 further allows for civil actions against all healthcare providers if they should have known that the woman was

pregnant and this language could chill doctors' treatment during emergencies because doctors might fear.....

THE PRESIDENT: Again, are we not on L.D. 327?

Senator **BELLOWS:** Excuse me, we are on L.D. 327.

THE PRESIDENT: Okay, so I'm confused by the reference to L.D. 1193?

Senator **BELLOWS:** Forgive me. It's because the language of L.D. 327 is identical to the 1193, but I will continue from my speech about L.D. 327. It's a typo in my comments.

THE PRESIDENT: It's very confusing to me and others as well. Thank you.

Senator **BELLOWS:** Sure. Because L.D. 327 amends the probate code, the question of personal representative arises. The fetus will not have a will, so the probate court must determine who the personal representative is, and under L.D. 327 the probate court would have to decide whether the mother or the father were the appropriate legal representative of the fetus. If L.D. 327 were to pass, it could potentially allow a father to sue a healthcare provider, including an abortion provider, on behalf of the estate of the fetus, even if the suit is contrary to the mother's desire. Regardless of our political or religious views, we can all agree that pregnant women deserve special protection under the law and should be treated with compassion and care. That's what this legislature did when it passed the Motherhood Protection Act in 2005 to update the law to ensure that the deficiencies identified in prior cases were addressed. This is an anti-abortion bill and I hope you will vote against the pending motion.

THE PRESIDENT: The Chair recognizes the Senator from Kennebec, Senator Katz.

Senator **KATZ:** Thank you, Mr. President. I'd pose a question through the Chair if I could.

THE PRESIDENT: The Senator may proceed.

Senator **KATZ:** I've heard that this is going to lead to a flood of litigation against physicians, a flood of litigation against employers, that it is going to lead to the limitation of abortion rights, and it will lead to contest in probate court. My question is: is there a single state out of those 40 states, in the hundreds of years of collective experience, where any of those horrible outcomes has come to pass? Thank you, Mr. President.

THE PRESIDENT: The Senator from Kennebec, Senator Katz, has posed a question through the Chair to anyone who may care to respond. The Chair recognizes the Senator from Kennebec, Senator Bellows.

Senator **BELLOWS:** To clarify that across the country only 12 states provide a statutory right of action for the wrongful death of a fetus. This would make Maine one of the handful of states nationwide and the only one in New England to codify this form of wrongful death action on behalf of a fetus.

THE PRESIDENT: The Chair recognizes the Senator from Kennebec, Senator Katz.

Senator **KATZ:** Thank you, Mr. President. I request the chance to speak for a third time very briefly.

THE PRESIDENT: The Senator may proceed without objection.

Senator **KATZ:** This is the law in 40 states. What is the difference whether it was adopted by the Supreme Court of the State or the Legislature of the State? Again, I would refer you back to Roe v Wade. Does anybody suggest that that is a less valid law in the United States because it was done by the Supreme Court as opposed to a Congress? Thank you.

THE PRESIDENT: The Chair recognizes the Senator from Penobscot, Senator Gratwick.

Senator **GRATWICK:** Thank you very much, Mr. President. Ladies and gentlemen of the Senate, I just rise very briefly. A personal aspect of this, that in rheumatology one also uses a medicine called Methotrexate, a strong medicine initially developed for particular kinds of Leukemia but works very well for rheumatoid arthritis, Lupus, etcetera, but it has many side effects, as I think people are aware. It can be used as a morning after pill. It has that effect. It also has the effect, in high doses, of causing the loss of a fetus. The difficulty is: should I know when a woman comes before me 25 weeks pregnant - she doesn't want to tell me, I ask her if she's pregnant, always ask that when you don't know. I believe people. I do not always do pregnancy tests on people and the language of the bill, particularly section 2 A1, is really open to question and I think this is going to have a major chilling effect on the use of particular kinds of medicines. I urge people to vote against this. The time is not ready for this. Thank you, Mr. President.

THE PRESIDENT: The Chair recognizes the Senator from Penobscot, Senator Cushing.

Senator **CUSHING:** Thank you, Mr. President. Mr. President, ladies and gentlemen of the Senate, I just, based on the good Senator from Penobscot's recent testimony, I'm just confused because, as I read the title, it says An Act to Allow Wrongful Death Cause of Action for the Death of a Viable Fetus. I don't understand, and perhaps I can pose a question through the Chair to anyone who might answer, how the referenced material the good Doctor just provided us would apply to a viable fetus?

THE PRESIDENT: Senator Cushing, the Senator from Penobscot, Senator Cushing, has posed a question through the Chair to anyone who cares to respond. The Chair recognizes the Senator from Penobscot, Senator Gratwick.

Senator **GRATWICK:** Thank you, Mr. President. Many medicines that are used can have an abortifacient effect on the fetus. They can cause the death of a fetus. This is one, this is the most commonly used medicine for rheumatoid arthritis and it can have that unfortunate side effect.

THE PRESIDENT: The Chair recognizes the Senator from Aroostook, Senator Carpenter.

Senator **CARPENTER:** Thank you, Mr. President. Just to follow along that line, and I guess this question would be posed to the Senator from Kennebec, Senator Katz. It would appear to be consistent with Senator Gratwick's concerns, this bill would appear to insulate from a cause of action a healthcare practitioner unless that healthcare practitioner did not know or and had not medical - medical, medical - reason to know. So I think Dr. Gratwick's scenario where you ask the patient, 'Are you pregnant?' and if the patient said 'no' you proceed, and I didn't catch the name of the drug, to administer the drug. It would seem to me that any healthcare practitioner, to be safe, would have to do pregnancy checks, whether they were dermatologists or rheumatologists or any of the ologists that are out there because it says 'no medical reason'. If the word 'medical' wasn't in there perhaps you could go on the patient's word, 'No, I'm not pregnant.' But that's not a medical reason. It seems to me you throw a burden onto the healthcare community here that they didn't have before and I think the chilling effect is of consequence. I would appreciate if somebody could respond to my question.

THE PRESIDENT: The Senator from Aroostook, Senator Carpenter, has posed a question through the Chair to anyone who cares to respond. The pending question before the Senate is Acceptance of the Ought to Pass Report. The Chair recognizes the Senator from Oxford, Senator Keim.

Senator **KEIM:** Thank you, Mr. President. This bill is pretty simple. It speaks only to a time which is passed the legal window for abortion. So this will not, and has not, affected abortion rights in any state. This bill is simply about economic justice for families in an amount of \$500,000. This bill is simply about allowing a family to say there is value, and a value that is far beyond that price, but something that they have lost through an action of another. This is about justice. Thank you.

THE PRESIDENT: The Chair recognizes the Senator from Cumberland, Senator Millett.

Senator **MILLETT:** Thank you, Mr. President. Mr. President, ladies and gentlemen of the Senate, certainly the loss of a pregnancy is tragic. We've heard remarks on the Floor of this Chamber and we've received testimony on this bill that a woman already has legal recourse in the courts. She can sue for negligence, assault, battery, or a host of other causes. That is not what this bill is about. I would also like to share some testimony that was received from insurance companies in Maine, particularly the Medical Mutual, and the testimony said it strongly urges the committee to reject L.D. 327. 'If adopted, the bill would alter 197 years of Maine law. We believe that dramatically altering the wrongful death statute in place since 1891 is inappropriate. Regretfully, we believe the bill appears to be more about a major social, philosophical, and contentious debate in this country.' I would concur. Thank you, Mr. President.

THE PRESIDENT: The pending question before the Senate is Acceptance of the Ought to Pass Report. A roll call has been ordered. If you are in favor of accepting the Ought to Pass Report you will be voting yes. If you are opposed you will be voting no. Is the Senate ready for the question?

The Doorkeepers secured the Chamber.

The Secretary opened the vote.

ROLL CALL (#348)

YEAS: Senators: BRAKEY, COLLINS, CUSHING, CYRWAY, DAVIS, DOW, HAMPER, KATZ, KEIM, LANGLEY, MAKER, MASON, ROSEN, SAVIELLO, VOLK, WHITTEMORE, WOODSOME, PRESIDENT THIBODEAU

NAYS: Senators: BELLOWS, BREEN, CARPENTER, CARSON, CHENETTE, CHIPMAN, DESCHAMBAULT, DIAMOND, DILL, DION, GRATWICK, HILL, JACKSON, LIBBY, MILLETT, MIRAMANT, VITELLI

18 Senators having voted in the affirmative and 17 Senators having voted in the negative, the motion by Senator **KEIM** of Oxford to **ACCEPT** the Minority **OUGHT TO PASS** Report, in **NON-CONCURRENCE, PREVAILED.**

Under suspension of the Rules, Bill **READ TWICE** and **PASSED TO BE ENGROSSED**, in **NON-CONCURRENCE.**

Ordered sent down forthwith for concurrence.

Off Record Remarks

RECESSED until the sound of the bell.

After Recess the Senate was called to order by the President.

ORDERS OF THE DAY

The Chair laid before the Senate the following Tabled and Later Assigned (6/19/17) matter:

An Act To Promote Impartiality in the Probate Court
S.P. 345 L.D. 1043

Tabled - June 19, 2017, by Senator **DAVIS** of Piscataquis

Pending - **ENACTMENT** in concurrence

(In House, **PASSED TO BE ENACTED.**)

THE PRESIDENT: The Chair recognizes the Senator from Piscataquis, Senator Davis.

Senator **DAVIS:** Thank you, Mr. President, and, Mr. President, I will wish you a good day. I'm taking a chance that the clock here might be wrong and it'd still be morning or afternoon, but it is day.

I rise, Mr. President, to oppose this matter, in opposition to this bill, and I will do my best to articulate why I do so. In nearly 200 years, Mr. President, the State of Maine has been a state and

during that time Maine's probate matters, such as contested estate wills and child custody things and that type of thing, have been taken care of by part-time, popularly elected judges, and that's all 16 counties, not just rural counties. That's according to the probate website. This system has worked well, I believe, for all these years and it brings me to the question: why do we need to change it now? In my small county of Piscataquis, although we are second in the State in landmass and in population we're the smallest, we have 17,000 people, our judge holds court one or two days a month and then sometimes they don't hold court at all if they don't have anything to do. Mr. President, my good friends who are the supporters of this legislation bring it forward and they seem to feel that sitting probate judges have some sort of an advantage when they are appearing - representing contested cases and they are appearing in other courts in other parts of the State from their own. However, Mr. President, I looked into this and I found some surprising results. The fact is I found absolutely the opposite from what was presented. I found that far more is expected of sitting judges than regular attorneys. That sitting judges are required to know more about probate matters and that more is demanded of them and, therefore, they even work harder than regular attorneys would. They know they are under a magnifying glass. They know they're being watched real close. Interestingly, Mr. President, Judge Morton, from Farmington, and Judge Mitchell, James Mitchell the deceased spouse of the current Judge Mitchell, had met each other in court, in probate court, in contested cases on opposite sides in front of Judge Alsop up in Skowhegan and if you talked to them they would tell you that there hasn't been any favoritism shown, although the losing guy might think there was a bit, but that isn't what's happened so far. That isn't what's been said. That certainly isn't to say that there haven't been some problems with our system. There're problems with every system. We had a judge in the southern part of the State that there was a bit of corruption around him and he was taken care of with the ballot box. There was another judge that decided he would run for political office other than Judge of Probate and the State Supreme Court had quite a bit to say to him about doing that.

Now, Mr. President, as you well know, I represent Piscataquis County, along with parts of Somerset, Piscataquis being the smallest of the three, certainly population-wise. This bill will hurt my county. There's no question. As I said before, we only have 17,000 people. Take that judge of probate and our probate courts away from us in favor of a full-time judge, it will mean, probably, that my constituents will have to travel great distances to receive the services of a probate judge and I would submit to you, Mr. President, as strongly as I can, my constituents are deserving as any constituents in the State of Maine of the services of a probate judge - anywhere, and they also deserve not to be handicapped by having to travel long distances. From Piscataquis, Maine to Bangor is probably 75 or 80 miles. That's unacceptable.

While, Mr. President, we have a small population, we are a very hard working, resourceful bunch of folks. We look after each other. Rural people usually do. We live distances apart and we have to take care of each other. When tragedy does strike, be it a disease or an accident or cancer, almost immediately a fundraiser of some sort or a benefit, supper, whatever, comes before us and it's done so to lift the spirits of those affected, and that is the order of the day, to look after each other. Ladies and gentlemen, we lost our hospitals quite a number of years ago. Most of the small schools in rural Maine are closed, most of them