

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-Ninth Legislature

State of Maine

Daily Edition

First Regular Session
beginning December 5, 2018

beginning at Page 1

The Chair laid before the Senate the following Tabled and Later Assigned (4/30/19) matter:

HOUSE REPORTS - from the Committee on **EDUCATION AND CULTURAL AFFAIRS** on Bill "An Act To Protect Maine Children and Students from Preventable Diseases by Repealing Certain Exemptions from the Laws Governing Immunization Requirements"

H.P. 586 L.D. 798

Majority - **Ought to Pass as Amended by Committee Amendment "A" (H-120)** (8 members)

Minority - **Ought Not to Pass** (5 members)

Tabled - April 30, 2019 by Senator **MILLETT** of Cumberland

Pending - motion by same Senator to **ACCEPT** the Majority **OUGHT TO PASS AS AMENDED** Report in concurrence

(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-120)**.)

On motion by Senator **TIMBERLAKE** 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 York, Senator Foley.

Senator **FOLEY:** Mr. President, ladies and gentlemen of the Senate, I rise in opposition to the pending motion. Last December we gathered in this Chamber, took our oath of office, and elected you, Mr. President, as the President of the Maine Senate. In your acceptance address to us you said that we all come from different parts of the state, with various backgrounds, and our own unique life experiences that guide our decisions and our votes. On that same day, Mr. President, my daughter would have celebrated her 32nd birthday. My wife and I were parents of a 2 month old daughter who died 32 years ago just 36 hours after receiving her first set of vaccinations, three separate shots, including the DPT shot. There is not a person in this Chamber or in these halls who will ever convince us that those shots did not play a significant and vital role in our daughter's untimely and unwarranted death. After her death her doctor secured the remaining quantities of vaccine he had for the possibility of testing the serum for potential imperfections. Enquires to the State Medical Examiner's Office and the State and Federal CDCs regarding the testing of the serum were rebuffed as unnecessary and potentially problematic for the vaccine regiment being implemented throughout the country. We were told on several occasions that no good would ever come of pursuing the testing we were asking for and it was time for us to move on. We were left with the saddest diagnosis, no known cause of death. Sudden infant death syndrome. My wife and I were not seeking vengeance or retribution in our inquiries. We were simply seeking the truth as to why our daughter died. Twenty-seven other infants died that same year as my daughter here in the state of Maine. A recent decision this past summer by the Vaccination Injury Court of the United States in *Boatman vs. HHS* a judge ruled, and I

quote, 'In this case I have concluded, after review of the evidence, that it is more likely than not that the vaccines played a substantial causal role in J.B.'s death, without the effect of which he would not have died.' Did you even realize, Mr. President, that the federal government has established a Vaccine Injury Court? If vaccines are 100% safe why has the federal government exempted all manufacturers of any liability and why has the Vaccine Injury Court paid out over \$4 billion in damages? J.B. was originally diagnosed as a SIDS death. Fortunately, my wife and I had two other children after our daughter's death. Both are similarly healthy. Neither of them had the vaccinations so early in their lives and neither had the DPT shot, just the DT. We did not start vaccinations until after 6 months and never multiple injections at one time. As a result, my wife and I have used the philosophical exemption requiring our children to not be vaccinated under the same protocol. We were frightened and scared of losing another child, a pain we could not have endured again. We were not and are not anti-vaxxers as the media would like to portray us. We were very diligent parents. Our doctors understood our concerns and respected our philosophical feelings and emotional stress. We never put our children or anyone else's children in danger by exercising our rights as parents. Every school they attended from Pre-K all the way to college equally respected those rights and never questioned our decisions. This bill would have prohibited my children from attending any Maine schools because of the lack of one shot. This bill will also prevent many students from attending Maine schools. Many foreign students from Europe, Japan, Asia, the Middle East, and beyond are not currently exposed to the same vaccination regiment required in this bill. In fact, many countries prohibit vaccinations for religious reasons, yet we welcome millions of foreign students and visitors into this country and into our state every year. Are we now going to require vaccination checkpoints at our borders or just at the doorsteps of our schools and daycares? I do not wish the death of a child on any parent. That pain is still with me today. I only ask that you understand the wrenching decisions that my wife and I had to make as a result of our daughter's untimely death. They were not easy decisions and were not made without a great deal of contemplation and consultation with our medical providers, as it should be. I ask any member of this Chamber or anyone listening to this debate today who has lost a child or had one badly injured: what would you do to prevent that from happening again? The answer, Mr. President, is anything. Anything I could possibly do. Mr. President, unless you believe that healthy babies simply die for no reason, I ask you to respect and understand the difficult decisions that parents who have had tragic vaccination reactions like our have faced. We live with that pain every day. Ladies and gentlemen of the Senate, I ask you to oppose the pending motion. There must be a better way for us to protect all of Maine's children other than by segregating a portion of that population as this bill proposes. Thank you, Mr. President.

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

Senator **MILLETT:** Thank you, Mr. President. Ladies and gentlemen of the Senate, as many of you know, the Education and Cultural Affairs Committee heard approximately 13 hours of emotional, thoughtful, and enlightening testimony in regard to this bill. As a lawmaker, as a parent, as a mother, I understand how personal this issue is for so many Maine families. We heard in Committee over and over again concerns from families about

vaccines. We also heard from those that are urging us to take action. I'm going to quote from some of the testimony that we heard. 'Due to effective vaccination programs in the United States we rarely see the terrible complications of infections like Polio, where children were put in iron lungs as their bodies were gradually paralyzed. Instead we forget that a choice not to vaccinate places a significant risk, and poses a significant risk, to our youngest children, our grandparents, and children attending school with illnesses, such as cancer, who cannot be vaccinated and are immune-compromised.' Some complications from measles: we're all very well aware of the measles outbreaks that are happening across our country, there are 78 more new cases just this week. They include acute neurological complications like Encephalitis, which is acute swelling of the brain that can lead to seizures. Chronic complications like deafness, epilepsy, and intellectual disabilities. Bacterial Meningitis: acute complications are seizures, stroke, brain abscesses, sepsis, coma, death. We are in receipt of pages of references to good science. The American Journal of Medical Genetics, the New England Journal of Medicine, Molecular Psychiatry, Pediatrics, Journal of the American Medical Association, the Lancet. Pages, the lists, goes on and on. I'm going to read to you from an E.R. nurse. 'I invite you to step into the shoes of an E.R. nurse for one minute, if you will, and imagine being in a brightly lit room, a mother on a stretcher holding her 3 year old. His tiny frame tired from chemo. She doesn't even notice the diarrhea spelling onto her legs. You are in nurse mode, frantically trying to get IV access. As the needles enter his frail body he doesn't even flinch. As anyone in healthcare knows, nothing says 'I'm sick' like a child who doesn't cry or fight when you're starting an IV. He reminds you of a child on TV commercial trying to raise money for children in Africa. This is rotavirus in a child with no immune system. Or perhaps you are caring for a 6 week old who coughs so hard that she turns blue as corpse, loses consciousness, and stops breathing. As her parents scream and beg, you try not to think about your own baby at home because this is not about you. As her heartrate quickly drops and you prepare to assist her breathing and start CPR, she gasps and the room sighs a collective sigh of relief. But then it happens again and again and again until you lose count and transfer her to the PICU, mostly likely to get intubated. This is pertussis in an infant too young to receive the vaccine.' My colleagues and I on the Education Committee worked hard to take into consideration the advice of experts, as well as the very real concerns of parents on all sides of this issue. We amended the bill in a way we feel keeps our children healthy in school while allowing parents some breathing room to get caught up with required immunizations. In addition, we amended it to allow physicians to authorize exemptions within the full scope of their licensure. There are no longer prescribed reasons for giving those exemptions if this bill were to pass. It's important to us to make sure State guidelines are both up to date and crystal clear about what immunizations are required for children to attend public school and for the Maine CDC to report biannually on efficacy and safety of immunizations. We continue to encourage families to work closely with their doctors and encourage doctors to communicate openly with their patients and make sure parents have all the information they need. At the end of the day this bill is about making sure our public schools are safe, healthy environments for our young people to learn and grow. Thank you, Mr. President.

THE PRESIDENT: The Chair recognizes the Senator from Knox, Senator Miramant.

Senator **MIRAMANT:** Thank you, Mr. President. Men and women of the Senate, listening to Senator Millett, I want to congratulate her and her Committee for their commitment to staying through the entire period with the great dedication to the people who were coming, who were there for long hours, and I want to acknowledge that from that testimony we looked through and about 60% were against this bill for a lot of reasons, which spoke to the fact that so many came out but also how strongly they felt they needed their voice to be heard in this message. I found out right away that there are some who didn't even believe that there were two sides, or didn't need to believe that there were, and tried to shout me down and say there weren't two sides, that there was their side and that was it and that's all they needed to say and it'd be over. So a lot of things I picked up along the years, 20 years now, of looking at this. A few years ago, when this bill came up and I had to look more in depth at it and really dig into the science that people are trying to bring and say that the problems didn't exist. At that point I did. This time I spent one whole Saturday, from when I woke up until I went to bed, looking at the links they sent me, the letters that they gave me. I'll tell you, I have reviewed everything from all the people, Mr. President, and I'll try to keep looking at you, that has come my way and dig in deeply. Sometimes it was interesting that the links took me to places that they believed were reinforcing their view of the science and it showed something different. So there are a lot of misperceptions out there.

I'll kind of go along with the exemption that's been in place that allows a religious or philosophical and medical, although quite limited medical. We've been around 95% in this herd immunity theory. Herd immunity is an interesting theory. It's also a part of where there are disagreements. But the drug company schedule said at 95% you would have herd immunity and when we reached it they said to have 100%. That's an industry that next year will make about \$60 billion off of the vaccines. So this is an interesting schedule but, in any case, we are about there. Of the remaining 5%, these are not people who aren't vaccinated. They are people who have noticed that their genetic markers and realized that because of that there may be adverse reactions to vaccines or they're folks who were adhering to the schedule with the first round and found quite a bad first reaction, sometimes the worst being paying the ultimate price for their children. So a lot of that remaining 5% are people that are just vaccinating on a different schedule and with the medical exemption in place before it would not allow that schedule. Some doctors say that they'll give it along those lines if they do patient-centered care. I know some of our members here would practice no other way. I know their integrity and their compassion and that's the only way they would practice. Now where that would translate into an exemption, I don't know. I know doctors who practice that way and they won't give an exemption because they fear being targeted for giving those exemptions when they know that's the way to go with certain children. I think any doctor would err on the side caution when they're unsure. They can have a great indicator that this will cause an adverse reaction, than they would definitely expand the schedule. If they don't know, but they suspect, they would do it. Does that make them a target of the folks that say there is no deviation from the rules as they are laid down and, in fact, the previous adverse reaction to a vaccine is not a reason to give a medical exemption for the next round? So,

knowing that, it's a tough place to put doctors, so I also commend the Committee on expanding the medical exemption to do patient-centered care, to expand it to nurse practitioners and PAs. That's all good. The only problem, and that's been raised in the other Body during their debate, is that there are groups of people in this country who have had medical experimentation on them because they were seen as less-than. California expanded the medical exemption and then, when doctors started to use the expanded exemption, those doctors were targeted. So they're not without concerns around that issue. So it plays into why some people are suspect about it being brought down to just one area that they can get that exemption. Although I believe that the doctors who want to have patient-centered care will breathe a sigh of relief that at least it's possible that within the scope of their practice they can do that. That's just one piece of it.

So if we only have that and then doctors start to back off, we're starting to say that if you want your kids to go to school they're going to have to be vaccinated. Well, it's about 9,000 children that aren't vaccinated and they're not going to rush to get this done so they can go to school. I've had many contacts about people who are going to leave the state because there are plenty of places you can go and they'll honor your philosophical or your religious exemption and they still have that old model of a medical exemption as well. When we talk about it, I just want to make sure, I know it's hard to believe that it could affect some of these things. It makes accepting some of the assurances all the harder when all daycares. This is what will be impacted. This is where you would have to adhere to the schedule that's laid down. All daycares; home-based or center-based pre-school programs; all K-12 public, private, and religious schools; on-line schools; charter schools; all children in DHHS custody; all post-secondary schools, including public colleges and universities; private colleges and universities; community colleges; trade schools; on-line degree programs; graduate students; nursing students; all healthcare employees; home health agencies; hospital networks; intermediate care facilities; licensed nursing facilities; multi-level healthcare facilities; residential care facilities; and everywhere new vaccine mandates are added.

So with the adult compliance to the vaccination schedule at less than 20%, there's no way we'll ever achieve herd immunity. We're not going to be forcing all adults into a 100% compliance rate. So, approximately 150 million adults in the country are not adequately protected, according to the schedule that's been laid down. A lot of parents are agonizing over this decision because they're not against vaccinating, many of them. So they have to make this choice; is my child going to be injured more by the vaccine or by the lack of it? That's not something anybody takes easily. The coercion for it to go to school takes it into a new area.

We, as Democrats, are proud to say we support choice. Now we don't? My body, you choose what goes into it whether you like it or not. So we're not going to throw all these people out and then say: 'Okay, you can't go to school but when my kids come home you're all going to play together. You can still go to the store. You can still do all these things. You're still around adults with less than a 20% vaccination rate according to that schedule.' We're still all intermingling. We still haven't stopped this group, but we have vilified it. We've shut them out. We're going to start creating a new minority. These kids, because these are kids, remember, to start with at the lower grades and they're not going to understand why they were thrown out of school. They're not going to understand why they're suddenly made into this group that's bad and what's going on. But I can play with my neighbors

still. They will not be able to understand and I don't think their parents can tell them because they're not going to understand this either. It's something we've been moving away from, from making groups. I believe the prayer was about that this morning. So, some of the studies are based on epidemiology. It can only draw correlations, not causation. So, we have to move away from thinking that some of these studies really mean anything.

So, back to the vaccines and the term Congress uses for them as unavoidably unsafe. When Congress is looking at what makes a vaccine unavoidably unsafe they're recognizing that there are a percentage of adverse reactions that are going to happen, but it's unavoidable because it's on a schedule that creates an unavoidable situation. That unavoidable situation could be remedied by recognizing that individuals are all different, that their immunology is all different, and vaccinating on schedule that works for them, if you believe in that, and remembering that people have a right to their religious beliefs and some of them will not vaccinate. That's not a big percentage because that's where we are right now. That's why we have such a high compliance rate with even that schedule that doesn't work for everyone. So, the vaccine adverse event reporting system, it's optional. Drug manufacturers were given liability from the problems that their vaccines cause. When they're not given liability they're not good corporate citizens. I remember Thalidomide. You can talk about before vaccines were widely used. Just think about Thalidomide babies. They are still in our midst. Let's think about the over-prescribing of antibiotics. They tell doctors: 'Oh no, this will do that.' Doctors know better. Then the public is used to coming in and getting something. So, they end up getting antibiotics for things that antibiotics won't work on. Everybody knows it. It's on the cover of magazines. Overuse of antibiotics, we're going to make them ineffective. Guess what we've done. Opioid epidemic, I know we've heard of that one. We don't have to reach back far for that. Sackler family. Oh, no, it's not addictive. If it's not working give them more. It's not addictive. Everybody's going. These people, they're falling into the cycle. They can't afford the opioid that's being prescribed anymore so now they're into the heroin, fentanyl loop to deal with the addiction that they've come up with. That was the drug companies. The Sackler's answer: come up with a drug to treat people with addiction problems so we can make money on the problem we caused. Great corporate citizens, the folks that bring you vaccines. The Vaccine Adverse Reaction Board has given out over \$4 billion since its inception. Even though vaccine manufacturers are not liable they have to pay into a fund to pay for vaccine injured children. Four billion dollars.

Then we get on to some of the vaccines that they put out. The best rate of the pertussis vaccine is 70%. So when we have these pertussis outbreaks, or we have a measles outbreak, it's the unvaccinated kids that are causing it. Well, then we look, after the hype dies down a little bit, and, low and behold, someone who was vaccinated against it got it and brought it into a group of vaccinated kids and they got it. In a certain percentage, that's predictable based on the rate. It's not usually the unvaccinated kids that are doing this. They may be a small part of the result but they aren't the ones bringing it. That data gets out but it's slow, because that's not where we are right now. It's supporting the idea that it's so much better to vaccinate because of all the problems that could come, ignoring the problems that are coming, both short term and long term and even death.

So, I thank all the folks that have brought that to us so that no one could stand in this Chamber. I see my colleagues have been

out in the halls talking to folks who say this vaccination's a miracle and it's part of the evolution of our health. We've learned about diet and vitamins and things that were not talked about. We don't give in easily to bad ideas in science. We do talk to all of the people who come with their children and who take a day off from both work and not being able to leave very often from their house because they have a vaccine injured child that requires so much care that they don't get a break in their life ever again. That's sad. That's really sad. But I always admire, I think everyone in this room, everyone in those halls, has the best interests of our children at heart. This bill will not help them have the tools they need. Please vote this bill Ought Not to Pass. Please vote against the motion as it stands right now and give people the tools they need to keep their children safe. That's what's really important. Let's protect all our children in every way we can. Thank you, Mr. President.

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

Senator **GUERIN:** Thank you, Mr. President. Mr. President, ladies and gentlemen of the Senate, I was much like other young mothers when I took our first child in for a doctor's appointment and shots. I truly gave it little thought at all. Children get shots, cry, and go happily home. That was my mindset. My views of vaccines changed that day when my son, Gabriel, had a seizure after the DPT shot was administered. Although we did continue to have vaccines, we were selective and had the vaccines well spaced for Gabriel and his subsequent four brothers. We followed our pediatrician's advice and had no further pertussis vaccines. Vaccines are biological products manufactured by for-profit pharmaceutical corporations. Like other pharmaceutical products, vaccines carry a risk of injury or death which can be greater for some people than others and often doctors cannot predict who will be harmed. One size fits all vaccine policies and laws which force you to risk your child's health without your voluntary informed consent and with the threat of punishment for declining a vaccine violates human rights. It is important to protect civil liberties, including the freedom to exercise voluntary informed consent to medical risk taking. Without the legal right to protect autonomy and bodily integrity, without the legal right to freedom of thought, speech and conscience and religious belief, we are no longer free. Please preserve our current exemptions and allow parents discretion in vaccinating schedules by voting against the pending motion.

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

Senator **L. SANBORN:** Thank you, Mr. President. Mr. President and ladies and gentlemen of the Senate, I rise to speak strongly in favor of the pending motion. L.D. 798 is a bill to protect our children from preventable childhood illnesses that can be life threatening with safe and effective immunizations. L.D. 798 is not sponsored by pharmaceutical companies and is not about pharmaceutical companies generating more and more vaccines for profit. This bill was sponsored by a young father from the other Body wanting to protect his toddler son and other children. L.D. 798 is not about forcing parents to do something against their will or taking away choice. It is about how the choices we make have consequences for ourselves and for others. L.D. 798 is certainly not about shaming young children and making them

feel less worthy than others. L.D. 798 is about keeping families healthy. As a family doctor whose practice was weighted toward delivering babies and caring for young families, I had the privilege of discussing the risks and benefits of immunizations with many young parents. If parents were hesitant because of something they had heard or about a reaction their child or a sibling or another family had experienced it was my job to listen carefully, understand their concerns, show them compassion, and give them an explanation based on science, based on my education and training, and based on my past experience, why I believed that each particular immunization we discussed, taking into account each particular child's family history, past history, and present health, should or should not be given the vaccine in question. This was done at every single well child visit. Primary care physicians, advanced practice nurses, and PAs, that is those who practice pediatrics and family medicine, are there first and foremost to prevent illness or injury whenever possible. Public health specialists and primary care providers are truly alarmed by the growing vaccine hesitancy we are witnessing and feel compelled to push back against ever spreading myths and misinformation. Vaccine hesitancy is not occurring just in Maine, not just in the U.S., but is a movement across the world. Those who experience medicine in third world countries that do not have universal immunization programs continue to witness deaths and disabilities from illnesses most of in the states have never seen.

I share with you this email I received from a neighbor and friend, Sam Broaddus, M.D. Sam writes: 'I read today's article in the Portland Press Herald about ending non-medical exemptions for childhood vaccinations in Maine. I couldn't let this opportunity pass without sending you a few comments and my full hearted support of such a bill. As you probably know, I spent considerable time over the past 35 years volunteering my medical services in challenging places like Haiti, Southeast Asia, and Africa where childhood vaccinations were not universal. Sadly, I have personally seen too many newborns and children die of tetanus, measles, chickenpox, and pertussis. One of the most trying surgical experiences of my career was having a 7 year old boy with diphtheria die while another surgeon and I attempted to perform a tracheotomy on him for epiglottitis. I have also seen a 12 year old with polio in rural Thailand on the Laotian border. He presented with paraplegia from the waist down. The story of how Haiti eliminated maternal and neonatal tetanus is a remarkable story of the importance of herd immunity and wholesale vaccinations. Vaccinations work. Period. Full stop. I have seen it up close and personal. As a society, we have become way too complacent about the scourge of deadly and preventable childhood diseases and the importance of immunizations. This is a serious public health issue. Please consider this my full support of such legislation here in Maine.'

L.D. 798 is an attempt in Maine to prevent a pending disaster. No one claims to have all the answers. No one claims the research should stop. We will always look for safer, more effective immunizations, knowing that, just like smallpox, we can eliminate certain infections altogether. But it takes a community caring about not just ourselves but about our neighbors to make this happen. We are truly all in this together. It is time to eliminate non-medical exemptions for school entry and continue to exempt those who cannot be safely immunized for the health and wellbeing of all. Thank you. I appreciate your support for this timely, pro-active, common sense legislation.

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 wish to talk about the importance of listening. It's probably the major thing I've learned. Going to medical school, on the very first day, the Dean stood up there and talked to us and said, 'You must learn to listen. That's going to be more important than any of the major sciences you learn here.' Behind him there was a whole row of Nobel Laurates and very impressive professors. He said, 'Learn to listen.' I think, as a physician, I have taken that to heart and I have certainly listened and I have learned in this particular discussion we've had. I have learned that vaccines have risks and, most assuredly, these are very, very real risks. I also, however, am very aware of the dangers of the diseases that they are used to treat. In my third year of medical school, pediatric rotation, on the wards seeing a young kid die from encephalitis. I decided not to be a pediatrician. I could not be a pediatrician after seeing that, a preventable death. I've seen others which were preventable. Very sad. I worked for a while in Iran and saw a young guy die of diphtheria. People should not die of diphtheria. I was initially hesitant about this bill but I think that the way it has evolved is very good. When I testified for this initially before the Committee I went through the list of 28 different exemptions that I, as a physician, could do. They were very obscure kinds of things that, as an immunologist, I had seen some but I had not seen many of them. Very obscure. This is now wide open. It's simply up to the 'professional judgment', professional judgment of your provider, and there are a wide variety of providers. Professional judgment, that means we are no longer confined in that way. I think the amendment has made an enormous difference and I think that virtually all of the questions I've heard here could have been answered by a provider who listens. I strongly urge you to vote in favor. Thank you.

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

Senator **CHIPMAN:** Thank you, Mr. President. Men and women of the Senate, I rise to explain, I guess, why it's been so difficult for me to arrive at a decision on this bill and I want to be really clear with the members of the public and with my constituents that I am not opposed to vaccines. I'm vaccinated myself. I would urge folks that are able to get vaccines to have vaccines and I have no opposition to vaccines. My concern with the bill has to do with the language in the bill, in particular, with the amendment that was put on it in the Committee. First of all, with the removal of the philosophical and religious exemptions but then broadens, as Senator Gratwick just explained it pretty clearly, it wide open. I think what we're going to see is, obviously, no more religious and philosophical exemptions but I think we'll see a real spike in medical exemptions. I don't think, at the end of the day, we're going to see any measurable increase in vaccinations because of how much we are broadening and opening up that medical exemption. That's one concern. The second concern, which is, I guess, the most important concern for me, is the implementation date. I've heard from a lot of constituents who are really concerned about a public health crisis; how they want something done right now. I had one constituent contact me that said she'd worried about the upcoming tourist season and what are we going to do this year if there's an outbreak in Maine. I don't think the

members of the public understand that this bill will do nothing this year and will do nothing for next year. It pushes out implementation to September of 2021, two and a half years from now. That's a real concern for me because, you know, if we're trying to address a real public health crisis that we feel we could have on our hands this does not address it in that way, with such an implementation date that's pushed out so far. So those are my two concerns. I'm hoping that, and I'm not sure how I'm going to vote on this bill at this point, but I'm hoping that, as the bill goes back and forth between the House and Senate, that it can be improved and it can be made better so it can be more acceptable to the number of constituents I've interacted with who would like to see it made better. Once I point out these things to them they did not know and they want it to be stronger. Thank you.

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

Senator **BELLOWS:** Thank you, Mr. President. Ladies and gentlemen of the Senate, I rise and, like my good colleague from Cumberland, this, for me, is one of the most challenging votes we have yet taken. I have met with literally dozens of people for and against this bill here in the halls of the State House, in livingrooms, and in the office of a local healthcare practitioner. I have heard the stories of vaccine injured children and I completely agree that their traumas are real. For some children in some populations vaccines can cause injury or death and the lack of recourse or redress for those children and their families is breathtaking and I hope this Body will take action to increase the supports and resources for those children and families. At the same time I've heard from constituents for whom this is not a choice. They are immunocompromised and, for them, herd immunity is necessary to their health and to their survival. The recent news that immunization rates in Maine have fallen below the herd immunity level of 95% has been shattering. I've heard since Maine Public reported on this from literally dozens of parents expressing concern that about half of our kindergarten classes in our state fall below the herd immunity threshold. I remember vividly a conversation with a grandfather in tears about the potential consequences for his granddaughter, a survivor of childhood cancer who cannot choose to vaccinate. I've heard from individuals who had polio as children, for whom the consequences were earthshattering and have been life-long. Another constituent, who has one son who could not be vaccinated from pertussis, implored me to consider him. When he was an infant she lived in terror of him contracting pertussis because in infants it is deadly. 'How can we allow polio, smallpox, whooping cough, or measles?' she asked. So this bill is difficult precisely because there are valid arguments on all sides. This is an ethical dilemma. How do we balance personal choice and individual liberty versus the public good and equal protection under the law? There are multiple aspects of the Committee amendment, which is a compromise, as my good colleague from Cumberland has pointed out, that have given me greater comfort in my choice today. Students with IEPs with religious or philosophical exemptions are grandfathered so that those children with IEPs will not be kicked out of school. For me, the delay in implementation until 2021 is important because I met with high school students who said, 'Let me finish my senior year. Let me go on and graduate. Don't kick me out of school in high school at this moment in time.' For me, that is a comfort. I will say that I was also grateful to see that the bill explicitly prohibits

the Department of Health and Human Services from narrowing the scope of the medical exemption and eliminates the rules that were so narrowly constructed that some medical professionals, and I believe this to be true, were not giving exemptions that would have been appropriate. Now, under this bill, medical professionals are given the full authority within their scope of practice to give any exemption that they see fit. Alternative schedules for vaccinations are now permitted under this amendment, and I think that is hugely important because one of the things that I heard over and over again were that parents should have the autonomy to choose the schedule or to work with their physician or their nurse practitioner or physician's assistant to choose a schedule that might work better for their children, that many of the children who are counted as unvaccinated, in fact, have chosen a different schedule. So that piece of the amendment was important to me. Lastly, another piece of the amendment that was very important to me was the piece of the amendment that allows nurse practitioners and physician's assistants to give the exemption. I'd like to see that further broadened in the future, but I think this is an important step. So I know that these compromises will not change the minds of my constituents who are opposed to L.D. 798 and as I speak I have a photo on my desk of a family of kids who are not vaccinated. This is their first day of school. I cast this vote recognizing that these parents fear that they may have to pull their children from our local school. But at the same time I cannot look away from the eyes of the parents whose children are immunocompromised, who've asked, 'What about us? What about the need to protect us?' I quote from one constituent. 'Should I have to question the health of my child while she's at school, where she is supposed to be safe? Should I have to pay for her to go to a school that is safer? Why am I at the doctor's office, crying with the doctor because I fear the safety of my child in a world of modern medicine that is able to eradicate potentially deadly diseases? Why? Please, for the safety of our town, our state, our country, please help push for this law.' Because for them, as long as herd immunity is below 95%, they cannot go to school safely, for them I will vote in favor of this compromise, while imperfect, a step forward. I'll be voting Ought to Pass. Thank you.

THE PRESIDENT: The Chair recognizes the Senator from York, Senator Chenette.

Senator **CHENETTE:** Thank you, Mr. President. Men and women of the Senate, I rise as a proud Rotarian. This past week was World Immunization Week, very timely, which signals a renewed effort to prevent the estimated 2 to 3 million deaths occurring worldwide from a lack of access to vaccines. Two to three million people are dying from vaccine preventable diseases. Closing this immunization gap is literally a matter of life and death. Rotary has been committed to eradicate polio for decades, and even before I was born. Our donations to Rotary International and its foundation has led to a direct reduction in the number of polio cases by 99% to fewer than 400 cases in 2014 and now there are only three countries in which polio transmission has never been stopped. Rotary, in conjunction with the World Health Organization, Unicef, and the U.S. Centers of Disease, Control, and Prevention, and their millions of volunteers and health workers have immunized children in hard to reach communities and established global monitoring structures. Now I cite this background and information because in determining a path forward to address our own issues within our state and

across the country I looked to this positive example of what is possible. It's very easy, I think, in our society to get complacent. My generation, in particular, grew up without having to see the horror of these preventable diseases. It's really easy to have an out of sight, out of mind philosophy. Continued prevention is critical to maintaining our way of life and continues to save lives, particularly our most vulnerable and our next generation.

That being said, the bill before us is not fully complete and I would like to highlight just a few issues of the text of the bill that needs to be fixed in subsequent legislation. In particular, naturopathic doctors are not included in this new expanded list of healthcare professionals that are able to provide a medical exemption. Now I want to make note, I very much appreciate the Committee hearing the concerns of countless families over the difficulties of obtaining a medical exemption, which has caused a number of them to obtain a philosophical exemption. In amending the bill in the committee process to expand this list to give out a medical exemption, but this omission is a glaring mistake and will have unintended consequences. Under this amended version of the bill licensed physicians, nurse practitioners, and physician's assistants would all be able to both administer vaccines and ensure, through their professional judgment, assess whether to provide a medical exemption. This will ensure, if there is a demonstrated medical issue or concerns over particular ingredients, a medical professional can ensure the safety of a child based on science, data, and expertise without restrictive and prescriptive rules previously set into statute, allowing and respecting a doctor-patient relationship as it should be. Now the problem is a whole set of individuals who currently administer vaccines are purposely being excluded from this bill. Naturopathic doctors. Now a few facts: naturopathic doctors are licensed through the State of Maine. It's currently within their scope of practice within their State license, just like their fellow healthcare providers and professionals. So let me get this straight. They are legally and ethically allowed to provide medical care, to administer vaccines, licensed through the State, but not trusted with providing a medical exemption. You do realize this does open up naturopathic doctors to possible lawsuits. Under medical ethics, they are responsible for documenting anything that occurs with a patient, but they are then deemed helpless to help because state law won't allow them. I with the Committee would have addressed this particular issue. Often time naturopathic doctors are the only option for a select few patients. Naturopathic care should be treated no differently under law. Last session we took bold steps to ensure nondiscriminatory policies from health insurance companies when it comes to naturopathic care. Let's not continue the unfair and completely baseless stigma attached to naturopathic care.

Now I know this isn't the biggest issue we're facing in the larger scheme of things and, while it shouldn't necessarily hold up the bill from passage, it does illustrate how this conversation must continue beyond this one proposal of this one idea from just one legislator. I have very much appreciated my conversations with folks wanting to vote on end to increase vaccination rates and on the other from folks concerned about their unique situation with their children. I am extremely disappointed in the level of negative discourse throughout this debate. Questioning the contents and text of a bill should not immediately be labeled into a category where societal judgment is deafening. Last time I checked, we should be able to think critically for ourselves without being bullied into silence. As a legislator, I have to do my due diligence and my homework, and that includes going line-by-line

through each bill, reading and comprehending to determine if the proposal before us the best possible solution at this particular time and has it been thoroughly flushed out. We should be open to hearing feedback, suggestions, and concerns. That's what makes our country different than others, because we are free to express our thoughts. It makes us stronger. No one should be demonizing individuals for simply having a unique set of circumstances. It's called having mutual respect for your fellow human beings. In the same vein, it is also clear that we, as a society, are failing to properly educate our population around the importance and lifesaving nature of vaccinations. Through misinformation campaigns, online or otherwise, people have been misled to vaccine hesitancy, government distrust, and pharmaceutical skepticism. No one bill is going to address those root issues and this bill surely doesn't. I believe a strong public education campaign should have been part of this bill, but I do think it's still possible to achieve. Even if this bill passes, full implementation would not be for another 2 1/2 years. What are we going to be doing about the issue in the interim? Why not tackle some of these root issues by raising awareness, providing facts, data, and clear rationales why vaccinating our youth is critical to supporting a public health infrastructure that saves lives and prevents disease.

Now I will be supporting the bill before us because this is the proposal that is before us and the only bill that is before us to address the issue of lowering vaccination rates to prevent potential outbreaks and increase herd immunity. Protecting the public should be the top responsibility of government. If we can't manage that simple act than what are we doing here, Mr. President? But moving forward, beyond this one proposal and in the immediate, we should still tackle a public education campaign, bring stakeholders together to determine other potential solutions and best practices from other states, and close a very glaring loophole to ensure patients of naturopathic care aren't unduly discriminated against from obtaining a medical exemption. So to recap, as a member of an organization that is trying our very best to eradicate preventable disease around the globe, I will be supporting the bill, but more work is needed and further clarifications are needed to address the realities of what is actually happening in our communities. I commit myself, Mr. President, to be part of that solution. Thank you for your time and everyone's patience and understanding and, in particular, respect on this critically important topic and debate.

THE PRESIDENT: The Chair recognizes the Senator from Knox, Senator Miramant.

Senator **MIRAMANT:** Thank you, Mr. President. Men and women of the Senate, in words of a former colleague, I rise to speak briefly. The issue was brought up about these letters that we are getting from all around saying that we would be on a path to allowing something horrible, towards hurting our children. What we've had with the present exemptions, religious, philosophical, and medical, as narrow as it is, is a steady increase to about 95%, sometimes 94. I'm not sure where we are or if we can quantify it. We're not talking about we're at 50 and going backwards. We're not talking about some horror that's around the corner. We're also calling that 95% or 94% those who adhere to the schedule that is very inflexible. So you have just talked about the new medical exemption that will take anyone who gets it out of the schedule that is how the percentage of vaccinated folks is quantified. So immediately, when people are using the new

medical exemption, that was well thought out and should be a part of all three pieces of that tripod, our exemption rate will allow that percentage of vaccinated to be considered less than or the same number even if more people are vaccinated. We're saying that this vaccination rate will keep these children healthy on a better schedule. We're also saying that that will allow them to go to school and be part of the population, even though in the rest of the country's eyes, because they use that other measure for percentage, these are unvaccinated children. Well, they're not. They've received immunity from breastfeeding from their mother. They received it from getting certain vaccines, whether as multiples or individually. Their immune systems are strong because they build their health in many ways. So the numbers are going to be skewed by what we're doing, but we're always, and with this exemption in place, for years worked our way up to this formally wonderful number of 95%, plus or minus a percentage. What number doesn't have a plus or minus percent? So that's where we are. We're in a good place and we allow all our people to have a good choice for how to protect their children and we should continue to allow that. Thank you.

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

Senator **CYRWAY:** Thank you, Mr. President. Ladies and gentlemen of the Senate, I rise to just take a moment and think about this. I heard a very strong argument at the very beginning of this from our Senator who experienced tragedy. I feel that we have to look at we're looking at trusting what the professional judgment is of doctors, which they do a tremendous job. But many of us have probably experienced at one time or another misdiagnosis or maybe there was a mistake made, and those things do happen. In fact, I can remember going to a school and rescue came because of using a flu virus vaccine where a teacher's tongue swelled up and had a serious reaction and couldn't breathe. She was taken off and then over the intercom they said does anybody else want a flu vaccine. Everybody says nope. I'm not going. Another situation happened where, just recently, we had a shingles vaccine, which was a dead virus before, and then they changed over to a live virus, and then there was a serious reaction. They had to take it off the shelves. So mistakes do happen and we don't hear about those figures of how it has affected our people. So here we are forcing everybody to have the vaccine when these mistakes do happen and we're talking about people's choices. I think we've done a tremendous job in the past and I think that we're really reaching to force somebody to do something when we don't really have to. I think it was touched up about education and I think that doctors do a great job. In fact, we heard from one of our Senators, that is a doctor, about educating and his first class about listening. That's what we should be doing, listening to our doctors when we have a baby or when we have a child and what they recommend, and to make our choices wise choices. So why should we put this burden onto everyone and mandate it? I don't understand that and I think I just wanted to take the time and bring that forward and thank you, Mr. President, for listening.

THE PRESIDENT: The pending question before the Senate is Acceptance of the Majority Ought to Pass as Amended Report. Is the Senate ready for the question?

The Doorkeepers secured the Chamber.

The Secretary opened the vote.

ROLL CALL (#79)

YEAS: Senators: BELLOWS, BREEN, CARPENTER, CARSON, CHENETTE, CHIPMAN, CLAXTON, DESCHAMBAULT, DIAMOND, DILL, GRATWICK, HERBIG, LAWRENCE, LIBBY, LUCHINI, MILLETT, SANBORN H, SANBORN L, VITELLI, PRESIDENT JACKSON

NAYS: Senators: BLACK, CYRWAY, DAVIS, DOW, FARRIN, FOLEY, GUERIN, HAMPER, KEIM, MIRAMANT, MOORE, POULIOT, ROSEN, TIMBERLAKE, WOODSOME

20 Senators having voted in the affirmative and 15 Senators having voted in the negative, the motion by Senator **MILLETT** of Cumberland to **ACCEPT** the Majority **OUGHT TO PASS AS AMENDED** Report, in concurrence, **PREVAILED**.

Bill **READ ONCE**.

Committee Amendment "A" (H-120) **READ**.

On motion by Senator **MIRAMANT** of Knox, Senate Amendment "A" (S-66) to Committee Amendment "A" (H-120) **READ**.

THE PRESIDENT: The Chair recognizes the Senator from Knox, Senator Miramant.

Senator **MIRAMANT:** Thank you, Mr. President. Men and women of the Senate, as I alluded to during our discussion, there are folks who have strong religious beliefs regarding this, regarding what is injected into their children, into themselves. We don't have a religious litmus test in this country. Our acceptance of religious ideas is broad and it allows the individual to decide what those beliefs are, whether in concert with their broader religion or not. I've had contacts from folks regarding this and I know it will be said that there wasn't a lot of mention of that. There were a couple of things that folks were told to stay with when they testified about this bill and it was about the choice and the adverse reaction. So religion wasn't brought up a lot because it was assumed that that was going to be protected throughout the process. Now that we're at this posture, where the religious exemption has been removed, we need to be talking about that. We need to not take away an area where people are used to having that latitude to make peace with what they are dealing with their religious beliefs, of their understanding of God. If we start looking at each belief and how that relationship to God is made in that religion, we would all say, 'Well this one does it this way. This does it this way.' The one thing that's for sure, if you have a strong religious belief this country has accepted that and we need to continue to allow that acceptance in all areas, especially where there's no proof that this is causing harm to our state. So don't let our state be one of only three, right now, that is denying religious exemptions. They're not finding that to be the tenants of our country, of our constitution, and of the exercise of religious freedom in a country that stands for freedom to exercise beliefs. Thank you very much, Mr. President.

Senator **LIBBY** of Androscoggin moved to **INDEFINITELY POSTPONE** Senate Amendment "A" (S-66) to Committee Amendment "A" (H-120).

On motion by Senator **TIMBERLAKE** 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 Cumberland, Senator Millett.

Senator **MILLETT:** Thank you, Mr. President. I rise in support of the pending motion. We need to be very clear that the bill that was before the Committee removed both the philosophical and religious exemptions. There was no doubt or question about it. People knew what was in front of them, what was being proposed. There was no confusion. One thousand, six hundred and fifty-eight pieces of testimony. Thirteen hours of public testimony. From that, two pieces of testimony addressing the religious exemption. I want to say this again.

THE PRESIDENT: Senator Millett.

Senator **MILLETT:** That's not in order. I apologize.

THE PRESIDENT: Your testimony is not out of order but using props is out of order.

Senator **MILLETT:** I apologize. Okay, two pieces of testimony out of 1,658 testimonies presented to the Education Committee, out of 13 hours of testimony, two brought up the issue of religion. We also received testimony from the Christian Civic League. 'Christian Civic League of Maine is not against vaccinations.' Testimony from the Roman Catholic Diocese of Portland, advocates for enacting and enforcing laws that create safe communities and promote the common good. The Committee was in receipt of no testimony in opposition to this legislation from any religious leader, church. Vermont recently moved to religious exemptions. They went from 0.9% to 3.7% using the exemption of religion in one year. Now Vermont is considering legislation to remove that religious exemption as a result. I will conclude by saying with all of this that we received in the Education Committee it is clear to me that this amendment that is now being indefinitely postponed is a Trojan Horse. It's just another way for those seeking to use non-medical reasons for not having vaccinations and they will use this religious exemption. This is happening across the country. There are websites on the internet providing advice to those who want to get exemptions through the religious exemption. One website explains, 'How to get a religious exemption like a boss.' Coaching people on the use of convincing religious rhetoric. The author warns not to delve into their actual objections, those unrelated to religious beliefs, 'Any time you find yourself talking about anything other than your religious beliefs, start over. No talking about the effects of toxins. You're argument needs to be religion-based.' Please, I hope you will support the motion in front of us.

THE PRESIDENT: The Chair recognizes the Senator from Knox, Senator Miramant.

Senator **MIRAMANT**: Thank you, Mr. President. I have tried to stay, men and women of the Senate, away from impugning anyone. I want to keep with that. There will always be, in all of our actions, some bad actors who try to use something that's in place for those who really practice something. Someone will try to take advantage of that. We find that in Health and Human Services, where we're always trying to help people in need and then there's someone who will take advantage of that practice of helping. So you can always point to an example of where something is being used improperly, but that's not what we're talking about here. We have separate groups. The only other thing, because the prop was used, it turns out that our website is not completely accurate for what's going on. Folks brought their testimony and it was put into the record by the clerks and they used either email or the new system to put it in electronically. So, in most cases, if you open the testimony for the event, for the bill, you'll see that, while there are 1,600 pieces, each person's testimony is duplicated in its entry into our system. Of that whatever number it turns out to be 60% were against this bill. That's how they were speaking. They were saying, 'Don't pass this bill. We need our religious exemption. We need our philosophical exemption. We need a better medical exemption but we hate to have you take these others that are important away to get the better medical exemption because that's just like kicking two legs out from under the tripod.' So they focused on that, 60% of the people who came to testify of 800 pieces of testimony, approximately. Thank you, Mr. President.

THE PRESIDENT: The Chair recognizes the Senator from Androscoggin, Senator Timberlake.

Senator **TIMBERLAKE**: Thank you, Mr. President. Ladies and gentlemen of the Senate, I'd like to say a couple of words. The Christian Civic League of Maine in their testimony stated, 'We're not against vaccination.' I, personally, am not against vaccination. It's easy to document that they have helped humanity. They are against this legislation in part because the ambiguity and the broadness of the language. 'We are certainly against this legislation as clearly it seeks to remove religious rights and sincerely held philosophical rights of the people of Maine. These are the rights that did not come from the State of Maine and the State of Maine has no right to take them away. To take even one of these rights would be a far overreach by the State but to seek both in one bill is incredible.' That's in the Christian Civic League's testimony. I would also like to go on to state that Carroll Conley called me on Friday night after the vote and was very strong with me about where they stood and what they stood for and what the religious beliefs were. They are against this. I called my pastor, Pastor Christner. I called Pastor Jones from the Lisbon Baptist Church and the Calvary Baptist Church. Both of them said they could live with the religious exemption because it gave them the right to have the conversation with their parishioners and it gave people the right. We have to keep this here. This is people's rights. We're telling people what they've got to inject in their bodies and what's not. I can't even believe we're having the conversation to begin with. So please follow my light for this vote. I can't believe we're here.

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

Senator **H. SANBORN**: Thank you, Mr. President. I just wanted to read a couple of excerpts from a New York Times article that appeared this weekend. The headline was Religious Objections to the Measles Vaccine? 'Get the shots, faith leader say.' Vaccination is endorsed by top Jewish and Islamic scholars, by the Vatican. Religious authorities have meticulously studied how vaccines are made and what is in them and have still ruled that they do not violate Jewish, Islamic, or Catholic law. Mormons, Episcopalians, Lutherans, and most other Christian denominations endorse vaccines, require them in their own schools, and distribute them at their missionary hospitals. Among Buddhists, the Dalai Lama has personally given polio vaccines to children to further the world polio eradication drive. Mr. President, respectfully I would say that what we're talking about right now is not whether there are, in fact, religions or religious people in the state of Maine who need to claim a religious exemption in order to adhere to their faith and to their belief in a Higher Power. Instead we heard, over and over, the parents are worried. They're scared. They know that their child might have genetic markers that make them particularly vulnerable, or that they may have had an adverse reaction at the first shot, or that, really sadly, one of their siblings may have had an adverse reaction. Those parents seek medical advice as to what to do: whether they should adhere to the schedule, whether they should seek an exemption all together from a particular vaccine in order to keep their children safe. That is an appropriate conversation for a provider to have with a family about what the medical science says as it relates to a particular family, particular individual immunology, genetic markers, adverse reactions. As one of my colleagues said, a one size fits all approach is not required and should not be required. That is about the medical exemption and this bill, the amendment that we just adopted previously, expands the medical exemption to allow for our health practitioners to exercise their professional judgment in consulting with their patients. That is what the solution is here. To reintroduce the religious exemption, as this amendment would seek to do, is simply to move the solution to the wrong box. Right now people check a philosophical exemption box. When that goes away they will need to talk to their providers and they will need to ensure that there's good medical reasons for exemptions for that vaccine, and we'll leave that to the discretion of our medical providers in their professional judgment. I urge you to vote in favor of the current motion to Indefinitely Postpone.

THE PRESIDENT: The Chair recognizes the Senator from Oxford, Senator Keim.

Senator **KEIM**: Thank you, Mr. President. I wasn't intending to speak on this bill but I do find that some of the comments are insulting to the people of Maine, insinuating that they will now lie about their religious beliefs. I think if we do not include this exemption Maine is a complete outlier in all of the United States and that it is important that we always respect people's religious beliefs in every matter and that we don't decide that, because we think one is more important than the other, we choose to take away religious exemptions. Thank you, Mr. President.

THE PRESIDENT: The pending question before the Senate is Indefinite Postponement of Senate Amendment "A" (S-66) to Committee Amendment "A" (H-120). Is the Senate ready for the question?

The Doorkeepers secured the Chamber.

The Secretary opened the vote.

ROLL CALL (#80)

YEAS: Senators: BELLOWS, BREEN, CARPENTER, CARSON, CHENETTE, CHIPMAN, CLAXTON, DESCHAMBAULT, DIAMOND, GRATWICK, LAWRENCE, LIBBY, MILLETT, SANBORN H, SANBORN L, VITELLI, PRESIDENT JACKSON

NAYS: Senators: BLACK, CYRWAY, DAVIS, DILL, DOW, FARRIN, FOLEY, GUERIN, HAMPER, HERBIG, KEIM, LUCHINI, MIRAMANT, MOORE, POULIOT, ROSEN, TIMBERLAKE, WOODSOME

17 Senators having voted in the affirmative and 18 Senators having voted in the negative, the motion by Senator **LIBBY** of Androscoggin to **INDEFINITELY POSTPONE** Senate Amendment "A" (S-66) to Committee Amendment "A" (H-120) **FAILED**.

On motion by Senator **MIRAMANT** of Knox, Senate Amendment "A" (S-66) to Committee Amendment "A" (H-120) **ADOPTED**.

Committee Amendment "A" (H-120) as Amended by Senate Amendment "A" (S-66) thereto, **ADOPTED**, in **NON-CONCURRENCE**.

Under suspension of the Rules, **READ A SECOND TIME** and **PASSED TO BE ENGROSSED AS AMENDED BY COMMITTEE AMENDMENT "A" (H-120) AS AMENDED BY SENATE AMENDMENT "A" (S-66)** thereto, in **NON-CONCURRENCE**.

Sent down for concurrence.

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

Off Record Remarks

On motion by Senator **LIBBY** of Androscoggin, **ADJOURNED**, pursuant to the Joint Order, until Tuesday, May 7, 2019 at 10:00 in the morning.