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 scanned originals with text recognition applied

(searchable text may contain some errors and/or omissions)

Legislative Record

House of Representatives

One Hundred and Thirty-First Legislature

State of Maine

Daily Edition

Second Regular Session

Beginning January 3, 2024

Beginning with Page H-1190

Madam Speaker, we have an opportunity to do something here today by voting this down. Thank you, Madam Speaker.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the Representative from Albion, Representative Cyrway.

Representative **CYRWAY**: Thank you, Madam Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Growing up on our farm, we always used, you know, on gardening; in fact, I raised tomatoes when I was a kid, I had a hundred tomato plants and my brother had an acre of string beans, and we hired our own teenagers from school and they came and they picked so much and they'd get weighed and they'd get so much for the weight. And they all enjoyed it and they all kind of had fun, they did competition. In fact, I can remember one guy, he was a little bit of a wise guy and he put some rocks in the bottom of the string bean basket just to make fun for my brother, you know, because he was in competition with me against the string beans and the tomatoes. So, but this would take and eliminate that fun. And also, you know, my daughters, my granddaughters; many people in the community have their kids go from the high school and pick strawberries, you know, right after school. It worked out so well for them, they could just not even have to make an application, they could just go to work and make some extra money, and quick money if they worked hard. This takes that incentive away.

I really think that you should think strong and hard, because the farming is a little different than your union workers or your mill workers or fabrications and stuff. I know my Mom, actually, she talks very much about piecework at the Hathaway, and they would do shirts. And I'll tell you, I loved those Hathaway shirts. They were beautifully done and you could do piecework, you could go anytime you wanted to; oh, Madam Speaker, I'll talk to you. But they do piecework and I loved those Hathaway shirts, they have the buttons and they were really a well-made material and they would inspect them and the quality that came out of there was just terrific and everybody had pride. I knew the manager, Everett Hunter, he managed Hathaway and he told me about all the stories that these people would come and they'd be able to make some money, go home, take care of their kids and come and go as they pleased and did the piecework and it really worked out well for them. It wasn't an hourly wage, it was a way to make money. And the same thing with our kids in our communities. This is taking that away from them.

I just don't understand. I wish I could understand why somebody would do that to our kids. It's their future. Some of them become farmers themselves because they enjoyed it so much. And, you know, I just can't say enough about how piecework really does play a big part and a big role for our teenagers to grow up and become good workers, good citizens, and to actually know how to earn a little extra money for either their cars or maybe something that they want to raise money for college or whatever, but why take that away? As it was, we didn't have permits, now they've got permits you have to apply for if you want to get a job and a lot of them won't even take the time to go get a permit, so, they don't get a job. On the farms, they don't need that permit during the summer. So, it really does help them in that way, too.

So, all we're asking is this is the time when we could really make a difference, have this thought out a little bit more, not take it away from the farmers. We're hurting, the farmers are hurting; they were out here yesterday, they were going to bring a cow over here because of a program. So, they really need some support from our legislators and this is the time to do it. That's all we're asking, Speaker. Thank you.

The SPEAKER: A roll call has been ordered. The pending question before the House is Passage to be Enacted. All those in favor will vote yes, those opposed will vote no.

ROLL CALL NO. 493

YEA - Abdi, Ankeles, Arford, Beck, Bell, Brennan, Bridgeo, Cloutier, Cluchey, Collings, Copeland, Crafts, Craven, Crockett, Dhalac, Dodge, Doudera, Eaton, Fay, Gattine, Geiger, Gere, Golek, Graham, Gramlich, Hasenfus, Hepler, Hobbs, Kessler, Kuhn, Lajoie, LaRochelle, Lee, Lookner, Madigan, Malon, Mastraccio, Mathieson, Matlack, Meyer, Millett R, Milliken, Montell, Moonen, Moriarty, Murphy, O'Connell, O'Neil, Osher, Perry J, Pluecker, Pringle, Rana, Rielly, Riseman, Roberts, Roeder, Runte, Russell, Sachs, Salisbury, Sargent, Sayre, Shagoury, Shaw, Sheehan, Sinclair, Skold, Stover, Supica, Terry, Warren, White B, Worth, Zager, Zeigler, Madam Speaker.

NAY - Adams, Albert, Andrews, Arata, Ardell, Babin, Bagshaw, Blier, Boyer, Bradstreet, Campbell, Carlow, Carmichael, Collamore, Costain, Cray, Cyrway, Davis, Dill, Drinkwater, Ducharme, Dunphy, Faulkingham, Foster, Fredericks, Galletta, Gifford, Greenwood, Griffin, Guerrette, Haggan, Hall, Henderson, Hymes, Jackson, Javner, Landry, Lavigne, Lemelin, Libby, Lyman, Mason, Millett H, Morris, Ness, Newman, Nutting, Parry, Paul, Perkins, Perry A, Poirier, Polewarczyk, Pomerleau, Quint, Rudnicki, Sampson, Schmersal-Burgess, Simmons, Smith, Soboleski, Strout, Swallow, Theriault, Thorne, Underwood, Walker, White J, Wood, Woodsome.

ABSENT - Boyle, Jauch, Lanigan.

Yes, 77; No, 70; Absent, 3; Vacant, 1; Excused, 0.

77 having voted in the affirmative and 70 voted in the negative, 1 vacancy with 3 being absent, and accordingly the Bill was **PASSED TO BE ENACTED**, signed by the Speaker and sent to the Senate.

By unanimous consent, all matters having been acted upon were **ORDERED SENT FORTHWITH** with the exception of matters being held.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEE
Divided Report

Majority Report of the Committee on **HEALTH COVERAGE, INSURANCE AND FINANCIAL SERVICES** reporting **Ought to Pass as Amended by Committee Amendment "A" (H-953)** on Bill "An Act Regarding Health Care in the State"

(H.P. 148) (L.D. 227)

Signed:

Senators:

BAILEY of York
RENY of Lincoln

Representatives:

PERRY of Calais
ARFORD of Brunswick
CLUCHEY of Bowdoinham
MASTRACCIO of Sanford
MATHIESON of Kittery
PRINGLE of Windham

Minority Report of the same Committee reporting **Ought Not to Pass** on same Bill.

Signed:

Senator:

BRAKEY of Androscoggin

Representatives:

CYRWAY of Albion
MORRIS of Turner
NUTTING of Oakland
SWALLOW of Houlton

READ.

Representative PERRY of Calais moved that the House **ACCEPT** the Majority **Ought to Pass as Amended** Report.

Representative MORRIS of Turner **REQUESTED** a roll call on the motion to **ACCEPT** the Majority **Ought to Pass as Amended** Report.

More than one-fifth of the members present expressed a desire for a roll call which was ordered.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the Representative from Turner, Representative Morris.

Representative **MORRIS**: Thank you, Madam Speaker. I rise in opposition to this bill and to the pending motion. It should be noted that this bill was printed as a concept draft in January 2023. Yet, less than a week before the public hearing, a 21-page amendment was dropped, without proper time for people to understand and fully comprehend this bill. Indeed, the amendment did not become available on the public website until 1:00 this afternoon. This is not the way that government should be done. Despite the late notice and the lateness of the language, hundreds of Mainers showed up to voice their strong opposition to this bill. The testimony was 10:1 in opposition to this bill. And why shouldn't it be? The problems are numerous with this legislation.

For starters, why are we declaring abortion and gender treatments a legal right in this State? That seems odd to me. Particularly since it wasn't that long ago, during COVID, that people were not able to access services like cancer screenings and dental visits; those were considered to be nonessential and were urged to delay those procedures. Yet, we're going to declare these two things a legal right in Maine moving forward.

Some of the biggest concerns with this bill lies with its constitutionality. The Constitution guarantees full faith and credit across the United States. It requires our law enforcement to cooperate in other states' investigations. It is no exaggeration that if the provisions of this bill would take effect, it would make it easier for traffickers to find safe haven here in Maine. It's no wonder that Maine's sheriffs, the Maine Sheriffs Association and 16 State Attorneys General have opposed this bill. It would make it harder for our law enforcement to find cooperation from other states. Indeed, during the public hearing, I asked Planned Parenthood about what their guardrails are to ensure that only custodial parents are the ones that bring a minor here for care. Despite a long soliloquy from them about all the things that they offer, I did not receive an answer. They promised they would bring one to the work session. To this day, I do not have an answer from Planned Parenthood about how they ensure that only the custodial parent and what guardrails they use to ensure that only custodial parents are the ones bringing their kids here for these types of care.

This bill also creates issues with as it relates to gender services. It recognizes the World Professional Association for Transgender Health as the standard of care, also known as WPATH. I would encourage this Body to Google WPATH and Google the WPATH files. What they will reveal is doctors performing experimental treatments on minors, on people that have schizophrenia, people who cannot consent to the procedures in this. Perhaps in part because of these revelations about WPATH, the United Kingdom has suspended gender treatments for minors, and this follows the lead of Finland and France and other European countries. In European countries, they are going in the other direction when it comes to these types of treatments for minors. Due to this bill's restrictions on what it calls hostile litigation, the question; it is a legitimate question to ask; could a patient not sue a doctor if they were following the standard of care that is laid out by WPATH? If a person feels that they were mistreated by a doctor and that doctor claimed that they were following these standards of care, could that patient sue the provider? Under the language of this bill, I would say it would be very difficult.

Indeed, during the public hearing, I actually asked the young man about his experience that testified in opposition to this bill, and I asked him about his experiences as now a de-transitioner. He was 26 years old, he said he tried to transition when he was 21 and figured out that wasn't right, he said he felt fortunate to not have done permanent damage. When I asked him, what does he wish the doctors had known about him at that time and how does he wish that they had handled his care, he said that he wished that they had recognized that he was in a mental health crisis and that this was a mental health issue. He furthermore, before leaving the podium, said these type of procedures should be illegal.

Another part of this bill that's very objectionable and problematic is the prohibiting of malpractice insurance from rating based on performing these two procedures. As I mentioned on a bill last year, one need look only at the case of Shannon Carr and the State of New Mexico, who is under investigation for her treatment of a patient in that state that was seeking abortion, which this bill would create as a legally protected right. Yet, this bill would guarantee someone in that position would be guaranteed malpractice insurance, and furthermore, they could not rate someone on that basis. Cost of malpractice insurance is one of the things that drives the cost of health care.

I have only scratched the surface of the problems with this bill. Particularly, the issues with the process, it is constitutionally questionable, the strong opposition from law enforcement and the restrictions it places upon them, the authority it gives to a group like WPATH, that I think should give us all great pause and concern, that it will raise the costs of health care with its questionable way it's treating malpractice insurance, as well as it is not stated how it will be paid for. I'm sure there will be more from my colleagues that will get more in depth in some of these issues, but I urge this Body to reject this motion. Thank you.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the Representative from Calais, Representative Perry.

Representative **PERRY**: Thank you, Madam Speaker. I want to talk a little bit about what this bill does do. For one thing, right now in the State of Maine, gender-affirming care and abortion are legal in this State. What this bill intends to do is to shield; and that's why it's called a shield bill; the providers who provide this care while in the State of Maine are protected from another state coming in to enforce their laws on this State. It is a sovereignty issue. It also clarifies access to health care and gender-affirming care as a legally protected health care process.

In terms of malpractice, malpractice means you have to work within the guidelines of your profession, you have to work within your own skills. There is nothing that prevents that from happening. It protects Maine's patients' medical records. That they're the only ones that can sign for their medical records, and not an AG from another state, especially if it's for legal care. It also ensures that resources are not used to further --

The SPEAKER: The Member will defer. The Chair is going to inform Members that if they'd like to have conversations in which we can overhear them as opposed to the Member speaking on the microphone, they will be removed from the Chamber. Please keep your conversations limited. If you have to have a conversation, respectfully have it outside of this Chamber. The Member may proceed.

Representative **PERRY**: Thank you. Another thing it does, it's not just providers, it also protects the staff that work with those providers as well. It aims to mitigate the risk of out-of-state law enforcement against reproductive health care and gender-affirming health care providers.

One thing that we did do as an amendment to this bill was to make some changes that we had gone to sheriffs to ask about that they had agreed with, and we put that in the bill. We have made other amendments that people have asked for, and we did hear from the people that were at the hearing, to make some changes and to define what this isn't. It isn't about trafficking. Trafficking is illegal, I don't care where you live. And I hope we find this in Maine. We've talked about this a lot. Kidnapping is illegal no matter where you live. If something illegal happens, law enforcement should have full course to act. This is only about what is legal in this State and it's for those providers who work to provide excellent health care for what the patient is asking for.

And I will say that protection also offers the fact that the provider has an opportunity to; and I lost my place on the thing; for the protection for their address being advertised out, that they have that protection as well, a privacy protection. And again, this is to protect those who are providing legal services only in this State. Thank you.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the Representative from Windham, Representative Bagshaw.

Representative **BAGSHAW**: Thank you, Madam Speaker. I rise in opposition to this bill. As I was looking at the bill, there was a lot of legalese and I was like, huh, so, I was reading it over and over again, and then I received a letter from my constituent and I would like to read that letter.

"LD 227; it ain't what it ain't. The removal of out-of-state children from their out-of-state parents and hiding them until gender affirmation or underage abortion happens here in Maine is called legally protected health care activity, a promotional sanctuary-ism. The bill, LD 227 and its strained list of definitions, attempt to redefine health care in a narrow segment of legal wordsmithing. In several paragraphs, 'abortion' is edited out in favor of the more generic 'legally protected health care activity.' This document lays out a plan to attract abortion seekers from jurisdictions outside of Maine and hinder law enforcement from reacting or responding to any legal claim or opposition, period. It makes Maine a super-Legislature above other states by creating sanctuary access to otherwise prohibited practices. In effect, legislating away the laws of the country and legally disenfranchising the sovereignty of anyone who disagrees. Does this seem like a workaround of the Supreme Court decision that gave Maine discretion to develop its own abortion laws? Having already done that, Maine does not need to become the abortion or transgender health care oasis for other states. The wording in LD 227 is similar in spirit to the masked 'reproductive autonomy' wording that overwrote the process of abortion in prior legislative enshrinement efforts by our Chief Executive. In LD 227, even 'reproductive health care' was stricken in favor of the new wording, 'legally protected health care activity.' The authors are so sensitive to the offending labels that their replacement becomes flattened, all-inclusive language, legally protected health care activity, example, ethnic cleansing. The sense I get from reading LD 227 is that there is no room for opposition, definition, discussion, opinion or disapproval. The fix is in for masked health care activities and Maine becomes the designated epicenter for abortion and aborted genders. Don't bother calling the cops. LD 227 is an energy-consuming effort to rewrite existing law. It should be aborted. Legally protected health care activity is legally protected. The law to enshrine this legally protected activity is redundant and redundancy and should be blocked for that alone. Vote no on LD 227."

And like I said, that is from one of my constituents, those are his words, not mine. Thank you.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the Representative from Palermo, Representative Smith.

Representative **SMITH**: Thank you, Madam Speaker. Madam Speaker and Members of the House, I implore you to vote no on LD 227.

Today, I want to focus on the most serious problem of this bill, a problem that should not be overlooked if we are looking at this bill to truly test if this bill is right for Maine. The serious problem is that this bill is based on the medical expertise of the World Professional Association for Transgender Health, or WPATH. WPATH is a disgraced and compromised group of medical providers that has heavily relied upon intimidation, lies and misinformation to keep their offices filled with patients and their pockets lined with money. On March 4th of this year, files were leaked from within the organization that reveal that the clinicians who shape how gender medicine is regulated and practiced around the world consistently violate medical ethics and informed consent.

I draw your attention to Section 9002, number four, of the bill. "'Gender-affirming health care services' means all supplies, care and services of a medical, behavioral health, mental health, surgical, psychiatric, therapeutic, diagnostic, preventative, rehabilitative or supportive nature, including medication, relating to the treatment of gender dysphoria and gender incongruence in accordance with the accepted standard of care as defined by major medical professional organizations and agencies with expertise in the field of gender-affirming care, including in the Standards of Care for the Health of Transgender and Gender Diverse People, Version 8, … published by the World Professional Association for Transgender Health." The bill states clearly that it is relying on the standards published by WPATH.

The WPATH files that were leaked contain the following information, proof that WPATH is conducting an unregulated experiment on some of the most vulnerable people in society, that its members are violating the ethical and legal requirement of obtaining informed consent, that members are aware that cross-sex hormones have debilitating and potentially fatal side effects. That WPATH members know that puberty blockers are experimental and have adverse consequences. That young patients do not understand the physical effects of sex trait modification interventions and therefore, cannot give cognitive consent, and that patients with severe mental health issues are being allowed to consent to invasive life-altering medical interventions without any attempt to first address their mental distress.

The following are quotes from the WPATH files. Now, keep in mind, these are legitimate quotes. WPATH themselves have not come out and said that any of these quoted are lies, that they are true quotes from their medical providers. Concerning whether it is reasonable to expect children and young adolescents to grasp the effects of gender-affirm care, Dianne Berg, child psychologist and co-author of the child

chapter of the WPATH Standards of Care; again, what was put in this bill as the medical professional. She says it is "out of their developmental range to understand the extent to which some of these medical interventions are impacting them." They'll say they understand, but then they'll say something else that makes you think, oh, they don't really understand they're going to have facial hair. Dr. Daniel Metzger, a Canadian endocrinologist says "most of the kids are nowhere in any kind of a brain space to really talk about [fertility preservation] in a serious way." It's always a good theory that you talk about fertility preservation with a 14-year-old, but I know I'm talking to a blank wall. He also states some of the Dutch researchers gave some data about young adults who had transitions and had reproductive regret, like regret, and it's there, and I don't think any of that surprises us. In reply to a nurse practitioner who is struggling with how to handle a patient with PTSD, major depressive disorder, observed disassociations and schizoid typical traits who wishes to go on hormone therapy, Dr. Dan Karasic, lead author of the WPATH Standards of Care, writes, "I'm missing why you are perplexed. The mere presence of psychiatric illness should not block a person's ability to start hormones if they have persistent gender dysphoria. Capacity to consent and the benefits of starting hormones outweigh the risks. So, why the internal struggle as the right thing to do?" And lastly, Dr. Christine McGinn reported performing about 20 vaginoplasties on patients under 18 over a 17-year period and confessed that not all, but some, most have perfect outcomes.

Do we understand that, based on the lack of truth within the standards of care provided by this organization, we are looking at passing a bill that is based on lies and hidden facts and abuse of children and patients? Even though I have heard that it has been said that those opposed to this information are spreading lies, this information can be verified and viewed by each and every one of us. Again, I reiterate that WPATH has not denied any of these quotes from their doctors, who know about regrets, problems with surgeries and overlooking mental health disorders. This bill will allow doctors to mutilate beautiful bodies, completely throw a child's fertility away, and hide and ignore true mental health issues and struggles based on the lies of a sham organization. We will be on the wrong side of history if we pass this bill. We must vote no on LD 227. It's not right for Maine and it's not right for the country. Thank you, Madam Speaker.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the Representative from Bowdoinham, Representative Cluchey.

Representative **CLUCHEY**: Thank you, Madam Speaker. Madam Speaker, Colleagues of the House, if I told you Maine could be stripped of its right to self-determination regarding our State's public policies, would it concern you? If I told you that officials in other states want to reach into Maine and punish Maine citizens for providing care and services that are legal in Maine, would you want to give them that right?

Unfortunately, these things are not hypothetical. Some states are actively working to punish health care providers offering safe, legal care in other states. Just this past January, the Texas Attorney General subpoenaed providers in Washington State and Georgia to produce private medical records for Texas patients. For Maine, this poses a significant threat to our self-determination, our freedoms, our privacy and our individual liberties. This is what 227 would address, and that is why this law is needed. It would protect Maine clinicians so that they can do their job. It would make sure that they feel safe training here and staying here. It would help ensure medical students don't decline opportunities here and clinicians don't leave the State.

There has been a lot of misinformation about this bill and a lot of fearmongering, perhaps more than I have ever seen on any bill this session. I serve on this Committee that heard this bill, and so, I am very familiar with what it does and does not do. Importantly, this bill changes absolutely nothing about to whom reproductive health care or gender-affirming health care is delivered in Maine. It also changes nothing about how reproductive health care or gender-affirming health care is delivered in Maine. It changes nothing about the ability to prosecute crimes in this State, and it has been amended to address the questions raised by the Maine police chiefs and the Maine Sheriffs' Association regarding Section 9006 of this bill.

What LD 227 actually does is protect Maine health care providers from being sued by other states for providing care that is already legal here. Seventeen states have passed very similar shield laws for reproductive health care and 11 have passed shield laws for gender-affirming care. We owe it to our constituents to protect Maine's health care infrastructure, our providers and legal health care access. Our constituents' lives depend on it, Maine's future depends on it, our independence as a sovereign State depends on it. And for these reasons, I urge you, and I wrote, to vote yes on LD 227.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the Representative from Houlton, Representative Swallow.

Representative **SWALLOW**: Thank you, Madam Speaker. LD 227 is one of the most misunderstood pieces of legislation in the 131st Legislature. And one of the reasons may be that this 21-page amendment was not viewable online until well after the work session and just recently. Therefore, though in some ways, the details of this bill and exact interpretation may be misunderstood, the essence and priorities of LD 227 are well understood by most. Many Mainers are upset over this legislation because they clearly understand the purpose and reality, which is; once again, parents' rights are secondary in the case of minors and transgender care. This legislation places concern for confused minors and parents' rights into the background behind the concerns for providers and practitioners of gender-affirming care and reproductive care for minors.

I have three issues with this bill. First, the fact that, as you heard, the World Professional Association for Transgender Health, WPATH, is set as one of the standards for gender-affirming care. Second, it continues to further protect those who are promoting gender-affirming care in minors, especially those in their teen years. And finally, the third, is terminology such as "interference" is not clear in its meaning.

First, not only are parents powerless to be involved in the issues of their 16- and 17-year-old children when dealing with transgender issues, but the care and advice given to their children in the quest to know what is being done with their children could easily be interpreted as interference with legally protected health care. If they carry their concerns too far and file suit, could they be guilty of hostile litigation and be countersued, which would include the provider's defense costs? With this legislation, the transgender health care provider holds all the cards, and it's time for parents to once again step to the back of the line.

Second, if anything, this bill moves us further in the wrong direction. Europe has long been ahead of the United States in offering gender-affirming care to adolescents. However, now, those old concepts and theories are falling to the realities of empirical evidence. In Finland, the Finnish health authority has broken away from WPATH Standards of Care, which are cited in this bill and is the primary standard of care to be followed. Finland has changed to their own standards and now recommends new guidelines that state that psychotherapy,

rather than puberty blockers and cross-sex hormones, should be the first line of treatment for gender dysphoric youth. And Finland is not the only European country that is stepping back from WPATH standards of care. In Europe, the debate over gender-affirming care in minors is more facts-based and centered around the ongoing health of the patient. Their long-term studies offering long-term data are in. The verdict is that more harm than good is being done in most cases with gender-affirming care for minors. Setting mental health issues aside, the physical health issues alone include bone damage, infertility and sexual dysfunction. Now, minors in five European countries; Norway, Sweden, Denmark, France and Finland; can access puberty blockers and cross-sex hormones only if they meet strict eligibility requirements, usually in the context of a tightly controlled research setting.

In England, England now prohibits almost all gender-affirming care for persons under 18 years of age. According to a 2022 study commissioned by the National Health Service of England just 10 years prior, there were 250 referrals, which were mostly boys, to their Gender Identity Development Service run by the National Health Service Foundation in London. In only 10 years, the referrals grew from 250 to more than 5,000. Interestingly, the largest group, being two-thirds, now consisted of birth females that first reported in adolescence gender-related stress. In truth, there has been a recent surge of teenage girls identifying as transgender. However, there has been no such change in women of other ages, only teenage girls. In fact, in England, from one decade to the next, the rate of gender dysphoria in teenage girls has risen 4,400%. In the past, this ailment has always been typical of boys in early childhood. The U.S. as well has seen an incredible surge with teenage girls claiming gender dysphoria. Dr. Littman, a doctor and researcher at Brown University, decided to find out why. Dr. Littman describes the condition experienced by these girls as rapid onset gender dysphoria, ROGD. According to the study, parents say that many of these girls have a history of mental illness and some are on the autism spectrum. Based on Dr. Littman's research and her claim that ROGD spreads via social media and peer contagion, it is not uncommon for two or more girls in the same friendship group, or even half of them, to begin to identify as transgender. Dr. Ray Blanchard, professor of psychiatry at the University of Toronto, has worked in gender identity clinics for many years and believes ROGD is absolutely real. The statistical changes are remarkable. The doctor further found most of the clinicians involved in these cases did not explore issues of mental health, previous trauma or any alternative causes of gender dysphoria prior to proceeding. She notes that some were offered prescriptions for puberty blockers or cross-sex hormones during their first visit. Gender dysphoria in teenage girls has become a social trend and a catch-all diagnosis for teens having mental health issues. The American College of Pediatricians noted that youth whose perceived gender identity does not align with their biological sex have high rates of mental health problems, regardless of any affirmations of their gender identity. Clearly, 16- and 17-year-olds are not ready to make these life-altering decisions. In fact, when gender dysphoria is not treated with puberty blockers and other drugs, studies show that between 70 and 90% of minors with gender dysphoria return to their birth sex. This bill moves us further in the wrong direction.

My final point is that when children are going through a difficult stage in life and having severe mental issues, they are reaching out for a solution. Rather than dealing with the mental health issues involved, we are separating these children further from their parents, placing them in the hands of the unknown and now, with this legislation, making it even more difficult for parents and guardians of these troubled youths to assist their children and discover what care is being given to these vulnerable youth that will have to live with the consequences for life.

This bill was inspired by the ongoing issues in other states, including Connecticut, where patients who were hastily treated are now having severe issues and are suing these doctors and practitioners. It's a money trail that leads back to using young, confused, gender-distressed patients as pawns and further moving pesky parents who are concerned about their children out of the way and allowing money to flow to certain providers and practitioners. Please join me in opposing this legislation. Thank you, Madam Speaker.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the Representative from Sanford, Representative Mastraccio.

Representative **MASTRACCIO**: Thank you, Madam Speaker. Madam Speaker and Women and Men of the House, this is not a bill about WPATH; it is a bill about patients and their health care providers in Maine. Providers who are our constituents, providers who deserve to be protected while delivering legal, essential and sometimes life-saving care in Maine. Providers who must follow standards of care in every aspect of any type of care they provide, and must obey the laws of Maine and the federal government while providing that care. We need to protect Maine health care professionals so they can do their work and care for their patients in Maine without fear of reprisal from entities in other states who do not agree with the laws of Maine and seek to deny our sovereignty as a State.

The truth about the World Professional Association for Transgender Health, WPATH, is that there is overwhelming consensus in support of the WPATH standards of care in how to treat diagnosed gender dysphoria. Standing alongside WPATH and its standards of care are the American Academy of Pediatrics, the Academic Pediatric Association, the American Academy of Child and Adolescent Psychiatry, the Association of American Medical Colleges, the American Academy of Family Physicians, the American Academy of Nursing, the American College of Obstetricians and Gynecologists, the American College of Osteopathic Pediatricians, the American College of Physicians, the American Medical Association, the American Pediatric Society, the American Psychiatric Association, the Association of Medical School Pediatric Department Chairs Incorporated, the Endocrine Society, the National Association of Pediatric Nurse Practitioners, the Pediatric Endocrine Society, the Societies for Pediatric Urology, the Society for Adolescent Health and Medicine, the Society for Pediatric Research and the Society of Pediatric Nurses. All legitimate health care professional organizations that warrant our respect. I urge you to support this bill and the health care professionals of Maine. Thank you, Madam Speaker.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the Representative from Albion, Representative Cyrway.

Representative **CYRWAY**: Thank you, Madam Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I stand before you representing law enforcement issues. I thank you for letting us speak our piece and I really think that law enforcement is a big issue in this bill. It's for the safety of our public, for not only here but all over the country.

From the Maine Chiefs' Association, I just received; and this is from the Chief of Police just now of the Chiefs' Association; said, "should this bill move forward as drafted, Maine's law enforcement community will be placed in a difficult position. We must provide records and information to other agencies with no questions asked, yet under this legislation, no

law enforcement officer may provide information or assistance to any law enforcement agency federally, locally or across State lines in relation to an investigation or inquiry into the providing of health care services. We do not support being placed in a scenario that we are unable to do our jobs or if we do carry out our sworn duty to work collaboratively with other agencies, that we may find ourselves in direct conflict with this proposed law. Should this bill move forward as drafted, Maine's law enforcement community will be placed in a difficult position;" there again, let me go here, so; "we do not support being placed in a scenario that we are unable to do our jobs, and if we do carry out our sworn duty to work collaboratively with our agencies, that we may find ourselves in direct conflict with the proposed law."

The other big piece of this is that the Maine Sheriffs' Association also wrote, and none of this; it says they feel that law enforcement should be completely removed from this bill. This bill has many objectives that are complicated and unrelated to law enforcement. A collective opposition to this bill is law enforcement related. In speaking with law enforcement around the State, they were unable to find anyone that was consulted on the language of this bill. And if you just heard, not once was law enforcement mentioned in their people or organizations that was contacted. "Maine Sheriffs' Association urges you to vote unanimously to defeat LD 227 and, at best, remove all references of law enforcement." This is from Mary-Anne LaMarre, Executive Director of the Maine Sheriffs' Association; nothing has changed since the updated amendments in their position; please protect our people in our State and our country. This is against all law enforcement sworn officers to uphold what they've sworn to. We cannot vote for this bill as upstanding law enforcement officers to do the duty that you've asked us to do. Please vote this down. Thank you, Madam Speaker.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the Representative from Portland, Representative Zager.

Representative **ZAGER**: Thank you very much, Madam Speaker, Colleagues of the House. I rise in support of this pending motion. I understand that many Members of this Body, and many folks in our society at large, doubt the need for this bill and even, in some cases, doubt the legitimacy of the health care that is discussed in it, and I respect that difference of opinion, even if I don't agree with it. I respectfully offer another voice from the medical profession.

I'm going to limit my remarks to gender dysphoria, which has been the tenor of the debate. People whose gender identity does not match their assigned gender, I believe, deserve access to evidence-based health care for their whole being, just like everybody else. So, health care practitioners can't be intimidated from out of state from providing it, hence this bill, LD 227. And what is the consensus opinion of the medical and broad health care community? The Good Representative from Sanford has listed it's about two dozen organizations. Not a radical fringe group of experimental practitioners, but very much the mainstream of health care in the United States has already submitted an answer to what the consensus is in the health care community in an *amicus curiae* brief to the U.S. Supreme Court just a few months ago in the case of *Williams v. Skrmetti*. The *amici* assert as follows, that gender dysphoria is a clinical condition that is marked by distress due to an incongruence between a person's gender identity, such as the innate sense of oneself as being a particular gender and the sex assigned at birth. This incongruence can lead to clinically significant distress and impair functioning in many aspects of life and even threaten a person's life. If not treated or treated improperly or delayed too long, gender dysphoria can result in debilitating anxiety, depression and self-harm and is associated with higher rates of suicide. As such, the effective treatment of gender dysphoria saves lives. And I just want that to be clear, the effective treatment of gender dysphoria saves lives.

To save those lives and to reduce morbidity, there exists a professionally well-accepted protocol for treating gender dysphoria. This is colloquially called, known professionally and also in the common vernacular, as gender-affirming care. It is very deliberate, very meticulous and is not done expediently; it's not rushed. In the U.S., approximately 1.4 million individuals are transgender. There is an increasing understanding among those who spend their professional lives in this field that being transgender is a normal variation of human identity. That's as far as we can determine in *homo sapiens*, our species. It happens to be that in other species in the natural world, individuals go from male to female, female to male, throughout their lives naturally, without intervention. If untreated or inadequately treated, gender dysphoria can cause depression, anxiety, self-harm and suicidality, as I mentioned. More than 50% of the population reported having seriously considered attempting suicide and more than one-third of transgender adolescents reported having attempted suicide in the preceding 12 months. To ignore their suffering would be deadly.

But that doesn't mean that health care practitioners are going to rush into treatment that is not adhering to strict protocols. That standard of care has many elements; among them, a thorough mental health and diagnostic assessment. If somebody, for instance, is suffering from schizophrenia, that would be discovered if they indeed cannot reality test; cannot tell what is reality and what is not reality. That would be discovered in that first step. Also, there are rigorous criteria. I won't elaborate them for the sake of time, but they're summarized nicely in the *amicus curiae* brief. There must be a sustained and persistent pattern of gender nonconformity or gender dysphoria. This is not somebody being whisked away for a weekend, making a declaration and having surgery. Sustained and persistent pattern. And in my discussions with colleagues who are reading the medical literature, we're talking years.

There must be sufficient emotional and cognitive maturity to provide informed consent. And so, yes, certain adolescents do not have that maturity or the ability to even recognize what's going on with their condition. And so, that person would not be appropriate to proceed with the treatment that they do not understand. Any coexisting psychological, medical and social problems that could interfere with the diagnosis, the treatment, or the ability to consent must be addressed. So, there's a whole host of reasons why a person could be suffering from depression, anxiety, suicidality, that are not gender dysphoria, and those must be addressed when a person has access to comprehensive medical care.

I won't go through the rest, but I think I've given you a flavor, Madam Speaker, that this is not rushed; this is very deliberate, very thoughtful and very caring. These guidelines were developed through a robust and transparent process, also employing the same scientific rigor that we depend on, that we expect for anything else that afflicts a human being. They've been developed over decades, even. And does it work? I mean, we could put a lot of time into something, we could recognize suffering, we can develop protocols, but in order for the scientific method to be duly applied to reduce human suffering, there have to be clinical trials, there has to be studies; not randomized, that would not be ethical in this case, as it's not ethical with many other human conditions; but there are legitimate ways to study whether it works and, indeed, it works. That is a large part of

why I think that this bill, LD 227, is important to protect providers who are reducing suffering with a treatment that works. Research has documented significant reductions in anxiety, reductions in depression, reductions in suicidal ideation. This is even after adjusting for several other factors like demographics, level of family support and so on, as would be conventionally done in research. And their overall functioning in their communities improves.

In conclusion, Madam Speaker, I just would like to say that scientists and researchers always welcome more understanding about important things, including this crucial topic. We will continue to learn more. However, currently, tonight, when we're considering LD 227, it seems to me that large amounts of the available data indicate that gender-affirming care works, and not applying it in time, in a thoughtful process, does significant harm to those who are suffering from gender dysphoria. LD 227 protects Maine doctors and other health care providers whose care improves these outcomes and alleviates suffering. That's why I think that this Body ought to advance LD 227. Thank you, Madam Speaker.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the Representative from Dover-Foxcroft, Representative Perkins.

Representative **PERKINS**: Thank you, Madam Speaker. I, too, have heard from the Maine Sheriffs' Association and I was asked by the Executive Director to read their testimony during Committee, but since the Good Representative from Albion has already read most of it, I'm going to forego that. However, I have heard from the Executive Director just since we've reconvened session this evening, and she asked me to share her thoughts on that, so, I'm going to read those, if I may. And she says; this is Mary-Anne LaMarre, Executive Director of Maine Sheriffs' Association and she says, "I've heard ugly rumors that only quote-unquote MAGA sheriffs are opposed to 227. That's not true. Of all sheriffs that voted, one changed position from opposed to not for nor against. All other sheriffs that voted opposed and the vote represents multiple sheriffs from both parties. We are steadfast in our position. Please feel free to share." Madam Speaker, Section 9006 of this bill prohibits law enforcement from participating with other agencies that may be looking for a missing or abducted child. What if there's an abducted child, Madam Speaker, I wonder, that is victimized but, you know, signs of that victimization aren't clear? We'd never know because we'd never be able to investigate it. What if someone is abducted and brought to Maine and the offender is trying to hide that victim because they're trying to change that child's appearance? We wouldn't know because we wouldn't be able to investigate it. Not investigating or reporting missing or abducted child is unconscionable, Madam Speaker, and contrary to the good of public order. Any law enforcement agency that refuses to do so would be negligent and it makes our law enforcement agencies complicit in endangering the welfare of a child.

And finally, Madam Speaker, just in closing, I'd like to share just one sentence of testimony that came from one of the sheriffs who individually submitted testimony, Sheriff Kevin Joyce, who is the Sheriff of Cumberland County. And he wrote, "if a law enforcement agency in State or out of state are investigating the whereabouts of a missing child and we have contact with that child, there is no scenario that an ethical and professional law enforcement officer is not going to check on the child's well-being and report that information to the investigating enforcement agency." Madam Speaker, regardless of anything else that's in this bill, the aspects in this bill that refer to law enforcement just can't stand and we can't support this bill. Thank you.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the Representative from Greenbush, Representative Carmichael.

Representative **CARMICHAEL**: Thank you, Madam Speaker, Men and Women of the House. I don't rise this evening with legal issues, with physical issues or even emotional issues, Madam Speaker. It should come as no surprise to anybody in this Chamber my faith is very important to me.

Madam Speaker, my priorities in my faith are my God, my family, my church and my work here. Madam Speaker, because my God is my highest priority, I feel like I need to share what He says and what I feel on this issue. In Galatians 1:15, God says He had a design for me, when I was even in my mother's womb, He chose and called me out of shared generosity. That's telling us that the Lord cares about us, He designed us a specific way and He has a specific plan for us. In Jeremiah 1:5, it says before I formed you in your mother's womb, I knew you. Before you were born, I sanctified you a prophet. He had a plan for Jeremiah, Jeremiah was a prophet and did good works. And I believe that He has a plan for each one of us in this Chamber.

Madam Speaker, Psalms 1:27 says children are a heritage from Heaven and from the Lord. Our offspring are a reward to us, they're a gift to us from God. Madam Speaker, parents have a God-given responsibility to protect their children from harm and, Madam Speaker, I believe this bill could get in the way of parents fulfilling their commitment to God. Madam Speaker, in the book of Matthew, we are warned to protect our children or face His judgment. Madam Speaker, it's out of compassion for everybody in this Body that I rise and share the word from God's Word. Thank you.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the Representative from Rockland, Representative Geiger.

Representative **GEIGER**: Thank you, Madam Speaker, and thank you for allowing me to rise and speak to my colleagues on the floor in support of LD 227.

Madam Speaker, when I was 24, I sold my Jeep and took all my savings and went on a nine-month trip around the world with my boyfriend, Sam. When we were in Malaysia, we met a Polish man who escaped from Poland two years before. He said to us, Americans are stupid and naïve and if you want to really learn about the world, you should visit a communist country. Being stupid and naïve, we thought this was an excellent plan, and we went to the Polish ambassador and got visas. We flew into Poland, we spent two weeks there and then realized that we didn't actually know how to get out of that country. After a couple of days, we found the international train station, only to discover that the tickets only went to other communist countries. After some thought, we bought a ticket to East Berlin. We boarded an evening train, and as we passed into East Germany, every hour from then on, German soldiers would throw open the train doors, scream out passport in German and Polish, demand to see peoples' papers. If they had a large suitcase, they would make them open it to make sure that no one was hiding inside. When we arrived in East Berlin, we discovered that if we stayed on the train, it would go through to West Berlin. I watched as they put mirrors under every car, looking for someone who might be clinging to the undercarriage of the train, trying to escape from East Germany. I watched as German Shepherds walked up and down the train station, sniffing large bags, suitcases, boxes, in case there was a human being trying to escape from that country. I watched when a train from West Berlin came in to East Berlin and the soldiers walked through and picked up every magazine and every newspaper so that the people in East Germany had no idea how unfree they were. And then we traveled across a long field full of barbed wire, full of landmines,

to the Berlin Wall, where there were men with machine guns in watch towers to make sure that no one tried to escape. And when I arrived in Berlin, I thought, oh, my God, thank God I am a United States citizen. I can travel wherever I want to, with no one's permission. I can travel anywhere in this country without papers and I can travel anywhere in the world without permission.

If anyone had told my 24-year-old self that today, we received letters from 16 Attorney Generals telling us that United States citizens who happen to reside in their states are not allowed to leave and come to Maine for medical care they choose, which is fully legal in this State, I would not have believed it. Are we going to be here next session to discuss a shield bill for librarians who are giving out books that turned out to be banned in states that the visitors were taking out? Are we going to receive letters from our colleges and universities saying they're hearing from those states that U.S. citizens who are attending education here are not allowed to take a black history course, a women's studies course or, if they're Floridians, not to be allowed to take a sociology course? We are United States citizens and we have always had the right to travel where we wanted to for reasons of our choosing.

When we pass this bill, Madam Speaker, what happens then? Do those states decide that any woman of childbearing age cannot leave that state? Do they decide that parents with young children are not allowed to leave that state in case they are seeking gender-affirming care? Are they going to require a pregnancy test or are they simply going to build a wall and start sliding mirrors under trains and walking German Shepherds through buses, looking at suitcases to make sure no one's trying to escape? This is America, and what we are proposing here is to protect our providers and, frankly, to protect our brothers and sisters who are fellow Americans, if they choose to come here for legal care. I hope you will join me in supporting this bill. Thank you.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the Representative from Winterport, Representative Paul.

Representative **PAUL**: Thank you, Madam Speaker.

The SPEAKER: The Member will defer. The Chair recognizes the Representative from Winter Harbor, Representative Faulkingham, and inquires as to why he rises.

Representative **FAULKINGHAM**: Madam Speaker, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

Representative FAULKINGHAM of Winter Harbor inquired if a Quorum was present.

The Chair ordered a quorum call.

More than half of the Members responding, the Chair declared a Quorum present.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the Representative from Winterport, Representative Paul.

Representative **PAUL**: Thank you, Madam Speaker. I rise in opposition to the pending motion. The proposed amendment for LD 227 outlines a vision for Maine that is truly egregious and dangerous for the women of our State. As legislators, it is our duty to protect and defend our citizens, not perpetuate a system that removes their power and subjects them to harm for the worst actors in our society.

In an effort to not provide repetitive information, I wanted to highlight some unintended or intended consequences of this bill related specifically to abortion. I should hope the recklessness of providing life-altering so-called gender-affirming care for children who are not equipped to make such a decision would be obvious. In order to understand what could happen, we must look at some of the darkest parts of the human experience; sex trafficking and domestic abuse. This bill could actually enable reproductive coercion and crimes against pregnant women and remove any recourse they might have if they are injured by an abortion procedure. How? Well, there are several ways, but I will highlight the provision which prohibits Maine courts from enforcing a judgment from another state related to abortion services. Let's say a woman in Georgia orders abortion pills online and they are mailed from a physician in Maine. She's had no physical exam and no confirmation of either stage or location of pregnancy. She's ectopic and the abortion pills cause her fallopian tube to burst and she's rushed into emergency surgery. She loses her fertility, something she will have to deal with for the rest of her life. This mother has absolutely no legal recourse under the provisions of this bill. In addition, due to the hostile litigation provision, is she the one would could be sued if she seeks damages? Or what if, instead of losing her fertility, she loses her life? Her family may have no legal recourse for wrongful death if blanket immunity is given to health care providers who are supposed to first do no harm. Why? Because a few lawmakers in Augusta decided to play God and determine what are human rights? Do you really want to remove all liability from abortion providers in this State?

If abortion procedures really are safe for women, then why does this bill provide blanket liability coverage for abortion providers and prevent malpractice insurance companies from increasing their rates if the procedures are not higher risk? The complete removal of any personal responsibility or accountability for physicians is just a Freudian slip of how deadly these procedures really are to women. In extreme cases, would this bill also protect abusers from prosecution if they coerce a woman to have an abortion? Forced abortions are not exempted in this bill. Medication abortion, which is already widely available, accessible and largely unregulated in our State, is often used as a tool in human trafficking and reproductive coercion. This bill could fling the door wide open for abusers, traffickers and the worst of society to use chemical abortion drugs, already 63% of all abortions in Maine, to coerce women into ending pregnancies that interfere with their bottom line. Because of the ease of acquiring abortion pills under this legislation, women who are harmed by abortion, even forced abortion, may have literally no recourse for injury. Abusive domestic partners, traffickers and the worst actors in our society may have zero accountability for injuries they cause because to stop them from assisting in what they can say was something the woman wanted, we would be interfering with a stated legal right.

Maine is supposed to be Vacationland, not a tourist destination for abortion and gender surgery, which will make Maine a sanctuary State for abusers and human traffickers, who may force their victims to have abortions under the protections afforded in this bill. You have to consider all possible consequences of the harm this bill could allow. That is your responsibility. This bill is not about access to health care; this bill is about empowering abusers. Make no mistake, if this bill passes, Maine will be known as a sex trafficking and domestic abuse capital of America.

All human beings are made in God's image and are worthy of protection. This means that all life, regardless of age, ability, gender, race, religion, born and pre-born, have infinite value. Do the right thing. Show the women of this State that you care about them and want to empower them against their abusers, not tie their hands from seeking justice when she is severely wronged. I urge you to vote against the pending motion. Thank you, Madam Speaker.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the Representative from Hampden, Representative Haggan.

Representative **HAGGAN**: Thank you, Madam Speaker. I know this will be the one that sways everybody. Okay, here we go.

Madam Speaker, this bill is appropriately called the Shield Law. It shields parents from foreign jurisdictions; i.e. states; from protecting their youth. It shields minors from critical decision making before they reach the age of maturity. It shields law enforcement from helping or intervening in these abhorrent practices. It shields medical practitioners from litigation for these procedures. In; I forgot to write the section number; Section B-5, number 14, it says, "an action in a foreign jurisdiction" or state, this is in the amendment, "that is brought by a parent involving litigation between parents over custody of a minor child of the parents if the custody dispute involves legally protected health care activity or aiding and assisting legally protected health care activity for the minor child." This shields other states from rescuing their own citizens of their own states.

I'm going to now read another excerpt from this bill that pertains to legally protected health care activity, that's the words that I put in quote, and remind the Body that this is the language of the bill. It's not the law yet. Once it's adopted, it will be the language of the law of the land of Maine. Part C, Section C-1, "Exception; legally protected health care activity. Notwithstanding any provision of state law to the contrary and except as required by federal law, the Governor may not surrender a person charged in another state as a result of the person's engaging in legally protected health care activity or aiding and assisting legally protected health care activity unless the executive authority of the demanding state alleges in writing that the accused was physically present in the demanding state at the time of the commission of the alleged offense and that thereafter the accused fled from the demanding state. For purposes of this subsection, 'aiding and assisting legally protected health care activity' and 'legally protected health care activity' have the same meanings…"

These words are shielding us from the truth; I'm on my own words now; these words are shielding us from the truth about the concept of legally protected health care as it is described in the bill, not yet the law. LD 227 makes both gender-affirming health care services and reproductive health care services a legal right, and interference with this right, whether or not under the color of the law, is against State policy. But gender-affirming health care services and reproductive health care services are very broadly defined in this bill. It's very vaguely defined in all of its legalese, in my opinion. Because it covers all supplies, care services, including services of a supportive nature related to gender dysphoria and incongruence, not only would Maine cover the cost of drugs, surgeries, mental health care services, it could even cover things like chest binders or prosthetics to create the appearance of male anatomy. If a child in Maine has a legal right to these services and no one can interfere with them, then this bill could be misused to argue that parents are prohibited from saying no to their child receiving them, which causes a scenario where trafficking will happen, because the bill has the law enforcement to stand down, which we've heard several times today.

LD 227 would allow lawsuits in Maine courts against a person who files hostile litigation, which is litigation in another state that would deter a person from obtaining gender identity/abortion services or from helping another person obtain those services. For example, if a person in another state filed a lawsuit to stop an aunt or someone from transporting a child to Maine for gender identity/abortion services, LD 227 would allow the aunt to sue the parents and seek punitive damages against the parents. This is an unprecedented new cause of action. LD 227 prohibits Maine courts from enforcing a judgment from another state related to gender identity/abortion services. So, if another state issued a judgment against an aunt or uncle or what have you from trafficking a child to Maine to obtain abortion or gender transition surgery, Maine courts would refuse to enforce that. The bill would prohibit a State court from even requiring the aunt or uncle to give testimony in the trafficking case or from issuing any subpoena or warrant against the aunt. And even if the aunt was found guilty of violating a criminal law in another state related to gender identity/abortion services, Maine would be prohibited from surrendering the aunt to the state where she was convicted of the crime. So, now, Maine has become the State that harbors criminals who violated criminal laws in other states and prohibited vulnerable individuals from gender identity/abortion services. Malpractice insurers cannot increase rates or impose penalties on a doctor for providing gender identity/abortion services. This is interfering with the ability of insurers to appropriately factor in the risk of malpractice claims related to these procedures. Thus, this is designed to protect Maine health care professionals who provide reproductive and gender-affirming care from being targeted by other states' bans or restrictions on such treatments.

And then, of course, there is the issue of unanswered questions, such as who will pay for someone to come to the State of Maine or services that happen here? Taxpayers of Maine, of course. Interference with this abominable act is prohibited, even if it goes against public policy of the State. Other states cannot interfere with Maine's ability to guarantee this horrific deed. And what about the fact that this bill also drew the attention of 15 Republican Attorneys General from around the country, who penned a letter in March arguing that this measure is unconstitutional? Maine denied that.

Madam Speaker, when a version of this bill was 1735, I can't tell you how many people came to us with great regret for what they had done to themselves earlier in life. Doctors testified in Committee that the frontal lobe, which guides our maturity, is not fully developed until age 26. As I've stated 85,000 times recently; I'm going to do it again, I guess; I have been a teacher for 36 years. The first 14, I was a high school teacher; the last 22, sixth grade and eighth grade. I've been a middle school basketball teacher and a soccer coach, at the highest level, of course, for 30 years. My career has been spent teaching history and coaching our youth.

I've got allergies and my eyes; I'm crying, but I'm not sad. And I lost my place.

I've just been a history teacher and a coach for a long, long time. I'm 61 years old; I have been in the classroom for 56 years, I have never missed a quarter. I have chaperoned more dances than I would care to admit; sadly, for me, three weeks ago, but that was my last one as I'm retiring, so, that's good. Kids, you know, sixth grade, seventh grade, eighth grade, ninth grade, at dances; sixth graders, they run around all over the place, they're usually in the bathroom crying for whatever reason; seventh graders have no idea what they're doing, they're just kind of wrestling and chasing each other; eighth graders try to act mature, they have no idea how to get that dance with that special person, so, they all kind of clump around in the middle waiting for *Stairway to Heaven*, as we all maybe recall.

Young people are confused about a lot of things. They get in trouble, they do dumb things. When I was in ninth grade at Orono High School, I found a trampoline in the gym, with two friends and a basketball and Coach Paul was not anywhere to be found. So, we moved the trampoline over to the basket;

I have a fake knee and two hips and I think I know why; I was so numb, I jumped over the rim and landed on the hardwood floor. I did that. And I'm a teacher of your kids. Anyway, I digress.

Growing pains have been a part of all of our lives. Emotional growing pains, social growing pains, physical growing pains; it's a part of being a human. How many times did most of us change our minds when thinking of taking up a career when we were young? I think I changed majors five times, I think I ended college with 180 or 190 credits, I only needed 120. I've been taking 130 eighth graders to the technology high school in Bangor known as UTC for 25 years. One question that I ask them all is, you know, you've seen all these great things, what do you want to be when you grow up? And they'll say something and then they'll change their mind later on and change their mind later on, and that's what we do. We're humans. We change our mind. The neat thing about the process, their process of figuring it out and what we all did just figuring it out and choosing their path in life is they can change their mind any time they want. They can choose a path and if that path is not for them, they can choose another path. And hey, if they want to go back to the first path, they can do that.

If this bill passes, our youth, through puberty blockers, sexual reassignment surgeries and other, can never go back. Never. These are choices that no person can change once it's done. Even future choices to have their own biological children will be lost. This bill is the most extreme and unconscionable thing that I have seen in my 61 years of life. How any human; grandmother, grandfather, person, father, brother, sister or person who cares for our youth or loves people could vote for this boggles my mind.

Representative **MALON**: Point of Order.

The SPEAKER: The Member will defer. The Chair recognizes the Representative from Biddeford, Representative Malon.

Representative **MALON**: Thank you, Madam Speaker. The Representative's remarks are questioning the motives of other Members of this Body and also, I believe, are not germane.

On **POINT OF ORDER,** Representative MALON of Biddeford objected to the comments of Representative HAGGAN of Hampden because he was questioning the motives of other Members of the House.

The SPEAKER: The Chair will remind the Member not to impugn Members' character or question their motives.

The Chair reminded Representative HAGGAN of Hampden that it was inappropriate to question the motives of other Members of the House.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the Representative from Hampden, Representative Haggan.

Representative **HAGGAN**: Thank you very much. I'll strike that last one.

Children are not allowed to do many things in life. I'm not going to give a long list, like they did in our Committee that long night way back in 1735; they can't vote, they can't go to war and, you know, the list goes on, before the age of 18. When a person reaches the age of 18, as we all know, didn't we love it, let them make whatever choices and decisions that they want.

Please, I would ask any of you, really consider, deeply think in your heart. I know these speeches are not going to change probably anybody's mind, we're all tired and we want to go home, but this is really big. This is big, big stuff, super important, and the decisions we make here tonight and maybe in the next couple days, these things we have to think about what we did for the rest of our lives. And we have an opportunity right now to change if we're for this thing or to not or what have you. So, we must protect our children, get them to the age of adulthood intact so that they can make mature decisions for what is right for their life. Thank you very much.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the Representative from Livermore Falls, Representative Lyman.

Representative **LYMAN**: Thank you, Madam Speaker, and Members of the Chamber. Never did I ever think, at this point in my life, I would be standing in front of a Body of lawmakers posing these questions to the Chamber, and before I do that, they're initiated from being involved in some conversations with some folks that were transitioning back, if you would, some of the most difficult things that I ever sat and participated in, walked away feeling; I'm not even going to go there. So, I would like to pose a few questions to the House, if I could.

The SPEAKER: The Member may proceed.

Representative **LYMAN**: Thank you. So, was a diagnosis of gender dysphoria an inaccurate determination for the number of individuals who have transitioned or are trying to transition, some are in the process of transitioning back to their birth gender; is that a misdiagnosis of gender dysphoria? That's one of them.

Is the same medical support available for individuals transitioning back to their birth gender? And I know that was addressed in some of the conversation, at least their perspective and what they were dealing with as they were trying to.

And finally, would these situations of medical procedures for emotional, physical treatments for dysphoria be considered a successful medical treatment? Are they examples of scientific experimentation that worked out for the affected humans who have chosen to transition back? Thank you.

The SPEAKER: The Member has posed some questions through the Chair to anyone who wishes to answer. The Chair recognizes the Representative from Windham, Representative Pringle.

Representative **PRINGLE**: Madam Speaker, Men and Women of the House, I rise today to speak in strong support of LD 227. As a physician, I have many examples over my 50-plus years of medical practice when health care providers have been able to deliver reproductive health care and gender-affirming care without interference in this private matter. LD 227 protects existing access to reproductive health care and gender-affirming care that is already legally protected in Maine, while reinforcing patients' autonomy and identity.

I would like to address the comments that have been made about increasing sex trafficking by sharing that the Maine Coalition Against Sexual Abuse submitted testimony to our Committee sharing their understanding of the problems of sexual abuse and, as people who are trained to identify people who are victims of abuse or being trafficked, they testified strongly in favor of this bill. They felt that it was extremely important and that it would not increase sex trafficking and all the things that have been referred to, and these are people who are trained to understand patients who are experiencing these horrific situations.

This legislation would ensure that individuals in Maine continue to have unimpeded access to gender-affirming care and reproductive health care services and that medical practitioners are able to provide these services without fear of legal consequences. Additionally, it will protect patients in Maine from having their private medical records shared with law enforcement agencies in other states where such care is banned. As we continue to see an increase in restrictions on pregnancy and gender-affirming care across the country, Maine must continue to champion patient rights while ensuring access to necessary and legal medical care. LD 227 will allow Maine to

join a growing number of states that have enacted similar legislation in response to the number of states that are restricting their citizens from accessing essential medical services and care.

My colleague, Representative Zager, I think, outlined extremely well the scientific basis, the care of patients, how carefully it's studied and how other peers play a role in helping us understand conditions and we've had growing body of knowledge and over my years, I've seen such a better understanding to help people who, as Representative Zager said, feel not right, they feel that they are not accepted for who they are, they are not loved for who they are and it creates incredible distress.

It's important to note that the legislation will not change the standard of care in our State, the care available to Maine patients or adjust the scope of practice available to providers. Additionally, it will not hinder a patient's legal right to redress action if they find issues with their care. You know, we have licensing boards, if there is a practitioner; physicians aren't perfect, other health care providers aren't perfect, we can make mistakes. If there is an error, if a patient feels they've been mistreated, there is a well-established process for them to file a complaint, for it to be investigated and for peers to review, and legal rights of a patient if they've been harmed by a provider. So, it's not that people don't have access to a system that has evolved over a long time and is well established. Our Committee hears over and over again from the professional licensing boards that these systems are in place to protect that.

So, simply put, LD 227 will prevent interference with patients' legal rights to access certain health care services and protect the providers who offer those services in Maine. Reproductive health care and gender-affirming care are medical care. As a physician, I hold my patients' privacy and confidentiality above all else, and I would like to say, too, that I know we hear a lot of people refer to their faith and understanding of how that affects their interpretation of this issue, but I'm a person of faith, and the God I believe in is a God of love, a God who loves all of us as we are. I have a favorite hymn, *Just as I am, Without one Plea*, and one of the things that's helped me as I grow older and realize how many mistakes I've made or people I might've hurt is that if I ask for forgiveness, that God forgives me and God accepts me with all my faults. So, I would just share another perspective of a faith-based approach to saying that I believe my faith supports care for these people, these patients. So, as a physician, I hold my patients' privacy and confidentiality above all else. I urge this Body to vote in favor of LD 227, as it will ensure that medical practitioners are able to continue to work with their patients, deliver the best course of care, without fear of retribution from other states. Thank you, Madam Speaker.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the Representative from Falmouth, Representative Kuhn.

Representative **KUHN**: Thank you, Madam Speaker, Fellow Members of the House. I rise in support of the pending motion. First, I'd like to thank the last speaker, the Representative, for her words, it was very moving.

This bill was introduced as a response to unprecedented threats on the Mainers who provide legal health care in our State. It comes in defense of Maine health care providers against states across the country that are banning and even criminalizing reproductive health care and transgender health care; care that Maine providers provide to their patients in accord with the highest ethical and medical standards. At its core, this bill is about our State's sovereign ability to set and enforce our laws, without interference from Texas, Tennessee or Kentucky. This really shouldn't be a startling or controversial concept. It's why 17 other states and the District of Columbia have already put in place shield laws. The motion before us would do the same. And to be clear, every substantive provision of this bill has a similar counterpart in other state shield laws.

Maine has no intention of setting policy in Florida or Arkansas, but the same cannot be said of those states. As has been heard here this evening, in March, the Attorney General of Tennessee sent a letter to our State's leaders, signed by 15 other Attorneys General, calling us totalitarians because of LD 227, and explicitly threatening to come after Maine and our people, saying that they would, quote, "vigorously avail themselves of every recourse," unquote. The Committee had not even held a work session on this bill when other states were overtly and clearly trying to intimidate us and influence our legislative process, threatening to sue before the bill language was even final.

Our sovereignty means we establish our laws; not Tennessee, not Texas, not Florida. People providing care here should not be threatened by or dragooned to a hostile state for legal actions that they took here, even if those actions offend other states. This is very important to the very founding of our country, because as part of a federalist system, we are free to disagree with each other's policies, and we do. Maine now needs LD 227 to ensure that Maine's health practitioners can continue to provide essential health care without fear of prosecution, civil lawsuits from other states and with the full protection of this State.

One might ask what has happened in other states with similar laws. None of the states with shield laws have experienced any adverse outcomes. Providers have reported a renewed confidence in their ability to safely provide medical care. Maine can and should ensure the safety of Mainers providing reproductive and transgender care while providing a lifeline to Americans outside of Maine who are dependent on other states for access to essential health care.

Although the letter from the Attorney General claimed that LD 227 was unconstitutional, it is not. The bill complies with the full faith and credit clause, jurisprudence and its requirement that court judgments be accorded effect in other states. And it complies with the duty to extradite when a person is a fugitive from justice. For all of these reasons, I support the pending motion and I urge my colleagues to do the same. Thank you.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the Representative from Biddeford, Representative Sheehan.

Representative **SHEEHAN**: Thank you, Madam Speaker, Members of the House. I rise in support of the pending motion, and to remind my colleagues and you that Mainers elected us to represent their values and priorities. Although not everyone agrees with every law, our laws reflect the will, however shifting it is, of the majority of Maine people. Every election cycle, they have the opportunity to rethink the direction of the State and to elect us back into our seats or out of them. Our laws change to reflect that, and the laws that currently govern the practice of medicine in our State reflect the most recent expression of Mainers' policy preferences. That could, of course, change at any time.

But how could anyone who has ever presented themselves on this floor as a defender of Maine's autonomy in the face of the federal or any other government, as an advocate for Maine's self-determination or as a champion of Mainers' voices, stand here and lobby us to turn Maine into a fiefdom of Texas, Oklahoma or any other state? Earlier this year, when a group of Attorneys General dared to deny Maine's sovereignty by suggesting that we had no right to protect medical providers who

operate in our State in accordance with our laws, I was astonished. I like the thought experiment of wondering how such a letter from Attorneys General from Connecticut, New York and California would be received threatening to target firearms dealers in our State for operating in accordance with Maine laws and not New York, Connecticut or California's laws. It's not appropriate. We are being gaslit by being told that this law is aggressive. What the Attorneys General want us to do is to sell out our constituents, to sit silent while they invoke their laws to undermine the privacy of our citizens' medical records and while they work to intimidate our providers from serving our State in the way our constituents have told us to carry out.

Now, it's legitimate to debate the laws that govern the practice of medicine in our State, and I trust that opponents will continue to advocate for laws that ban or curtail access to abortion and gender-affirming care and probably many other areas of medical practice that offend their belief systems. We should work to change our laws when that's needed; that's what we are elected to do. But giving aid and comfort to a bullying mob of state-sponsored lawyers from away while they degrade our laws and target our medical providers for harassment, intimidation and doxxing is really not it. It's a shame and a betrayal of the people that we represent. Please support the pending motion.

The Chair ordered a quorum call.

More than half of the Members responding, the Chair declared a Quorum present.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the Representative from Hodgdon, Representative Quint.

Representative **QUINT**: Thank you, Madam Speaker. I would like to thank the Members of this Body for their attention. You see, my voice and the voice of my constituents were silenced at the Committee hearing for this bill. If you will recall, this bill was dropped without publicized wording or time allowed for my constituents to travel down for the hearing. Many live in excess of three hours away. Because of this, I went to the hearing to testify on their behalf. Imagine my surprise when a couple of minutes into my testimony, I was asked to please wrap it up. I asked for an explanation for the interruption and was told that I only had two minutes. I can accept a change in rules if those rules are known before the hearing. Just a few days prior, we were told that we were not time-limited. I want to thank the Representative from Turner; who is not here at the moment; but who did speak up on my behalf. Remember, sufficient time was not given for my constituents to travel due to the way that this bill was handled; dare I say, how many bills have been handled with blatant disrespect and disregard to all of our constituents.

Madam Speaker, I am disturbed that only certain bills have received this kind of extra special treatment. The sad part is that I had questions within my testimony and I am still seeking the answers. And so, I will now give my speech to this Body on behalf of both myself and my constituents. This bill, LD 227, is so very concerning for me. I would like to share an excerpt from a federal law enforcement officer. I quote, I would like to ask the Legislature this question. Is the proposed bill, known as LD 227, being discussed here, a representation of how the people of this State would wish for the care of our children and the children of others? In light of the recent issues blatantly and glaringly made apparent in the State-run DHS foster care system, has the State, under the current leadership and Administration, even been shown competent to make a decision in this matter that truly puts the needs and safety of our children before their own political or personal agendas? Does this bill offer more protection to the health care providers, the so-called health rights, the courts, insurance providers, the health practitioners and the newly proposed public policy of the State, or to the children that the State will be receiving if; or once this legislation is enacted? I will answer that question. This bill seeks to protect the aforementioned entities before and at the expense of both the children and adults in this State that they will be receiving upon the enactment of this bill. In addition, LD 227 seeks to impede any efforts that law enforcement in the State may wish to take to protect not only children, but any person seeking care of their own or by proxy of a guardian. If trafficking or kidnapping of children were taking place upon enactment of this bill, if it was claimed such movement of children was due to a legal right or public policy of the State, the ability of our law enforcement to intercede on behalf of the child would be severely restricted. LD 227 also appears to fundamentally change the subpoena process and the process of discovery. I wish to conclude by very strongly urging and exhorting the Members of this Body to do what is in their power to stop this reprehensible piece of legislation by voting Ought Not to Pass on LD 227. While thinking about how it is we, as a State, wish to take care of our children, please consider the many ways that this bill could negatively affect them.

This is the shield bill, but who will shield the children? Should parents across the country be informed that their child, upon entry to Maine, will have complete access to legally protected health care activity? After all, as this bill states, the parents would never have to be informed of their teenage daughter coming to our State and having an IUD inserted in her uterus without their consent or knowledge while in Maine. What if there were complications upon insertion? Would parents have to be notified, as this bill considers that to be protected information? Is there any recourse? Has Maine only attracted the most highly skilled, highly qualified medical professionals? Not with this bill. It gives protection to those who may have caused harm in other states and offers them a new place for employment. Medical errors are the third-leading cause of death, after heart disease and cancer. What are the parameters of a successful reassignment surgery? Perhaps sterilization, lack of libido, lack of sexual fulfillment, surgical removal of healthy body parts, castration.

It authorizes a person who makes civil, criminal or administrative action in another state is brought to deter, prevent, sanction or punish that person for engaging in or for aiding and assisting with legally protected health care activity, referred to in this amendment as hostile litigation, to bring a civil action in this State for damages, punitive damages and equitable relief. A court in this State may include in a damage award the amount of any judgment issued in connection with the hostile litigation, as well as the person's reasonable attorney's fees and expenses incurred in connection with that action. Parents of Maine and everywhere, let that sink in. Maine will foot the bill to prevent you from having any awareness or redress for your complaints as to what happens to your child in our State concerning protected health care activity. Does this Body believe that Maine taxpayers feel that this is a good way for their tax dollars to be spent?

This bill is so very dangerous in that it protects everyone but those who would truly be harmed by it. Perhaps before allowing a trip to Acadia National Park with relatives, a week in some of our more exclusive summer camps, parents across Maine and the country should realize that your rights can be usurped and that Maine can take over the parenting of your child in the most private areas of their lives. Will your child be safe in Maine if you do not have to be told of the harm perpetrated against them? Will any child in Maine be safe if this bill passes? I ask that you vote down this atrocious bill.

Madam Speaker, I do have a couple of questions, too. One of them would be in the amended bill, Section D-5, Part 2-A, it says, "Upon recommendation of an application assistant, an adult person, a parent or guardian acting on behalf of a minor or a guardian acting on behalf of an incapacitated person may apply to the secretary to have a designated address assigned by the secretary to serve as the person's address or the address of the minor or incapacitated person." Why would an incapacitated person be needing reassignment surgery or abortive procedures done?

And then, if I may, there were just two comments that I'd like to make. I'd like to thank the Representative from Rockland for speaking about concerning issues from other states. I agree with her. Many states are saying that parents must affirm their children's perceived gender or they will lose their children. This has already happened. This also reminds me of another country, as the Good Representative was also talking about, where children were encouraged to turn their parents in if they did not share the current political ideology.

And Madam Speaker, as I mentioned before, I was disrespected within the Committee over this bill, and at the same time, I have been disrespected in this House. I understand text messages could be sent to other Members in the Body to try to relieve some of the pressure. It's a very divisive bill. However, I am not okay with some comments being put on people's social media, fundraising in the middle of a debate and saying that words from the other side of the Body, they're going to make money off of by calling them liars. That is not acceptable to me. And it's not acceptable to joke that someone needs to be restrained, so that they don't commit acts of violence. Thank you, Madam Speaker.

Representative THORNE of Carmel **MOVED THE PREVIOUS QUESTION**.

Subsequently, the same Representative **WITHDREW** his motion to **MOVE THE PREVIOUS QUESTION**.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the Representative from Fairfield, Representative Rudnicki.

Representative **RUDNICKI**: Thank you, Madam Speaker. Kind of a hard act to follow there here. I rise against this motion, but I want to remind this Body of something that just happened a week or so ago. I'm losing track of time, like everybody else. But on March 28th, we took up LD 1779 that dealt with the juvenile justice system, and the Good Representative from Portland actually made a comment that said that our brains don't develop until they're 25 years old. So, I ask you, if they don't develop enough to be held responsible for their actions to be placed within the juvenile justice system, how are their brains developed enough to do gender-affirming treatments? So, I ask you, does anyone else find this as hypocritical as I do? Thank you.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the Representative from Albion, Representative Cyrway.

Representative **CYRWAY**: Thank you, Madam Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I had to get up one more time only because this is dear to my heart. This bill does not protect our kids. I've worked with kids for many years, and parents, and it takes their legal rights to their child away. This could disrupt a serious case and have serious consequences. It's reckless legislation. Without law enforcement input, it's reckless. There's the result could be kidnapping, sexual assaults, ransom situations and the list could go on, even death. And the reason why I say that, I experienced it once.

In 2010, right here in Augusta, I had a parent call me from Sidney, Maine, saying that his child was kidnapped and he knows it. And his ex-wife lived in Lewiston. Her family lived in Sanford. The new husband that she married, the stepdad, talked the 16-year-old girl into getting into his car when she was with three girls at Cumberland Farms down here. And in doing so, he told her that her mom and him was having difficulties and wanted to talk to her about it. He took her over to the Summerhaven pits, took all her clothes off and strangled her, then took her to Manchester at the graveyard over here, threw her in the grave and then she started coming to and he clubbed her over the head with a log and then buried her with leaves.

Representative **MALON**: Point of Order.

The SPEAKER: The Member will defer. The Chair recognizes the Representative from Biddeford, Representative Malon, and inquires to why he rises.

Representative **MALON**: I apologize, Madam Speaker, but this is not germane to what is before us right now.

On **POINT OF ORDER,** Representative MALON of Biddeford asked the Chair if the remarks of Representative CYRWAY of Albion were germane to the pending question.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the Representative from Albion, Representative Cyrway.

Representative **CYRWAY**: Thank you, Madam Speaker. I had to do the research. I had to do the investigation. I had to find out what happened. And in doing so, I found out that he was the one that picked her up, the girls told me. And then I put an APB out on him, because I found out that earlier, when he was married the first time, he had run over his wife twice, once over, backed over her again, and got eight years, all but four years suspended for manslaughter. Well, it was attempted manslaughter. I put an APB out for him, found out that he; it was 2:00 in the morning, I was in bed and I got a call that there was a fire in Sanford and it was a nearby house to the people that his family was from and it was on fire. And then found out that there was a car on fire down there and it belonged to him. And so, I asked for detectives, K-9, anything I could get out there to find him, to locate him. He stole a shotgun out of the house that he burnt and he shot at a State Trooper's cruiser. And also, we got the fire marshals involved because three weeks earlier, their apartment here in Augusta burnt down and the lady that owned the apartment building was killed.

The SPEAKER: The Member will defer. The Chair respectfully asks the Member to try to stick to the germane of the bill as soon as possible. The House will be in order.

The Chair reminded Representative CYRWAY of Albion to stay as close as possible to the pending question.

The SPEAKER: The Member may proceed.

Representative **CYRWAY**: He had killed her as well, he had lit her on fire with newspapers and stepped on her throat and told her she used Satan and you're looking at Satan and he lit her on fire.

These situations, I could not tell the parents until we found out the identity of their daughter before I could tell them that she was deceased. It was painful, downright painful. I have to say that without this group or this bill, not taking the time to talk to law enforcement to see if it even has any effect of this, which, when I hear that this is not pertaining to the bill but nobody has checked into it to see if it is, I am just saying this is reckless conduct as far as legislation goes. You have a team of experienced law enforcement officers from the Chiefs of Police, the Sheriffs' Association, and no one has even talked to them or asked them one bit on this bill. And for me to witness what I did and think that nobody attempted is shameful.

I think that this bill should die as quick as it came because they didn't even give us notice when it came. We had 400 people and it wasn't even on the website. They had to take their time and try to find out all they could before they could come and

testify. This is how quick this is going through and nobody's taken the time. This is reckless legislation. So, thank you, Madam Speaker, for listening and I hope in sincerity that you be careful about how we can take care of our public and our Maine people and keep them safe, and our country. Thank you, Madam Speaker.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the Representative from Auburn, Representative Libby.

Representative **LIBBY**: Thank you, Madam Speaker. Madam Speaker, it has been a very long battle against this evil, and I'm not just talking about this session. It's late, I am very cognizant of that fact; I am run down, I am sick, I am not going to be the greatest orator tonight. But it is absolutely, absolutely critically important to me that I speak up for Maine people that value life, that value parental rights, that value protecting and defending our children.

Madam Speaker, I promise this is on topic. Last session, I submitted a school choice bill, and I was very proud of this bill, Madam Speaker. I think that Maine families deserve school choice, and so, I put out a press release. I prepared social media, I sent out emails, I wrote an op-ed, the whole shebang to get the word out about this bill. This bill that was important to me, that I know someday, not last session, but someday, will improve options for Maine families. And so, I shouted it off the rooftops.

Madam Speaker, LD 227 was hidden away in a Committee that would ordinarily not handle a bill of this topic. The concept draft was composed of, if I remember correctly, one sentence. The 21-page amendment was buried in an email six days before the public hearing, and most people found out about it on Friday, less than a week; less than four days, Madam Speaker. Maine people had three days to find out about this public hearing. Until today, that 21-page amendment was available one place that I know of; my Google Drive, Madam Speaker. That's where Maine people have gotten this 21-page amendment from since it appeared in the end of February. That is disgraceful, that lack of transparency with Maine people when we say that we are here to represent them and do the will of the people, to hide it away. We should be ashamed of that process.

Madam Speaker, the 17-page amendment that was discussed at the work session became available this afternoon. I would like to think that the Maine Legislature is better than Washington, D.C. congressional shenanigans. But, again and again, it's not. Here we are. I don't know if a single legislator outside of the Committee has actually read this bill. I would love to know. Because I've been hearing all kinds of information about what it does and does not say, and I would love to know how everyone knows, because it's not available.

Madam Speaker, I can only think of one reason not to make a bill; bills available to Maine people. What other reason than being ashamed of it and knowing that Maine people do not support the premise therein? There is no other reason, Madam Speaker. There is no other reason to not be transparent and forthcoming with the people of Maine that we say that we serve.

The SPEAKER: The Member will defer. The Member is getting very, very close to questioning the motives of Members of the Body and impugning their character. Just getting close.

The Chair reminded Representative LIBBY of Auburn that it was inappropriate to question the motives of other Members of the House.

The SPEAKER: The Member may proceed.

Representative **LIBBY**: Madam Speaker, when I reflect on why I might not put forward full information about a bill that I supported, the only reason I can think of is to not allow Maine people to know what their government is doing. But that's just me.

What does this bill do? Madam Speaker, this bill establishes that transgender treatments and abortion are a legal right under State Law. But further than that, it says that anyone interfering with that right may not; no one may interfere with that right. And therein lies the biggest, baddest, most horrible problem with this bill, Madam Speaker, because if it is; if no one can interfere, then, Madam Speaker, I don't see how 15 States Attorneys General can be wrong in thinking that the parents in their state could be affected. Because frankly, Madam Speaker, parents in this State could be affected. This depends on interpretation. And if a child in Maine decides that they want to change their gender and their parents try to stop them, this law will say that no one may interfere with that right. Multiple legal analyses of the 21-page amendment and the 17-page amendment that followed concur.

Madam Speaker, from the beginning, we have heard proponents say this is no big deal, there's no danger to children, no one's going to be kidnapping anyone, trafficking is not an issue. Madam Speaker, I spoke directly with the Representative from Calais on Friday, March 1st, and I asked her point blank if there would be any amendments to the bill. She said definitely there would not, this was the final version of the bill. And yet, at the work session following, I think, what was the longest public hearing of this session on four days' notice, we saw an amendment come forward. Madam Speaker, why was that amendment necessary? If there was no problem with the bill, there's no risk to children, if what supporters say is true, then why was that amendment presented at the work session? Surely it was not necessary if there is no risk to children either here in Maine or across our nation.

Bottom line, Madam Speaker, we must protect our children. We must shield them. It is shocking to me how much I have heard tonight about shielding anyone other than the children that could potentially be affected by this, what we all know will become a law in this State. Our children are the most vulnerable citizens in our State. They are the future of Maine, Madam Speaker, and they are infinitely precious.

Madam Speaker, before I am a legislator, I am a mother, and I absolutely bring that life experience to this job. After the birth of my third child, I experienced a severe illness and was hospitalized. And I distinctly remember being in the ER, very, very, very sick, and my child at home had an asthma attack. And through a terrible twist of fate and poor cell phone signal, we had a very bad game of telephone where I received a message that my child had stopped breathing. It would be absolutely impossible to describe the sheer panic and distress that I felt when I heard that news. And that moment in time has stuck out to me, and will forever, in the almost 10 years since. And I bring that moment up, Madam Speaker, because I think many of us have heard parents reflect on that moment where they first saw their child. Any parent in this room remembers that moment and when you think you knew what love was, right? And then you become a parent. And so, I had had that same experience. But when I was in that ER room and thought my child had died or was near death, I realized the incredible love and protective instinct that a parent has for their child in a very different way, Madam Speaker. That instinct that a parent has is beyond compare.

Parents should be in the driver's seat when it comes to making decisions for their children, full stop. They should be in the driver's seat making decisions for their children, particularly when we are talking about life-changing decisions, Madam Speaker. There is no one that is better suited, that is equipped

with the love and the instincts to protect that child other than the parents. The government does not, medical professionals are not, only parents, Madam Speaker. Parents are the appropriate best shield for their children. Yet in this upside-down world we are in at this moment, this bill would strip parents of their ability to shield their children. The legal analysis regarding parental rights is absolutely clear. LD 227 would allow children to be brought to Maine to receive gender reassignment surgery without their parents' consent and it would punish parents if they tried to stop it. They could face a counter lawsuit and punitive damages under the clawback provision.

Madam Speaker, LD 227 will infringe on parental rights. Not might, it will. And every person in this room should be on the side of protecting children by protecting parental rights. By supporting the best shield that our children have. Madam Speaker, I had a conversation with the Good Representative from Windham after the public hearing and she told me that gender reassignment surgeries are not happening. Madam Speaker, I listened to testimony before Congress of a 19-year-old woman who had a double mastectomy at 15 years of age and now, at 19, she regrets that choice to her core. It is not undoable; it is undoable; I'm tired, Madam Speaker. I'm tired and this is a crappy bill, and this young woman has made a life-changing decision that she regrets. She expressed her grief, the sense of loss that she feels and she wishes that someone had said no. She had no shield. She talks about the hundreds of individuals just like her that she knows that had no shield, Madam Speaker.

The legal analysis makes it very clear, Madam Speaker, both gender-affirming health care services and reproductive health care services; I use the terms loosely; are very broadly defined under LD 227. In contrast, under a previous bill, LD 1735, gender-affirming health care was limited to medically necessary health care, which, at least, as extreme as that bill was, implies that a doctor must have first concluded that a certain drug or surgery is necessary. There is no such provision in this bill, Madam Speaker.

I think about my mother and my grandmother, they've both gone through breast cancer. And yet, my sisters and I, there's no medical professional out there that would recommend a double mastectomy for my sisters and I. It's not medically necessary. We have children across this country who are undergoing not-medically-necessary surgeries and this bill will only hurt this future generation, Madam Speaker. We can stick our fingers in our ears and we can pretend that this is not happening. We can say surgery is not happening or doctors won't do this or doctors don't do this, Madam Speaker, but I prefer to look at the stark realities, it is and it will.

Madam Speaker, when I come to work in this State House, there is nothing that makes me happier than seeing Maine people fill the halls, to sit in the balcony. I don't agree with all of them, but this is the People's House and I love to see them speaking up and making their voices heard on the issues that they care about. They take time away from their busy lives, some of them bring their children and they come and speak to us, to advocate, to petition their government. And I'm tired of their government not listening to them, Madam Speaker. Madam Speaker, when the public hearing for LD 227 was tucked away in an obscure Committee with no publicly available language and only three days' notice to the public, over 400 people turned out in opposition to this bill. There was five times the testimony in opposition than there was in support. Madam Speaker, from the way I've heard people talking in the Chamber tonight, I would've expected thousands of testimonies in support; this is a bill that Maine needs, we must have it, the people demand it. There was no such outcry, Madam Speaker. None. No busloads of people. If I were the one that put forward a bill with five times the opposition to the support, I would think, perhaps I should amend my agenda, but that's just me. I've heard justifications and explanations about why the testimony of those in opposition should be ignored or negated by voting for this bill, but it all comes down to the same thing; asserting our dominance over those we supposedly serve to advance an extreme bill that strips not just Maine parents, but parents across the country of their parental rights that harms future generations.

Madam Speaker, if this bill passes; when this bill passes, there will come a time where future generations will look back at what we did tonight and say, 'what were they thinking?' What were they thinking, Madam Speaker, when they passed a bill that will irreparably harm the children of our State and of this nation, that will forever change their futures, that will drive some of them to drastic actions, the very actions we are supposedly preventing? Madam Speaker, I don't know when, but at some point, there will be a reckoning and we will understand the drastic impact of this terrible legislation. Madam Speaker, let's respect the wishes of Maine citizens who have spoken up so definitively in defense of our children. Let's support parental rights and let's protect and shield Maine children.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the Representative from Portland, Representative Moonen.

Representative **MOONEN**: Thank you, Madam Speaker. Madam Speaker, Colleagues of the House, there's been so much said tonight, I don't even know where to start, but I will try and find a way forward.

The Representative who just spoke asked if anybody had read the bill. I have. She claimed that because we were saying abortion and gender-affirming care are a legal right in this State and that the right can't be interfered with, that that means there are no parental rights for minors. The reason she's wrong is in the very first sentence of the bill, and I would like to read that sentence to you, Madam Speaker. It reads, "the Legislature finds and declares that … Access to gender-affirming health care services and reproductive health care services in this State, as authorized under the laws of this State, is a legal right." Madam Speaker, as the Chair of the Judiciary Committee, with many years of service on that Committee, I'm the person; one of the people; who has jurisdiction over parental rights when it comes to consent to health care for minors. Let me tell you, parental consent is required for all health care for minors, with a few exceptions. So, when the bill says 'as authorized under the laws of this State,' that means that we acknowledge that the law says that health care for minors requires parental consent.

Now, I did mention there are some exceptions. We actually had a bill about this last year that was trying to get rid of all of these exceptions. A few of those exceptions are a minor without parental consent can pursue STI testing and treatment, a minor can pursue mental health care, substance use treatment, sexual assault forensic exams, they can give blood and, yes, Madam Speaker, a minor can get an abortion in the State of Maine without parental consent. But a minor cannot get gender-affirming surgeries, puberty blockers or lots of other gender-affirming care services in the State of Maine without parental consent. There is nothing in this bill that changes our parental consent laws. Nothing.

Now, there is one minor exception to that, that we did pass last year, that deals with 16- and 17-year-olds who can access hormones. It was a very rigorously worked bill, requires a diagnosis of gender dysphoria, requires many months of documented counseling, there has to be evidence that the minor sought the support of their parents and were rejected; there's all

kinds of criteria that have to be met, but even then, you have to be 16 or 17; only for hormones, this is well after puberty blockers would be helpful; there's no surgery at all in this. So, one more time, when the bill says 'as authorized by the laws of this State,' that means that we recognize that parental consent is required for minors' health care.

I've also heard concern that this bill would say abortion is a legal right. Well, I've got news for you, Madam Speaker; Maine Law already says that, it's in Title 22, so, I don't think it's that big of a deal to say it again.

I've heard concern about full faith and credit and how we're going to interact with other states. I want to emphasize that this bill would not prohibit law enforcement cooperation with other states for crimes that were committed in those states. But it would say that those states cannot pursue prosecutions for legal activity that was engaged in here in the State of Maine.

I've heard concerns about kidnapping and trafficking. It feels obvious, but kidnapping is illegal in every state in this country, so is trafficking. If you cross state lines, it's not just a crime in the state where it started; if you cross state lines, it's actually a federal crime. This bill doesn't change any of that, nor could we if we wanted to.

I've heard concerns that law enforcement wasn't consulted on this bill. That's not true. I would like to quote for you from an article from the *Maine Morningstar* this morning. It reads, in part, I skip ahead, "legal authorities in Maine, however, say arguments that the bill would facilitate criminal activity are simply not accurate. In an email to *Maine Morningstar*, Attorney General Frey said the bill makes no changes to criminal law nor does it legalize any current illegal behavior." Madam Speaker, the Attorney General of the State of Maine is the top law enforcement officer of the State of Maine. The article continues, "there is no reading of the bill that would authorize criminal acts like kidnapping or trafficking." And in testimony on March 5th, the Maine Prosecutors' Association, also law enforcement, said the bill doesn't make any adjustments to State Law that would affect the group's ability to prosecute Maine's criminal Statutes. In an interview, the association's Executive Director, Shira Burns, agreed with Frey that claims the bill would promote kidnapping or trafficking are not grounded in reality. If such actions took place, those responsible could be prosecuted under existing laws regardless of whether LD 227 passes, she said. Shira Burns also pointed to a section of the bill that says a court cannot issue a summons or warrant if someone providing legally protected health care in Maine is being prosecuted under the laws of another state, unless required by federal law or unless the conduct constitutes a criminal offense under State law. Quote, "we do think lawmakers were purposefully and carefully carving out to make sure that this would not shield prosecution of criminal conduct, Burns said." The article goes on to say, "furthermore, in response to concerns about the bill, lawmakers from the HCIFS Committee;" and I take exception to that Committee being referred to as obscure, even though I've never served on that Committee; "lawmakers on that Committee amended the measure in March before moving it forward, narrowing the bill to provide protection specifically for health care professionals and those who assist them, rather than offering protections for any person." So, the Attorney General was consulted, the Prosecutors' Association was consulted, I know folks in the criminal division of the Attorney General's office were consulted. I can't think of anyone in the State of Maine in law enforcement who are more respected than the lead of the criminal division of the Attorney General's office. She is amazing, everybody respects her.

I've heard concerns about the language in the bill around cooperation and extradition. The Executive Order issued by the Chief Executive nearly two years ago in response to the *Dobbs* decision already addresses law enforcement cooperation and extradition. I'd like to tell you; well, paraphrase what it said. That Executive Order, that has been in effect for two years, prohibits cooperating with another state's investigation into a person, organization or health care provider for delivering abortion care in Maine. The world has not ended since that Executive Order was issued nearly two years ago. In fact, I would argue that that Executive Order was critical, has been necessary and, I hate to have to say it, but Executive Orders can come and go with the Executive who issued them. That's why we need a law that makes these protections permanent rather than subject to future Executive Orders.

I've heard concerns that Maine will be a sanctuary State. You've heard it several times, but I'll say it again, 17 states already have laws like this. We would be joining many states that have already done this, and they are doing this in response to the other states that are banning and criminalizing health care. And they are doing these laws so that their providers will be protected from adverse actions by those states that are criminalizing health care. Just yesterday, Madam Speaker, I spoke about the reinstatement of an 1864 law in Arizona that requires a two-year mandatory minimum for providers of abortion. That law is in effect in Arizona right now. Two years mandatory minimum. That's the example of why we should be protecting our providers here in Maine.

Finally, Madam Speaker, I'll close with acknowledging the person who spoke before me, the Representative who spoke before me, she said that someday, they will ask what were they thinking. Madam Speaker, I've been part of many, many, many debates on LGBTQ issues in this Body and in this State for many, many years. In my experience, these issues always move one way, and when they ask what were they thinking, it's never about my side. Thank you, Madam Speaker.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the Representative from Chelsea, Representative Lemelin.

Representative **LEMELIN**: Thank you, Madam Speaker. Before I give my testimony, I would like to thank the gentleman from Portland for his humor. He is the Chair of the Committee and is one of the few that had the language of the bill for a long time, so, it's easy for him to quote it. The people of Maine and Republicans were left out. We didn't have the language. As a matter of fact, I still don't have it on my tablet. Also, in his quote for lawmakers, he only quoted Democrats. Very unfair.

Now, Madam Speaker, were you not taught as a child not to play with fire? This bill, 227, is the purest form of evil, ever.

Representative **MALON**: Point of Order.

The SPEAKER: The Member will defer. The Chair recognizes the Representative from Biddeford, Representative Malon.

Representative **MALON**: I apologize, Madam Speaker, but I'm pretty sure saying the bill is evil is questioning the motives of those who support it.

On **POINT OF ORDER,** Representative MALON of Biddeford objected to the comments of Representative LEMELIN of Chelsea because he was questioning the motives of other Members of the House.

The SPEAKER: The Member may proceed.

Representative **LEMELIN**: Thank you, Madam Speaker. This bill was influenced by Lucifer himself. Gender dysphoria --

The SPEAKER: The Member will defer. The Chair has given quite a bit of latitude here; quite a bit of latitude here, and you are getting dangerously; very dangerously close to questioning the motives and impugning the character. The Chair will allow the Member to continue to speak, in hopes that the Member will speak about the bill, offer opinions, without implying very, very dangerous conceptions about some of the Members in this Chamber.

The Chair reminded Representative LEMELIN of Chelsea that it was inappropriate to question the motives of other Members of the House.

The SPEAKER: The Member may proceed.

Representative **LEMELIN**: Madam Speaker, my intent is the bill. I'm talking about the bill and the language of the bill.

The SPEAKER: The Member may proceed.

Representative **LEMELIN**: Thank you. Now that we have covered the pros and cons of this bill, I want to cover the one thing nobody has bothered with. Something to consider, Madam Speaker, are the consequences to our actions, and nobody's covered that.

God has given us free will and he allows us a large path of leeway; just like you, Madam Speaker. However, he draws a line in the sand. When we cross that line, there's consequences. History has shown this. Noah, Sodom, Babel, the seven-year drought proves that God will allow so much immorality before he steps in. Back in those days, people knew God.

Representative **ROBERTS**: Point of Order.

The SPEAKER: The Member will defer. The Chair recognizes the Representative from South Berwick, Representative Roberts.

Representative **ROBERTS**: Thank you, Madam Speaker. The Member's comments are not at all germane to the bill.

On **POINT OF ORDER,** Representative ROBERTS of South Berwick asked the Chair if the remarks of Representative LEMELIN of Chelsea were germane to the pending question.

The SPEAKER: The Member may proceed.

Representative **LEMELIN**: Thank you, Madam Speaker. The people then knew God and could not use excuses like climate change, guns or racism for the tragedies that happened due to the effect of their choices; immoral choices. Today, we self-justify everything. We blame others instead of ourselves.

When you passed LD 227's sister, 1619, I told many people that there would be five consequences to 1619 passing. We just had four storms that wreaked havoc on Maine. I will get to the fifth event in a moment. If 227 passes, you will not believe the consequences for refusing to honor the five warnings given for passing 1619 by stop passing immoral laws like LD 227.

Abortion is murder, transgender is a slap in God's face. You are telling Jesus he made a mistake. This is a big, big mistake. Madam Speaker, you may have that kind of courage; I don't. LD 227 will have severe consequences. I'm announcing it. Instead of announcing it to five or six people, I'm telling all of you.

And now, I'm going to tell you the fifth consequence, because I told you four; the storms. Meditate on this, Madam Speaker, when 1619 passed and went into law on October 25th, you told God life doesn't matter.

Representative **MALON**: Point of Order.

The SPEAKER: The Member will defer. The Chair recognizes the Representative from Biddeford, Representative Malon.

Representative **MALON**: Thank you, Madam Speaker. The Member is emphatically questioning and impugning the character of other Members of this Chamber, including yourself.

On **POINT OF ORDER,** Representative MALON of Biddeford objected to the comments of Representative LEMELIN of Chelsea because he was questioning the motives of other Members of the House.

The SPEAKER: The Chair has given quite a bit of latitude out of respect for the Member to be able to express an opinion about the bill; a lot of latitude out of respect for the Member to be able to express an opinion about a bill. The Chair asks that the Member get to the point and stay germane to the bill. Otherwise, the Chair will have to rule in a different way very soon. You have come very close.

The Chair reminded Representative LEMELIN of Chelsea that it was inappropriate to question the motives of other Members of the House.

The SPEAKER: The Member may proceed.

Representative **LEMELIN**: Thank you. I only have one sentence left. Keep in mind that the law came into effect on October 25th. God heard you, and the horrible events on October 25th happened. Thank you.

Representative **MALON**: Point of Order.

The SPEAKER: The Member may; the Chair recognizes the Representative from Biddeford, Representative Malon.

Representative **MALON**: Thank you, Madam Speaker. I'm pretty certain that implying that the passage of legislation caused a horrible and horrific evil tragedy is impugning the character of every Member of this Chamber, and I would request that he stand down.

On **POINT OF ORDER,** Representative MALON of Biddeford objected to the comments of Representative LEMELIN of Chelsea because he was questioning the motives of other Members of the House.

The SPEAKER: The Chair finds that the Member is out of order. The Chair finds that the comments made violate the decorum of this Chamber. The Chair finds if the Member continues to make comments in this manner, the Member will continue to be out of order and additional steps will be taken.

The Chair recognizes the Representative from Fairfield, Representative Rudnicki.

Representative **RUDNICKI**: Thank you, Madam Speaker. I just wanted to stand and say that I agree with Representative Lemelin and everything he said. Thank you.

Representative **TERRY**: Point of Order.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the Representative from Gorham, Representative Terry.

Representative **TERRY**: That is absolutely out of order, non-germane to the bill and absolutely offensive.

On **POINT OF ORDER,** Representative TERRY of Gorham asked the Chair if the remarks of Representative RUDNICKI of Fairfield were germane to the pending question.

The SPEAKER: The Chair finds the Member out of order.

The Chair recognizes the Representative from Palermo, Representative Smith.

Representative **SMITH**: Thank you, Madam Speaker. I just want to ask us all to refocus on the bill here. It does have some very important elements. This has been a hard and emotional night for everyone, I think. I think some people have some passionate thoughts and ideas. We are separated by a large divide and it's quite unfortunate, but we need to do what we need to do. A lot of us have spoken from the heart. I just ask everyone to consider the serious issues here and vote how their constituents would want them to vote and how their conscience tells them to. Thank you.

The SPEAKER: A roll call has been ordered. The pending question before the House is Acceptance of the Majority Ought to Pass as Amended Report. All those in favor will vote yes, those opposed will vote no.

ROLL CALL NO. 494

YEA - Abdi, Ankeles, Arford, Beck, Bell, Boyle, Brennan, Bridgeo, Cloutier, Cluchey, Collings, Copeland, Crafts, Craven, Crockett, Dhalac, Dill, Dodge, Doudera, Eaton, Fay, Gattine, Geiger, Gere, Golek, Graham, Gramlich, Hasenfus, Hepler, Hobbs, Jauch, Kessler, Kuhn, Landry, LaRochelle, Lee, Lookner, Madigan, Malon, Mastraccio, Mathieson, Matlack, Meyer, Millett R, Milliken, Montell, Moonen, Moriarty, Murphy, O'Connell, O'Neil, Osher, Perry A, Perry J, Pluecker, Pringle, Rana, Rielly, Riseman, Roberts, Roeder, Runte, Russell, Sachs, Salisbury, Sargent, Sayre, Shagoury, Shaw, Sheehan, Sinclair, Skold, Stover, Supica, Terry, Warren, Worth, Zager, Zeigler, Madam Speaker.

NAY - Adams, Albert, Andrews, Arata, Ardell, Babin, Bagshaw, Blier, Boyer, Bradstreet, Campbell, Carlow, Carmichael, Collamore, Costain, Cray, Cyrway, Davis, Drinkwater, Ducharme, Dunphy, Faulkingham, Foster, Fredericks, Galletta, Gifford, Greenwood, Griffin, Guerrette, Haggan, Hall, Henderson, Hymes, Jackson, Javner, Lajoie, Lanigan, Lavigne, Lemelin, Libby, Lyman, Mason, Millett H, Morris, Ness, Newman, Nutting, Parry, Paul, Perkins, Poirier, Polewarczyk, Pomerleau, Quint, Rudnicki, Sampson, Schmersal-Burgess, Simmons, Smith, Soboleski, Strout, Swallow, Theriault, Thorne, Underwood, Walker, White B, White J, Wood, Woodsome.

ABSENT - NONE.

Yes, 80; No, 70; Absent, 0; Vacant, 1; Excused, 0.

80 having voted in the affirmative and 70 voted in the negative, 1 vacancy, and accordingly the Majority **Ought to Pass as Amended** Report was **ACCEPTED**.

The Bill was **READ ONCE**. **Committee Amendment "A" (H-953)** was **READ** by the Clerk and **ADOPTED**.

Under suspension of the rules the Bill was given its **SECOND READING WITHOUT REFERENCE** to the Committee on **Bills in the Second Reading**.

Under further suspension of the rules the Bill was **PASSED TO BE ENGROSSED as Amended by Committee Amendment "A" (H-953)**.

Subsequently, Representative MOONEN of Portland moved that the House **RECONSIDER** its action whereby the Bill was **PASSED TO BE ENGROSSED as Amended by Committee Amendment "A" (H-953)**.

The same Representative **REQUESTED** a roll call on the motion to **RECONSIDER** whereby the Bill was **PASSED TO BE ENGROSSED as Amended by Committee Amendment "A" (H-953)**.

More than one-fifth of the members present expressed a desire for a roll call which was ordered.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the Representative from Winter Harbor, Representative Faulkingham.

Representative **FAULKINGHAM**: Madam Speaker, may I ask why a Roll Call is in order?

The SPEAKER: The Member has asked for a Roll Call and Reconsideration and one-fifth of the Members indicated requesting a Roll Call. A sufficient number having requested a Roll Call, a Roll Call is in order on Reconsideration.

The Chair is going to have to have a moment to recognize you in order for me to then hear what you want to say. The Chair recognizes the Representative from Winter Harbor, Representative Faulkingham.

Representative **FAULKINGHAM**: Madam Speaker, I'll just speak in plain words rather than try to speak in parliamentary words. I am not objecting to the Reconsideration, I don't believe that a Roll Call is necessary.

The SPEAKER: The Chair would advise the Member that a Member asked for a reconsideration to the Roll Call and a Roll Call is in order.

A roll call has been ordered. The pending question before the House is Reconsideration whereby the Bill was Passed to be Engrossed as Amended by Committee Amendment "A" (H-953). All those in favor will vote yes, those opposed will vote no.

ROLL CALL NO. 495

YEA - Adams, Albert, Andrews, Arata, Ardell, Babin, Bagshaw, Blier, Boyer, Bradstreet, Campbell, Carlow, Carmichael, Collamore, Costain, Cray, Cyrway, Davis, Drinkwater, Ducharme, Dunphy, Faulkingham, Foster, Fredericks, Galletta, Gifford, Greenwood, Griffin, Guerrette, Haggan, Hall, Henderson, Hymes, Jackson, Javner, Lanigan, Lavigne, Lemelin, Libby, Lyman, Mason, Morris, Ness, Newman, Parry, Paul, Perkins, Poirier, Polewarczyk, Pomerleau, Quint, Rudnicki, Sampson, Schmersal-Burgess, Simmons, Smith, Soboleski, Strout, Swallow, Theriault, Thorne, Underwood, Walker, White J, Wood, Woodsome.

NAY - Abdi, Ankeles, Arford, Beck, Bell, Boyle, Brennan, Bridgeo, Cloutier, Cluchey, Collings, Copeland, Crafts, Craven, Crockett, Dhalac, Dill, Dodge, Doudera, Eaton, Fay, Gattine, Geiger, Gere, Golek, Graham, Gramlich, Hasenfus, Hepler, Hobbs, Jauch, Kessler, Kuhn, Lajoie, Landry, LaRochelle, Lee, Lookner, Madigan, Malon, Mastraccio, Mathieson, Matlack, Meyer, Millett H, Millett R, Milliken, Montell, Moonen, Moriarty, Murphy, Nutting, O'Connell, O'Neil, Osher, Perry A, Perry J, Pluecker, Pringle, Rana, Rielly, Riseman, Roberts, Roeder, Runte, Russell, Sachs, Salisbury, Sargent, Sayre, Shagoury, Shaw, Sheehan, Sinclair, Skold, Stover, Supica, Terry, Warren, White B, Worth, Zager, Zeigler, Madam Speaker.

ABSENT - NONE.

Yes, 66; No, 84; Absent, 0; Vacant, 1; Excused, 0.

66 having voted in the affirmative and 84 voted in the negative, 1 vacancy with none absent, and accordingly the motion to **RECONSIDER** whereby the Bill was **PASSED TO BE ENGROSSED as Amended by Committee Amendment "A" (H-953) FAILED**.

ORDERED SENT FORTHWITH.

BILLS HELD

HOUSE DIVIDED REPORT - Report "A" (7) **Ought to Pass as Amended by Committee Amendment "A" (H-842)** - Report "B" (4) **Ought Not to Pass** - Report "C" (2) **Ought to Pass as Amended by Committee Amendment "B" (H-843)** - Committee on **HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES** on Bill "An Act to Prohibit Tobacco Sales near Schools"

(H.P. 1383) (L.D. 2157)

- In House, **PASSED TO BE ENGROSSED AS AMENDED BY COMMITTEE AMENDMENT "A" (H-842) AS AMENDED BY HOUSE AMENDMENT "A" (H-942)** thereto.

HELD at the Request of Representative FAULKINGHAM of Winter Harbor.