

Pamela Felice
Bristol
LD 51

I am presenting a Memo from

The Office of The Attorney General of the United States

SUBJECT: Federal Law Protections for Religious Liberty.

Link Here:

<https://www.justice.gov/opa/press-release/file/1001891/download>

I was very impressed by Rep. Drinkwaters's testimony in presentation of this bill, in pointing out how LD 798 is in direct conflict with Maine law and is unconstitutional.

I believe this memo provides further support for his case.

From this memo, I believe sections 2,4,12, 13 & 14 strongly apply to the unlawful and unconstitutional nature of LD798.

Personally, I am the mother of a vaccine injured child and, as a result, after MUCH research, have become religiously and medically opposed to vaccination, in general for the following reasons.

I believe number 14 puts the state of Maine in serious legal jeopardy, as it states...

“Once a religious adherent has identified a substantial burden on his or her religious belief, the federal government can impose that burden on the adherent only if it is the least restrictive means of achieving a compelling governmental interest.”

Let me explain why this should be a deal breaker, legally, for LD798. Prior to LD798, the law stated that if a student utilized any of the three exemptions to vaccination, that the student would be required to stay home in the event of an outbreak of any disease for which said student was not vaccinated against. This is easily facilitated, now, with remote learning.

In other words, the state of Maine already had an alternative in place that was a least restrictive means of achieving the governmental interest. If there's an outbreak, the unvaccinated must stay home (and can participate in remote learning). There has been no incident, in Maine, in which this lesser restrictive means was shown ineffective. A strong case could also be made that there was no crisis which led to this extremely burdensome act by the State of Maine. This point, arguably, deems the law unconstitutional.

Section 13 answers the questions about denominational positions regarding vaccine as it states, “A governmental action substantially burdens an exercise of religion under RFRA if it bans an aspect of an adherent's religious observance or practice, compels an act inconsistent with that observance or practice, or substantially pressures the adherent to modify such observance or practice. Because the government cannot second-guess the reasonableness of a religious belief or the adherent's assessment of the religious connection between the government mandate and the underlying religious belief,” applies to the majority of testimony. that you heard today, whether one is opposed to vaccines due to aborted fetal cells in some vaccines; the concern regarding toxins; the very real risk of injuring a healthy child due to an adverse event; or the fact that all vaccines by pass God's natural design of the immune system through bypassing type 1 immunity and going straight to Type 2 immunity, which is highly inflammatory... or any other reason a citizen sincerely believes vaccines violate the temple of t he Holy Spirit, which is our body.

The courts have ruled that a sincerely held religious conviction is entirely personal and can not be linked to specific denominational positions on a give conviction. For example, while most denominations take no position of vaccines ,per se, most Christians agree on Biblical teachings that can be applied to vaccination, such as we are to treat our bodies as a temple to the Lord; parents have an obligation to make wise decisions for their children and protect them from harm; we are to honor God's

creation (the function of our bodies included) and we are to protect life and do nothing to align ourselves with the industry of abortion.

Thank you for considering this very permanent information.

Regards,

Pamela Felice

<https://www.justice.gov/opa/press-release/file/1001891/download>