

ONE HUNDRED AND THIRTY-SECOND LEGISLATURE
FIRST SPECIAL SESSION
32nd Legislative Day
Monday, June 16, 2025

The House met according to adjournment and was called to order by the Speaker.

The SPEAKER: Before we begin our work this morning, I wanted to ask everyone to stand in a moment of silence for those who were murdered in Minnesota, victims who are in the hospital and those impacted.

At this point, the Members of the House stood and joined in a moment of silence in honor of Minnesota State Representative Melissa Hortman and her husband, Mark, Minnesota State Senator John A. Hoffman and his wife, Yvette, and others impacted.

Prayer by Reverend John Allen, First Parish Church, Brunswick.

National Anthem by First Parish Church Choir, Brunswick.
Pledge of Allegiance.

The Journal of Friday, June 13, 2025 was read and approved.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the Representative from York, Representative Sargent, who wishes to address the House on the record.

Representative **SARGENT**: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to celebrate and recognize Maine Odyssey of the Mind.

Odyssey of the Mind is a worldwide organization that is focused on creative problem solving. Odyssey of the Mind is a vital component of Maine's educational landscape. It fosters critical thinking, collaboration and perseverance. In Maine, Mr. Speaker, we have 650 students who participate in over 100 teams, in over 14 different communities in this extraordinary experience. In fact, some of those teams recently went to the World Finals at Michigan State University, and they are here with us today. Of those teams, I'm very proud to salute that two teams from Biddeford High School finished in the top 10 in one of their competitions and one team from Auburn High School as well.

Odyssey of the Mind is driven by volunteers, committed coaches; including some of my fellow Members who have served as coaches; and to really stress perseverance, collaboration and out-of-the-box thinking. They are a wonderful tribute to Maine's education and something that we are proud to celebrate in the Chamber today. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

SENATE PAPERS
Non-Concurrent Matter

Bill "An Act to Strengthen Maine Citizens' Second Amendment Rights by Allowing the Discharge of Firearms on Private Property That Is Within 500 Feet of School Property in Certain Circumstances"

(H.P. 344) (L.D. 525)

Majority (8) **OUGHT NOT TO PASS** Report of the Committee on **EDUCATION AND CULTURAL AFFAIRS READ** and **ACCEPTED** in the House on May 27, 2025.

Came from the Senate with the Minority (5) **OUGHT TO PASS** Report of the Committee on **EDUCATION AND CULTURAL AFFAIRS READ** and **ACCEPTED** and the Bill **PASSED TO BE ENGROSSED** in **NON-CONCURRENCE**.

Speaker FECTEAU of Biddeford moved that the House **INSIST**.

Representative MORRIS of Turner moved that the House **RECEDE AND CONCUR**.

Representative MOONEN of Portland **REQUESTED** a roll call on the motion to **RECEDE AND CONCUR**.

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, Mr. Speaker. I rise to speak in support of the pending motion.

This was my bill. All this bill does; everybody has the right to defend their own premises in the case of being attacked or being under threat on their home property. The law currently is not clear whether someone can be charged with a crime if their property happens to be within 500 feet of a school zone. And the case that I brought this forward, it was because of a constituent whose land happens to abut school property, is nowhere near the school itself. This is a common occurrence in Maine, particularly in rural areas. All this does is we are seeking to clarify that if somebody, in their capacity of defending their premises, it happens to fall within that zone, that they will not be charged with the crime of discharging a firearm, the same way I would not be charged with discharging a firearm for that purpose on my own property.

This is really just a clarification to put in Statute and put in law, so that no one ever can be charged with it. I would encourage this Body to support this very reasonable piece of legislation and support the pending motion. Thank you.

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

ROLL CALL NO. 505

YEA - Albert, Arata, Archer, Ardell, Babin, Bagshaw, Bishop, Blier, Boyer D, Campbell, Carlow, Caruso, Chapman, Cimino, Collamore, Collins, Cooper, Cray, Daigle, Dill, Drinkwater, Ducharme, Eder, Faulkingham, Flynn, Foley, Foster, Fredericks, Fredette, Gifford, Greenwood, Guerrette, Haggan, Hall, Henderson, Hymes, Jackson, Javner, Lance, Lemelin, Libby, Lyman, Mason, McIntyre, Mingo, Morris, Nutting, Olsen, Parry, Paul, Perkins, Pluecker, Poirier, Pomerleau, Quint, Rudnicki, Schmearsal-Burgess, Simmons, Smith, Soboleski, Strout, Swallow, Thorne, Tuell, Wadsworth, White J, White R, Wood P, Wood S.

NAY - Abdi, Ankeles, Arford, Beck, Bell, Boyer M, Bridgeo, Bunker, Cloutier, Cluchey, Crafts, DeBrito, Dhalac, Dodge, Doudera, Faircloth, Farrin, Friedmann, Frost, Gattine, Geiger, Gere, Golek, Graham, Gramlich, Hasenfus, Hepler, Julia, Kessler, Kuhn, Lajoie, Lee, Lookner, Macias, Malon, Mastraccio, Mathieson, Matlack, McCabe, Meyer, Milliken,

Mitchell, Montell, Moonen, Murphy, O'Halloran, Osher, Pugh, Ray, Rielly, Roberts, Roeder, Rollins, Runte, Sachs, Salisbury, Sargent, Sato, Sayre, Shagoury, Sinclair, Skold, Stover, Supica, Terry, Warren, Webb, Yusuf, Zager, Mr. Speaker.

ABSENT - Adams, Brennan, Copeland, Crockett, Lanigan, Lavigne, Rana, Underwood, Walker, Woodsome.

Yes, 69; No, 70; Absent, 10; Vacant, 0; Excused, 2.

69 having voted in the affirmative and 70 voted in the negative, with 10 being absent and 2 excused, and accordingly the motion to **RECEDE AND CONCUR FAILED**.

Subsequently, the House voted to **INSIST**.

Non-Concurrent Matter

An Act to Provide That Spouses and Children of Corrections Officers Who Die in the Line of Duty Receive a Pension (MANDATE)

(H.P. 733) (L.D. 1114)

(C. "A" H-597)

PASSED TO BE ENACTED in the House on June 10, 2025.

Came from the Senate **FAILING** of **PASSAGE TO BE ENACTED** in **NON-CONCURRENCE**.

The House voted to **INSIST**.

Non-Concurrent Matter

Bill "An Act to Replace Participation Thresholds with Approval Thresholds in Certain School, Municipal and County Measures"

(H.P. 1002) (L.D. 1517)

Report "A" (6) **OUGHT TO PASS AS AMENDED** of the Committee on **STATE AND LOCAL GOVERNMENT READ** and **ACCEPTED** and the Bill **PASSED TO BE ENGROSSED AS AMENDED BY COMMITTEE AMENDMENT "A" (H-578)** in the House on June 10, 2025.

Came from the Senate with Report "B" (6) **OUGHT NOT TO PASS** of the Committee on **STATE AND LOCAL GOVERNMENT READ** and **ACCEPTED** in **NON-CONCURRENCE**.

Speaker FECTEAU of Biddeford moved that the House **INSIST**.

Representative GREENWOOD of Wales moved that the House **RECEDE AND CONCUR**.

Representative MOONEN of Portland **REQUESTED** a roll call on the motion to **RECEDE AND CONCUR**.

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 Wales, Representative Greenwood.

Representative **GREENWOOD**: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I do rise in support of the Recede and Concur motion. In this instance, I do not believe we should be lowering the thresholds on those off-year elections. So, I will be supporting the measure to Recede and Concur. Thank you.

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

Representative **SATO**: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I will not be supporting the motion; just to say that this bill does not lower thresholds, it replaces one threshold with another type of threshold. Thank you.

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

ROLL CALL NO. 506

YEA - Albert, Arata, Ardell, Babin, Bagshaw, Bishop, Blier, Boyer D, Campbell, Carlow, Caruso, Chapman, Cimino, Collamore, Collins, Cooper, Cray, Daigle, Drinkwater, Ducharme, Eder, Faulkingham, Flynn, Foley, Foster, Fredericks, Fredette, Gifford, Greenwood, Guerrette, Haggan, Hall, Henderson, Hymes, Jackson, Javner, Lance, Lemelin, Libby, Lyman, Mason, McIntyre, Mingo, Morris, Nutting, Olsen, Parry, Paul, Perkins, Poirier, Pomerleau, Quint, Rudnicki, Runte, Schmursal-Burgess, Simmons, Smith, Soboleski, Strout, Swallow, Thorne, Tuell, Wadsworth, White J, White R, Wood P, Wood S.

NAY - Abdi, Ankeles, Archer, Arford, Beck, Bell, Boyer M, Bridgeo, Bunker, Cloutier, Cluchey, Crafts, DeBrito, Dhalac, Dill, Dodge, Doudera, Faircloth, Farrin, Friedmann, Frost, Gattine, Geiger, Gere, Golek, Graham, Gramlich, Hasenfus, Hepler, Julia, Kessler, Kuhn, Lajoie, Lee, Lookner, Macias, Malon, Mastraccio, Mathieson, Matlack, McCabe, Meyer, Milliken, Mitchell, Montell, Moonen, Murphy, O'Halloran, Osher, Pluecker, Pugh, Rana, Ray, Rielly, Roberts, Roeder, Rollins, Sachs, Salisbury, Sargent, Sato, Sayre, Shagoury, Sinclair, Skold, Stover, Supica, Terry, Warren, Webb, Yusuf, Zager, Mr. Speaker.

ABSENT - Adams, Brennan, Copeland, Crockett, Lanigan, Lavigne, Underwood, Walker, Woodsome.

Yes, 67; No, 73; Absent, 9; Vacant, 0; Excused, 2.

67 having voted in the affirmative and 73 voted in the negative, with 9 being absent and 2 excused, and accordingly the motion to **RECEDE AND CONCUR FAILED**.

Subsequently, the House voted to **INSIST**.

By unanimous consent, all matters having been acted upon were **ORDERED SENT FORTHWITH**.

Non-Concurrent Matter

Bill "An Act to Protect Maine People from Inflation by Exempting Gold and Silver Coins and Bullion from the State Sales and Use Tax"

(S.P. 164) (L.D. 372)

Minority (6) **OUGHT NOT TO PASS** Report of the Committee on **TAXATION READ** and **ACCEPTED** in the House on June 12, 2025.

Came from the Senate with that Body having **INSISTED** on its former action whereby the Majority (7) **OUGHT TO PASS AS AMENDED** Report of the Committee on **TAXATION** was **READ** and **ACCEPTED** and the Bill **PASSED TO BE ENGROSSED AS AMENDED BY COMMITTEE AMENDMENT "A" (S-353)** in **NON-CONCURRENCE**.

Speaker FECTEAU of Biddeford moved that the House **INSIST**.

Representative FAULKINGHAM of Winter Harbor **REQUESTED** a roll call on the motion to **INSIST**.

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

Representative GREENWOOD of Wales moved that the House **RECEDE AND CONCUR**.

Representative MOONEN of Portland **REQUESTED** a roll call on the motion to **RECEDE AND CONCUR**.

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 Albion, Representative Flynn.

Representative **FLYNN**: Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I have in my possession a 1964 American silver quarter.

The SPEAKER: The Member will defer. The Chair will remind the Member that props are not permitted on the floor.

The Chair reminded Representative FLYNN of Albion that no props were allowed during the floor debate.

The SPEAKER: The Member may proceed.

Representative **FLYNN**: In 1964, a gallon of gasoline was approximately 25 cents. An American citizen would've gone to the gas station and paid with a 90% silver coin. At that time, 25 cents represented one-quarter of one ounce of the value of an ounce of silver. In 2025, a gallon of gasoline is now approaching \$3.50 to \$4.00 per gallon. That same silver quarter today, given today's melt value, is worth \$6.56.

The difference between now and 61 years ago is the inflation of our currencies through the issuance of fiat currencies, our appetite for debt continues. As such, to hedge inflation, Americans and Mainers have found a safe haven in precious metals, the same metals that was used as our currencies for 164 years. Yet in the State of Maine, with every purchase of precious metals, we assess sales tax.

Given the state of the economy, there are many, many, many Mainers that are moving to precious metals to hedge inflation for their investment portfolios. And unfortunately, Maine is one of those states that remains a state that levies a sales tax on the purchase of money. It's no secret, then, that people are going to act in such a fashion that they're going to buy from dealers or buy from areas where they can avoid the sales tax. In addition, every single year in the United States of America, there are national coin shows that attract many, many thousands of people from literally all over the world. Those same promoters will not have a promotion in the State of Maine, because we would be subjecting to sales tax.

So, today, I stand and I urge this Body to relinquish the sales tax on money and bring us into parity with other states and relieve us of the sales tax on gold and silver. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the Representative from Wales, Representative Greenwood.

Representative **GREENWOOD**: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I, too, rise in support of the Recede and Concur motion and thank the Representative from Albion for his words.

As we've seen in recent years, inflation can erode the purchasing power of the dollar, leaving many families and individuals struggling to maintain their standard of living. In times of economic uncertainty, people often look to precious metals like gold and silver as a hedge against inflation, preserving wealth in times of financial instability.

Paying tax on gold and silver is the equivalent of paying sales tax on an ATM withdrawal at your local bank or credit union. Gold and silver is currency, Mr. Speaker. It's outlined in the Constitution in Article I, Section 10. However, the current taxation on gold and silver and bullion exacerbates the financial challenges faced by everyday Mainers. By taxing these valuable assets, the State is discouraging individuals from investing in precious metals and ultimately reducing their ability to protect their savings and investments.

In fact, 45 states have already ended sales tax, Mr. Speaker. New Hampshire was just one of them. Of the five remaining states that still levy this tax, four of them are considering legislation to eliminate it this year. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the Representative from Arundel, Representative Parry.

Representative **PARRY**: Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. As somebody that lives in York County, this is just one more reason for people to go to New Hampshire. We keep adding taxes that people won't pay in New Hampshire, or in this case, we have a tax that they don't have in New Hampshire.

Currently, an ounce of gold is around \$3,300, which is that's what it would cost you in New Hampshire. In Maine, it would cost almost another \$200 just from the tax. We've got to stop pushing business to New Hampshire. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

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

ROLL CALL NO. 507

YEA - Albert, Arata, Ardell, Babin, Bagshaw, Bishop, Blier, Boyer D, Campbell, Carlow, Caruso, Chapman, Cimino, Cluchey, Collamore, Collins, Cooper, Cray, Daigle, Drinkwater, Ducharme, Eder, Faulkingham, Flynn, Foley, Foster, Fredericks, Fredette, Gifford, Greenwood, Guerrette, Haggan, Hall, Henderson, Hymes, Jackson, Javner, Lance, Lemelin, Libby, Lyman, Mason, McIntyre, Mingo, Morris, Nutting, Olsen, Parry, Paul, Perkins, Poirier, Pomerleau, Quint, Rudnicki, Schmearsal-Burgess, Simmons, Sinclair, Smith, Soboleski, Strout, Swallow, Thorne, Tuell, Wadsworth, White J, White R, Wood P, Wood S.

NAY - Abdi, Ankeles, Archer, Arford, Beck, Bell, Boyer M, Bridgeo, Bunker, Cloutier, Crafts, DeBrito, Dhalac, Dill, Dodge, Doudera, Faircloth, Farrin, Friedmann, Frost, Gattine, Geiger, Gere, Golek, Graham, Gramlich, Hasenfus, Hepler, Julia, Kessler, Kuhn, Lajoie, Lee, Lookner, Macias, Malon, Mastraccio, Mathieson, Matlack, McCabe, Meyer, Milliken, Mitchell, Montell, Moonen, Murphy, O'Halloran, Osher, Pluecker, Pugh, Rana, Ray, Rielly, Roberts, Roeder, Rollins, Runte, Sachs, Salisbury, Sargent, Sato, Sayre, Shagoury, Skold, Stover, Supica, Terry, Warren, Webb, Yusuf, Zager, Mr. Speaker.

ABSENT - Adams, Brennan, Copeland, Crockett, Lanigan, Lavigne, Underwood, Walker, Woodsome.

Yes, 68; No, 72; Absent, 9; Vacant, 0; Excused, 2.

68 having voted in the affirmative and 72 voted in the negative, with 9 being absent and 2 excused, and accordingly the motion to **RECEDE AND CONCUR FAILED**.

Subsequently, Representative FAULKINGHAM of Winter Harbor **WITHDREW** his **REQUEST** for a roll call.

Subsequently, the House voted to **INSIST**.

Under suspension of the rules, members were allowed to remove their jackets.

Non-Concurrent Matter

Bill "An Act to Amend the Maine Death with Dignity Act to Ensure Access by Qualified Patients"

(H.P. 381) (L.D. 613)

PASSED TO BE ENGROSSED AS AMENDED BY COMMITTEE AMENDMENT "A" (H-433) in the House on June 10, 2025.

Came from the Senate **PASSED TO BE ENGROSSED AS AMENDED BY COMMITTEE AMENDMENT "A" (H-433) AS AMENDED BY SENATE AMENDMENT "A" (S-365)** thereto in **NON-CONCURRENCE**.

Speaker FECTEAU of Biddeford moved that the House **RECEDE AND CONCUR**.

Representative JAVNER of Chester **REQUESTED** a roll call on the motion to **RECEDE AND CONCUR**.

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

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

ROLL CALL NO. 508

YEA - Abdi, Ankeles, Archer, Arford, Beck, Bell, Boyer M, Brennan, Bridgeo, Bunker, Cloutier, Cluchey, Crafts, DeBrito, Dhalac, Dill, Dodge, Doudera, Faircloth, Farrin, Fredericks, Friedmann, Frost, Gattine, Geiger, Gere, Graham, Gramlich, Hasenfus, Hepler, Julia, Kessler, Kuhn, Lajoie, Lee, Lookner, Macias, Malon, Mastraccio, Mathieson, Matlack, McCabe, Meyer, Milliken, Mitchell, Montell, Moonen, Murphy, O'Halloran, Olsen, Osher, Parry, Pluecker, Pugh, Rana, Ray, Rielly, Roberts, Roeder, Rollins, Runte, Sachs, Salisbury, Sargent, Sato, Sayre, Shagoury, Sinclair, Skold, Stover, Supica, Terry, Warren, Webb, White R, Wood S, Yusuf, Zager, Mr. Speaker.

NAY - Albert, Arata, Ardell, Babin, Bagshaw, Bishop, Blier, Boyer D, Campbell, Carlow, Caruso, Chapman, Cimino, Collamore, Collins, Cooper, Cray, Daigle, Drinkwater, Ducharme, Eder, Faulkingham, Flynn, Foley, Foster, Fredette, Gifford, Greenwood, Guerrette, Haggan, Hall, Henderson, Hymes, Jackson, Javner, Lance, Lavigne, Lemelin, Libby, Lyman, Mason, McIntyre, Mingo, Morris, Nutting, Paul, Perkins, Poirier, Pomerleau, Quint, Rudnicki, Schmursal-Burgess, Simmons, Smith, Soboleski, Strout, Swallow, Thorne, Tuell, Wadsworth, White J, Wood P.

ABSENT - Adams, Copeland, Crockett, Golek, Lanigan, Underwood, Walker, Woodsome.

Yes, 79; No, 62; Absent, 8; Vacant, 0; Excused, 2.

79 having voted in the affirmative and 62 voted in the negative, with 8 being absent and 2 excused, and accordingly the House voted to **RECEDE AND CONCUR**.

By unanimous consent, all matters having been acted upon were **ORDERED SENT FORTHWITH**.

Non-Concurrent Matter

Bill "An Act to Allow Municipalities to Prohibit Firearms Within Their Municipal Buildings and Voting Places and at Their Municipal Public Proceedings"

(H.P. 1161) (L.D. 1743)

Minority (6) **OUGHT NOT TO PASS** Report of the Committee on **JUDICIARY READ** and **ACCEPTED** in the House on June 12, 2025.

Came from the Senate with the Majority (7) **OUGHT TO PASS** Report of the Committee on **JUDICIARY READ** and **ACCEPTED** and the Bill **PASSED TO BE ENGROSSED IN NON-CONCURRENCE**.

Speaker FECTEAU of Biddeford moved that the House **RECEDE AND CONCUR**.

Representative FAULKINGHAM of Winter Harbor **REQUESTED** a roll call on the motion to **RECEDE AND CONCUR**.

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 Brunswick, Representative Arford.

Representative **ARFORD**: Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I will be brief.

I am standing now in support of the Recede and Concur, and I want to read from you the testimony from Kate Dufour of; just a very small part of it; of the Maine Municipal Association. At the end, she wrote: "Finally, it is important to note that during our policy committee's debate;" which is comprised of 70 members from 70 towns --

The SPEAKER: The Member will defer. The Chair will remind the Member to address her comments to the Chair.

The Chair reminded Representative ARFORD of Brunswick to address her comments toward the Speaker.

The SPEAKER: The Member may proceed.

Representative **ARFORD**: I'm going to get a neck brace, I promise.

But anyhow, what's important about what I'm telling you now, what I'm trying to impress on my many respected, all the respected, all of you are respected Members of this House, is that this is a motion, voting in favor of this, you will be voting for all the municipalities throughout our State. It may be, because I've heard from some of you that your municipality does not want this, does not see any reason for them to need to prohibit firearms within any of their spaces. However, we have also heard in testimony from 11 mayors. These are municipal officials who submitted a request to pass this bill in testimony; 11 mayors, one city council and one town council as a body, 13 individual municipal officials and as I'm just telling you now, the 70 members of the MMA policy committee voted in favor of this bill, and this is why they did this, and I'll just finish this quote and then leave you to your vote.

"Finally, it is important to note that during our policy committee's debate on this issue, municipal officials were split on whether the authority provided in the bill would benefit their communities." I think we all know that, so, that is not what's at question here. However, all agree that the local legislative body is in the best position possible to make that determination for their community. So, that's what I am asking of you, is to allow every municipality to make that determination for themselves. And there are municipalities right now, listening to this or following this who are scared, and this is a gift we can give them to help alleviate; in some small measure at least; their fears. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the Representative from Camden, Representative Doudera.

Representative **DOUDERA**: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, political violence is a thing. I think we all know that after what has happened this weekend. I just implore my colleagues please give our towns the tools that they need to deal with whatever is in their town as they see fit. Thank you.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the Representative from Skowhegan, Representative Poirier.

Representative **POIRIER**: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I am actually opposed to the pending motion. It violates Maine's preemption law, which prohibits individual cities and towns from making their own gun laws.

There are nearly 500 municipalities in Maine, and we have our preemption law for a good reason. It'd be horribly unreasonable and unfair to Maine people to create a confusing and ever-changing patchwork of gun laws across the State. This bill actually would start chipping away at preemption, setting a very dangerous precedent.

There are already laws on the books that can address the concerns that folks are having, including prohibition of criminal threatening, threatening display of firearms, interference with free passage of individuals in voting places. And Title 18 of the U.S. Code contains very strong prohibition against intimidation of voters. So, we already have measures in place, and this is unnecessary. Thank you.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the Representative from Augusta, Representative Bridgeo.

Representative **BRIDGEO**: Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House. This is an issue that is going to affect different municipalities differently throughout the State. But having lived through some pretty scary circumstances in my prior life and having wished mightily for some opportunity for the City of Augusta to have addressed those very unfortunate situations, I feel pretty passionately that this is really a true matter of local control and something where each of our municipalities should be given the opportunity to address their circumstances as they see best. Thank you.

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

ROLL CALL NO. 509

YEA - Abdi, Ankeles, Archer, Arford, Beck, Bell, Boyer M, Brennan, Bridgeo, Bunker, Cloutier, Cluchey, Crafts, DeBrito, Dhalac, Dill, Dodge, Doudera, Faircloth, Farrin, Friedmann, Gattine, Geiger, Gere, Golek, Graham, Gramlich, Hasenfus, Julia, Kessler, Kuhn, Lajoie, Lee, Lookner, Macias, Malon, Mastraccio, Mathieson, Matlack, McCabe, Meyer, Milliken, Mitchell, Montell, Moonen, Murphy, Osher, Pluecker, Pugh, Rana, Ray, Rielly, Roberts, Roeder, Rollins, Runte, Sachs, Salisbury, Sargent, Sato, Sayre, Shagoury, Sinclair, Skold, Stover, Terry, Warren, Yusuf, Zager, Mr. Speaker.

NAY - Albert, Ardell, Babin, Bagshaw, Bishop, Blier, Boyer D, Carlow, Caruso, Chapman, Cimino, Collamore, Collins, Cooper, Cray, Daigle, Drinkwater, Ducharme, Eder, Faulkingham, Flynn, Foley, Foster, Fredericks, Fredette, Frost, Gifford, Greenwood, Guerrette, Haggan, Hall, Henderson, Hepler, Hymes, Jackson, Javner, Lance, Lavigne, Lemelin, Libby, Lyman, Mason, McIntyre, Mingo, Morris, Nutting, O'Halloran, Olsen, Parry, Paul, Perkins, Poirier, Pomerleau, Quint, Rudnicki, Schmiersal-Burgess, Simmons, Smith, Soboleski, Strout, Supica, Swallow, Thorne, Tuell, Wadsworth, Webb, White J, White R, Wood P, Wood S, Woodsome.

ABSENT - Adams, Arata, Campbell, Copeland, Crockett, Lanigan, Underwood, Walker.

Yes, 70; No, 71; Absent, 8; Vacant, 0; Excused, 2.

70 having voted in the affirmative and 71 voted in the negative, with 8 being absent and 2 excused, and accordingly the motion to **RECEDE AND CONCUR FAILED**.

Subsequently, the House voted to **INSIST**.

Non-Concurrent Matter

Bill "An Act to Reduce Pollution Associated with Transportation in Alignment with the State's Climate Action Plan"

(S.P. 469) (L.D. 1138)

Minority (6) **OUGHT NOT TO PASS** Report of the Committee on **TRANSPORTATION READ** and **ACCEPTED** in the House on June 11, 2025.

Came from the Senate with that Body having **INSISTED** on its former action whereby the Bill was **PASSED TO BE ENGROSSED AS AMENDED BY COMMITTEE AMENDMENT "A" (S-331)** in **NON-CONCURRENCE**.

Speaker FECTEAU of Biddeford moved that the House **RECEDE AND CONCUR**.

Representative PARRY of Arundel **REQUESTED** a roll call on the motion to **RECEDE AND CONCUR**.

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

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

ROLL CALL NO. 510

YEA - Abdi, Ankeles, Archer, Arford, Beck, Bell, Boyer M, Brennan, Bunker, Cloutier, Crafts, DeBrito, Dhalac, Dill, Dodge, Doudera, Faircloth, Farrin, Friedmann, Gattine, Geiger, Gere, Golek, Graham, Gramlich, Hasenfus, Julia, Kessler, Kuhn, Lajoie, Lee, Lookner, Macias, Malon, Mathieson, Matlack, McCabe, Meyer, Milliken, Mitchell, Montell, Moonen, Murphy, Osher, Pugh, Rana, Ray, Rielly, Roeder, Rollins, Runte, Sachs, Salisbury, Sargent, Sato, Sayre, Shagoury, Sinclair, Skold, Stover, Supica, Terry, Warren, Webb, Yusuf, Zager, Mr. Speaker.

NAY - Albert, Arata, Ardell, Babin, Bagshaw, Bishop, Blier, Boyer D, Bridgeo, Carlow, Caruso, Chapman, Cimino, Cluchey, Collamore, Collins, Cooper, Cray, Daigle, Drinkwater, Ducharme, Eder, Faulkingham, Flynn, Foley, Foster, Fredericks, Fredette, Frost, Gifford, Greenwood, Guerrette, Haggan, Hall, Henderson, Hepler, Hymes, Jackson, Javner, Lance, Lavigne, Lemelin, Libby, Lyman, Mason, Mastraccio, McIntyre, Mingo, Morris, Nutting, O'Halloran, Olsen, Parry, Paul, Perkins, Pluecker, Poirier, Pomerleau, Quint, Roberts, Rudnicki, Schmiersal-Burgess, Simmons, Smith, Soboleski, Strout, Swallow, Thorne, Tuell, Wadsworth, White J, White R, Wood P, Wood S, Woodsome.

ABSENT - Adams, Campbell, Copeland, Crockett, Lanigan, Underwood, Walker.

Yes, 67; No, 75; Absent, 7; Vacant, 0; Excused, 2.

67 having voted in the affirmative and 75 voted in the negative, with 7 being absent and 2 excused, and accordingly the motion to **RECEDE AND CONCUR FAILED**.

Subsequently, the House voted to **INSIST**.

Non-Concurrent Matter

An Act Regarding the Management of Wastewater Treatment Plant Sludge at the State-owned Landfill (EMERGENCY)

(H.P. 197) (L.D. 297)
(C. "A" H-537)

FAILED of **PASSAGE TO BE ENACTED** in the House on June 11, 2025.

Came from the Senate **PASSED TO BE ENGROSSED AS AMENDED BY COMMITTEE AMENDMENT "A" (H-537) AND SENATE AMENDMENT "A" (S-392)** in **NON-CONCURRENCE**.

Speaker FECTEAU of Biddeford moved that the House **RECEDE AND CONCUR**.

Representative ANKELES of Brunswick moved that the House **RECEDE**.

Representative FAULKINGHAM of Winter Harbor **REQUESTED** a roll call on the motion to **RECEDE**.

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 Brunswick, Representative Ankeles.

Representative **ANKELES**: Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Fellow Colleagues of the House. I'll try to remain brief, since we already have had debates on this item previously.

I asked the Body in my last floor speech for the opportunity for us; provide ourselves with the opportunity to make this bill better, and this series of motions is our chance to do that and I'm tremendously grateful to my colleagues who allowed that to happen. I'll try to confine my remarks to why a Recede is good and not into anything I would want to do later.

Just to say in 2022, the Legislature closed the out-of-state waste loophole with the passage of another bill, LD 1639, and we did so because the people of Maine made it clear that our State-owned landfill should be confined to the needs of Maine and not become a dumping ground for regional waste. We made an exception to that in 2023, and now we have a piece of legislation back before us, this bill, to provide another extension and another deal. In my previous floor speech, I expressed that the deal was too lucrative, and I don't think it's the best for our constituents as currently written. If we are able to accept this motion, I hope to be able to make the bill better.

I would just say if we pass on this opportunity, I feel pretty strongly that we're only negotiating against ourselves. I feel that if we do pass the bill as Amended by Committee Amendment "A" without further changes, what will end up happening is that I fear that, even with the drier coming online in Norridgewock as early as this fall, that we may find ourselves right back in the same position. I would hope that we give ourselves the opportunity here to stand up to our negotiating partner and say that these terms are not acceptable at this time and that we can do better. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the Representative from Camden, Representative Doudera.

Representative **DOUDERA**: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, to say that many of us are not happy with this original bill, with this situation as a whole, is a big understatement. We're livid about this situation. I think all of us are. But the original bill, LD 297, is the only version that's really going to guarantee that our municipalities don't have these unbudgeted increases in their sludge disposal fees. And I think ultimately, we have to look out for our municipalities, which means we are looking out for our constituents.

So, I appreciate the hard work of my colleague in trying to suggest a situation where things could be different, but I just, I just feel it's a gamble that we can't take at this point, and I will be voting against the Recede motion. Thank you.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the Representative from Phillips, Representative Soboleski.

Representative **SOBOLESKI**: Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker.

Juniper Ridge; this has been a lot of work to try and get Juniper Ridge in the position it needs to be in. It shuts down in 2040. In 2034, the current operating service agreement that they're under expires. They've already applied or put in for a PBD; public benefit determination; to get the process going for the last six years. It is the wind-down, the shut-down of it, is what we're going through right now. And that's gone through a number of phases. Sending some of them from Juniper Ridge, some of the wastewater treatment plants, trying to get them distributed out into other places. We were lucky and were able to get Lewiston-Auburn, one of the big four, sent over to Hartland. That relieved some of the pressure there. The other three major ones have already committed to stay with Juniper Ridge. Portland, Bangor just signed a new contract and Brunswick have all committed to stay with Juniper Ridge.

What we need in this bill right here is to get the two-year extension, which is there to make sure they have enough construction debris to mix with it to maintain the stability of the cell itself, and enough fines, daily-cover fines, so that, at the end of every day, they can cover that landfill over and reduce the smell and the seagulls and whatnot from around the surrounding area. This is a necessary step. I agree with my friend and my colleague from Camden, it's not the happiest of ending here, especially for Juniper Ridge. They weren't originally scheduled to take or slated to take sludge; they were forced to take it when we took it off of the ground, stopped spreading it. We needed a place to put it. That's been the place to put it. That drier is going to be up and running, we don't know when, it hasn't even been shipped from China yet. It's not here.

So, there's a lot that goes on over the next couple of years, and this bill ensures that we can see this through to the end. Thank you.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the Representative from Augusta, Representative Bridgeo.

Representative **BRIDGEO**: Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House. There are times when we get into this particular debate where I ask myself why I'm so concerned about it. The Greater Augusta Utilities District, my wastewater treatment facility, takes its sludge to Norridgewock and it's not affected by this matter one way or another. But after spending three years on the Environment and Natural Resources Committee and learning more than I ever thought I would learn about these particular issues and this particular circumstance, I became very much convinced that this is a course of action that we really need to take in order to avoid a recurrence of a significant statewide crisis that we had in the recent past. I wish there were an easier answer, I wish this wasn't so divisive amongst our own caucus, but I really believe that we need to do this.

The other thing that's pretty clear to me is that we are probably somewhere, I hope, within the neighborhood of 48 or 50 hours away from adjournment *sine die*. And to bounce this back and forth like a tennis ball between the two Chambers, to me, risks us ending up with one foot on the boat and one foot on the dock, and that would truly be an unfortunate circumstance. So, I urge my colleagues to vote against this motion.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the Representative from Buxton, Representative Carlow.

Representative **CARLOW**: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Parliamentary inquiry?

The SPEAKER: The Member may proceed.

Representative **CARLOW**: Since I'm neither an attorney or lawyer, I'm wondering if the motion to Recede allows an amendment to be brought forward.

The SPEAKER: The Chair would answer in the affirmative.

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

ROLL CALL NO. 511

YEA - Abdi, Ankeles, Archer, Arford, Boyer M, Brennan, Bunker, Cluchey, DeBrito, Dodge, Faircloth, Friedmann, Frost, Geiger, Golek, Graham, Gramlich, Hasenhus, Hepler, Julia, Kessler, Lookner, Macias, Malon, Mathieson, Matlack, McCabe, Milliken, Mitchell, Montell, Moonen, O'Halloran, Osher, Pluecker, Pugh, Rana, Ray, Roberts, Roeder, Rollins, Sachs, Sato, Sayre, Shagoury, Sinclair, Skold, Supica, Warren, Zager.

NAY - Albert, Arata, Ardell, Babin, Bagshaw, Beck, Bell, Bishop, Blier, Boyer D, Bridgeo, Campbell, Carlow, Caruso, Chapman, Cimino, Cloutier, Collamore, Collins, Cooper, Crafts, Cray, Daigle, Dhalac, Dill, Doudera, Drinkwater, Ducharme, Eder, Farrin, Faulkingham, Flynn, Foley, Foster, Fredericks, Fredette, Gattine, Gere, Gifford, Greenwood, Guerrette, Haggan, Hall, Henderson, Hymes, Jackson, Javner, Kuhn, Lajoie, Lance, Lavigne, Lee, Lemelin, Libby, Lyman, Mason, Mastraccio, McIntyre, Meyer, Mingo, Morris, Murphy, Nutting, Olsen, Parry, Paul, Perkins, Poirier, Pomerleau, Quint, Rielly, Rudnicki, Runte, Salisbury, Sargent, Schmorsal-Burgess, Simmons, Smith, Soboleski, Stover, Strout, Swallow, Terry, Thorne, Tuell, Wadsworth, Webb, White J, White R, Wood P, Wood S, Woodsome, Yusuf, Mr. Speaker.

ABSENT - Adams, Copeland, Crockett, Lanigan, Underwood, Walker.

Yes, 49; No, 94; Absent, 6; Vacant, 0; Excused, 2.

49 having voted in the affirmative and 94 voted in the negative, with 6 being absent and 2 excused, and accordingly the motion to **RECEDE FAILED**.

Subsequently, the House voted to **RECEDE AND CONCUR**.

By unanimous consent, all matters having been acted upon were **ORDERED SENT FORTHWITH**.

COMMUNICATIONS

The Following Communication: (S.C. 540)

**MAINE SENATE
132ND LEGISLATURE
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY**

June 13, 2025

Honorable Ryan Fecteau

Speaker of the House

2 State House Station

Augusta, ME 04333-0002

Dear Speaker Fecteau:

In accordance with 3 M.R.S.A. §158 and Joint Rule 506 of the 132nd Maine Legislature, please be advised that the Senate today confirmed the following nominations:

Upon the recommendation of the Committee on Housing and Economic Development,

- Donald Powers of Madawaska Lake for appointment, to the Loring Development Authority of Maine,
- Troy Haney of Caribou for appointment, to the Loring Development Authority of Maine,
- John Armitage of York for appointment, to the Maine Space Corporation, Board of Directors.

Best Regards,

S/Darek M. Grant

Secretary of the Senate

READ and ORDERED PLACED ON FILE.

The Following Communication: (S.C. 542)

**MAINE SENATE
132ND LEGISLATURE
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY**

June 12, 2025

Honorable Robert B. Hunt

Clerk of the House

2 State House Station

Augusta, ME 04333

Dear Clerk Hunt:

Please be advised the Senate today insisted to its previous action whereby it accepted the Majority Ought Not to Pass Report from the Committee on Taxation on Bill "An Act to Clarify That a Business's License or Subscription to Use Software Is Not Considered a Lease for the Purposes of Sales and Use Tax" (H.P. 865) (L.D. 1330) in non-concurrence.

Best Regards,

S/Darek M. Grant

Secretary of the Senate

READ and ORDERED PLACED ON FILE.

The Following Communication: (S.C. 543)

**MAINE SENATE
132ND LEGISLATURE
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY**

June 12, 2025

Honorable Robert B. Hunt

Clerk of the House

2 State House Station

Augusta, ME 04333

Dear Clerk Hunt:

Please be advised the Senate today insisted to its previous action whereby it accepted the Minority Ought Not to Pass Report from the Committee on Criminal Justice and Public Safety on Bill "An Act Regarding the State Forensic Service" (H.P. 282) (L.D. 428) in non-concurrence.

Best Regards,

S/Darek M. Grant

Secretary of the Senate

READ and ORDERED PLACED ON FILE.

The Following Communication: (S.C. 544)

**MAINE SENATE
132ND LEGISLATURE
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY**

June 13, 2025

Honorable Robert B. Hunt
Clerk of the House
2 State House Station
Augusta, ME 04333

Dear Clerk Hunt:

Please be advised the Senate today insisted to its previous action whereby it accepted the Minority Ought Not to Pass Report from the Committee on Environment and Natural Resources on Bill "An Act to Clarify the Prohibition on the Sale of Beverages in Plastic Containers" (H.P. 1040) (L.D. 1582) in non-concurrence.

Best Regards,
S/Darek M. Grant

Secretary of the Senate

READ and ORDERED PLACED ON FILE.

The Following Communication: (S.C. 545)

**MAINE SENATE
132ND LEGISLATURE
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY**

June 12, 2025

Honorable Robert B. Hunt
Clerk of the House
2 State House Station
Augusta, ME 04333

Dear Clerk Hunt:

Please be advised the Senate today insisted to its previous action whereby it Failed to Engross Bill "An Act to Prohibit Lodging Establishments from Providing Single-use Plastic Containers" (H.P. 1289) (L.D. 1928) in non-concurrence.

Best Regards,
S/Darek M. Grant

Secretary of the Senate

READ and ORDERED PLACED ON FILE.

The Following Communication: (S.C. 546)

**MAINE SENATE
132ND LEGISLATURE
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY**

June 12, 2025

Honorable Robert B. Hunt
Clerk of the House
2 State House Station
Augusta, ME 04333

Dear Clerk Hunt:

Please be advised the Senate today insisted to its previous action whereby it accepted the Majority Ought Not to Pass Report from the Committee on Taxation on Bill "An Act to Expand the Use of Tax Increment Revenue for Affordable Housing by Adding Authorized Project Costs" (H.P. 1098) (L.D. 1657) in non-concurrence.

Best Regards,
S/Darek M. Grant

Secretary of the Senate

READ and ORDERED PLACED ON FILE.

By unanimous consent, all matters having been acted upon were **ORDERED SENT FORTHWITH.**

SPECIAL SENTIMENT CALENDAR

In accordance with House Rule 519 and Joint Rule 213, the following items:

Recognizing:

Desmond J. Robinson, of Solon, a senior at Carrabec High School, who is a recipient of a 2025 Principal's Award for outstanding academic achievement and citizenship, sponsored by the Maine Principals' Association. We extend our congratulations and best wishes;

(HLS 365)

Presented by Representative CARUSO of Caratunk.

Cosponsored by Senator BLACK of Franklin.

On **OBJECTION** of Representative CARUSO of Caratunk, was **REMOVED** from the Special Sentiment Calendar.

READ.

On motion of the same Representative, **TABLED** pending **PASSAGE** and later today assigned.

**REPORTS OF COMMITTEE
Ought to Pass as Amended**

Report of the Committee on **VETERANS AND LEGAL AFFAIRS** on Bill "An Act to Amend the Maine Medical Use of Cannabis Act"

(S.P. 723) (L.D. 1840)

Reporting **Ought to Pass as Amended by Committee Amendment "A" (S-374).**

Came from the Senate with the Report **READ** and **ACCEPTED** and the Bill **PASSED TO BE ENGROSSED AS AMENDED BY COMMITTEE AMENDMENT "A" (S-374) AS AMENDED BY SENATE AMENDMENT "A" (S-398)** thereto.

The Report was **READ** and **ACCEPTED.**

The Bill was **READ ONCE. Committee Amendment "A" (S-374)** was **READ** by the Clerk.

Senate Amendment "A" (S-398) to **Committee Amendment "A" (S-374)** was **READ** by the Clerk and **ADOPTED.**

Committee Amendment "A" (S-374) as Amended by Senate Amendment "A" (S-398) thereto was **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" (S-374) as Amended by Senate Amendment "A" (S-398)** thereto in concurrence.

By unanimous consent, all matters having been acted upon were **ORDERED SENT FORTHWITH.**

The following items were taken up out of order by unanimous consent:

Divided Reports

Majority Report of the Committee on **CRIMINAL JUSTICE AND PUBLIC SAFETY** reporting **Ought to Pass as Amended by Committee Amendment "A" (H-715)** on Bill "An Act to Establish Bail Officers to Administer the Maine Bail Code"

(H.P. 346) (L.D. 527)

Signed:

Senators:

BEEBE-CENTER of Knox

CURRY of Waldo

Representatives:

HASENFUS of Readfield

LAJOIE of Lewiston

LOOKNER of Portland

MILLIKEN of Blue Hill

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

Signed:

Senator:

CYRWAY of Kennebec

Representatives:

ARDELL of Monticello

MCINTYRE of Lowell

NUTTING of Oakland

PERKINS of Dover-Foxcroft

READ.

On motion of Representative HASENFUS of Readfield, the Majority **Ought to Pass as Amended** Report was **ACCEPTED**.

The Bill was **READ ONCE**. **Committee Amendment "A" (H-715)** 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-715)** and sent for concurrence.

By unanimous consent, all matters having been acted upon were **ORDERED SENT FORTHWITH**.

Majority Report of the Committee on **JUDICIARY** reporting **Ought Not to Pass** on Bill "An Act to Regulate Social Media Use by Minors Under 16 Years of Age"

(H.P. 530) (L.D. 844)

Signed:

Senators:

CARNEY of Cumberland

TALBOT ROSS of Cumberland

Representatives:

KUHN of Falmouth

BABIN of Fort Fairfield

CARUSO of Caratunk

HENDERSON of Rumford

LEE of Auburn

O'HALLORAN of Brewer

POIRIER of Skowhegan

PUGH of Portland

SATO of Gorham

SINCLAIR of Bath

Minority Report of the same Committee reporting **Ought to Pass** on same Bill.

Signed:

Senator:

HAGGAN of Penobscot

READ.

On motion of Representative KUHN of Falmouth, the Majority **Ought Not to Pass** Report was **ACCEPTED** and sent for concurrence.

By unanimous consent, all matters having been acted upon were **ORDERED SENT FORTHWITH**.

Majority Report of the Committee on **JUDICIARY** reporting **Ought Not to Pass** on Bill "An Act to Increase Maximum Small Claim Limits for Home Construction Contracts"

(H.P. 565) (L.D. 879)

Signed:

Senators:

CARNEY of Cumberland

HAGGAN of Penobscot

TALBOT ROSS of Cumberland

Representatives:

KUHN of Falmouth

BABIN of Fort Fairfield

CARUSO of Caratunk

HENDERSON of Rumford

O'HALLORAN of Brewer

POIRIER of Skowhegan

PUGH of Portland

SINCLAIR of Bath

Minority Report of the same Committee reporting **Ought to Pass** on same Bill.

Signed:

Representatives:

LEE of Auburn

SATO of Gorham

READ.

Representative KUHN of Falmouth moved that the House **ACCEPT** the Majority **Ought Not to Pass** Report.

Representative KESSLER of South Portland **REQUESTED** a roll call on the motion to **ACCEPT** the Majority **Ought Not to Pass** 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 South Portland, Representative Kessler.

Representative **KESSLER**: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I had introduced this bill because I care about homeowners who are getting screwed by bad contractors. When I introduced this bill, it received the support of Legal Services for Maine Elders and the Associated General Contractors of Maine. Nobody testified in opposition to this bill. It gives homeowners the ability to claim more money in small claims court, because generally, the amounts that they are not able to; excuse me; they're not able to recoup their true losses, because the small claims limit is so small and when they have to go to District Court, they have to pay so much in fees to lawyers that they can't launch a lawsuit.

I introduced this in partnership with the Representative from Pittsfield because I was looking for a bipartisan, non-bureaucratic approach to this problem. And in light of the potential for contractor licensure to get across the finish line being very small, I feel like this is something that we can do. So, please follow my light on this motion, I would appreciate it.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the Representative from Skowhegan, Representative Poirier.

Representative **POIRIER**: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I rise actually in support of the pending motion. And though I appreciate the intent behind this bill, what we found was that by increasing the amount that a person can claim in small claims court, it actually makes it harder for the person creating, the 'bad actor' being prosecuted, because people will go to the police and ask for assistance and it will be a civil matter that they can figure out in court and they will not pursue any actions against, like, bad contractors in the home construction context.

So, I believe I can speak collectively for us on the Ought Not to Pass Report that that's one of the main reasons why. We want to make sure that there are remedies to not just penalize people in the courts with small claims, but to make sure that they're penalized enough that they don't have those bad actions again. Thank you.

The SPEAKER: A roll call has been ordered. The pending question before the House is Acceptance of the Majority Ought Not to Pass Report. All those in favor will vote yes, those opposed will vote no.

ROLL CALL NO. 512

YEA - Albert, Arata, Ardell, Babin, Bagshaw, Bishop, Blier, Boyer D, Campbell, Carlow, Caruso, Cimino, Collins, Cooper, Crafts, Cray, Daigle, Drinkwater, Ducharme, Eder, Faircloth, Farrin, Faulkingham, Flynn, Foley, Foster, Fredericks, Fredette, Gattine, Gifford, Greenwood, Guerrette, Haggan, Hall, Henderson, Hepler, Hymes, Jackson, Kuhn, Lajoie, Lance, Lavigne, Lemelin, Libby, Lyman, Mason, Matlack, McIntyre, Meyer, Mingo, Morris, Murphy, Nutting, O'Halloran, Olsen, Parry, Paul, Perkins, Pluecker, Poirier, Pomerleau, Pugh, Quint, Ray, Rudnicki, Salisbury, Simmons, Sinclair, Smith, Soboleski, Strout, Swallow, Thorne, Tuell, Wadsworth, White J, White R, Wood P, Wood S, Woodsome, Zager.

NAY - Abdi, Ankeles, Archer, Arford, Beck, Bell, Boyer M, Brennan, Bridgeo, Bunker, Chapman, Cloutier, Cluchey, Collamore, DeBrito, Dhalac, Dill, Dodge, Doudera, Friedmann, Frost, Geiger, Gere, Golek, Graham, Gramlich, Hasenfus, Javner, Julia, Kessler, Lee, Lookner, Macias, Malon, Mastraccio, Mathieson, McCabe, Milliken, Mitchell, Montell, Moonen, Osher, Rana, Rielly, Roberts, Roeder, Rollins, Runte, Sachs, Sargent, Sato, Sayre, Schmersal-Burgess, Shagoury, Skold, Stover, Supica, Terry, Warren, Webb, Yusuf, Mr. Speaker.

ABSENT - Adams, Copeland, Crockett, Lanigan, Underwood, Walker.

Yes, 81; No, 62; Absent, 6; Vacant, 0; Excused, 2.

81 having voted in the affirmative and 62 voted in the negative, with 6 being absent and 2 excused, and accordingly the Majority **Ought Not to Pass** Report was **ACCEPTED** and sent for concurrence.

By unanimous consent, all matters having been acted upon were **ORDERED SENT FORTHWITH**.

Majority Report of the Committee on **JUDICIARY** reporting **Ought Not to Pass** on Bill "An Act to Secure Under Authority of a Subpoena Pretrial Statements from a Witness Other than the Defendant in a Criminal Proceeding"

(H.P. 1191) (L.D. 1780)

Signed:

Senators:

CARNEY of Cumberland
HAGGAN of Penobscot
TALBOT ROSS of Cumberland

Representatives:

KUHN of Falmouth
BABIN of Fort Fairfield
CARUSO of Caratunk
HENDERSON of Rumford
LEE of Auburn
O'HALLORAN of Brewer
POIRIER of Skowhegan
SATO of Gorham

Minority Report of the same Committee reporting **Ought to Pass as Amended by Committee Amendment "A" (H-720)** on same Bill.

Signed:

Representatives:

PUGH of Portland
SINCLAIR of Bath

READ.

On motion of Representative KUHN of Falmouth, the Majority **Ought Not to Pass** Report was **ACCEPTED** and sent for concurrence.

By unanimous consent, all matters having been acted upon were **ORDERED SENT FORTHWITH**.

Majority Report of the Committee on **JUDICIARY** reporting **Ought to Pass as Amended by Committee Amendment "A" (H-723)** on Bill "An Act to Increase Penalties for Human Trafficking Offenses"

(H.P. 1248) (L.D. 1877)

Signed:

Senators:

CARNEY of Cumberland
TALBOT ROSS of Cumberland

Representatives:

KUHN of Falmouth
LEE of Auburn
PUGH of Portland
SATO of Gorham
SINCLAIR of Bath

Minority Report of the same Committee reporting **Ought to Pass as Amended by Committee Amendment "B" (H-724)** on same Bill.

Signed:

Senator:

HAGGAN of Penobscot

Representatives:

BABIN of Fort Fairfield
CARUSO of Caratunk
HENDERSON of Rumford
O'HALLORAN of Brewer
POIRIER of Skowhegan

READ.

On motion of Representative KUHN of Falmouth, the Majority **Ought to Pass as Amended** Report was **ACCEPTED**.

The Bill was **READ ONCE**. **Committee Amendment "A" (H-723)** 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-723)** and sent for concurrence.

Majority Report of the Committee on **TAXATION** reporting **Ought to Pass** on Bill "An Act to Remove Certain Wharves and Piers from the Laws Governing the Current Use Valuation of Working Waterfront Land"

(H.P. 486) (L.D. 744)

Signed:

Senators:

GROHOSKI of Hancock
BICKFORD of Androscoggin
TIPPING of Penobscot

Representatives:

CLOUTIER of Lewiston
CROCKETT of Portland
FRIEDMANN of Bar Harbor
MATLACK of St. George
QUINT of Hodgdon
SAYRE of Kennebunk
SWALLOW of Houlton
WHITE of Ellsworth

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

Signed:

Representative:

RUDNICKI of Fairfield

READ.

On motion of Representative SAYRE of Kennebunk, the Majority **Ought to Pass** Report was **ACCEPTED**.

The Bill was **READ ONCE**.

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** and sent for concurrence.

By unanimous consent, all matters having been acted upon were **ORDERED SENT FORTHWITH**.

Majority Report of the Committee on **TAXATION** reporting **Ought to Pass as Amended by Committee Amendment "A" (H-712)** on Bill "An Act to Increase the Maine Historic Property Rehabilitation Tax Credit in Rural Areas"

(H.P. 1173) (L.D. 1755)

Signed:

Senators:

GROHOSKI of Hancock
BICKFORD of Androscoggin
TIPPING of Penobscot

Representatives:

CLOUTIER of Lewiston
CROCKETT of Portland
FRIEDMANN of Bar Harbor
MATLACK of St. George
SAYRE of Kennebunk
WHITE of Ellsworth

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

Signed:

Representatives:

LAVIGNE of Berwick
QUINT of Hodgdon
RUDNICKI of Fairfield
SWALLOW of Houlton

READ.

On motion of Representative SAYRE of Kennebunk, the Majority **Ought to Pass as Amended** Report was **ACCEPTED**.

The Bill was **READ ONCE**. **Committee Amendment "A" (H-712)** 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-712)** and sent for concurrence.

By unanimous consent, all matters having been acted upon were **ORDERED SENT FORTHWITH**.

CONSENT CALENDAR

First Day

In accordance with House Rule 519, the following items appeared on the Consent Calendar for the First Day:

(S.P. 62) (L.D. 15) Bill "An Act to Eliminate the Excise Tax on Camper Trailers" Committee on **TAXATION** reporting **Ought to Pass as Amended by Committee Amendment "A" (S-399)**

(S.P. 435) (L.D. 1018) Bill "An Act to Protect Health Care for Rural and Underserved Areas by Prohibiting Discrimination by Participants in a Federal Drug Discount Program" Committee on **HEALTH COVERAGE, INSURANCE AND FINANCIAL SERVICES** reporting **Ought to Pass as Amended by Committee Amendment "A" (S-402)**

(S.P. 758) (L.D. 1951) Bill "An Act to Promote Food Processing and Manufacturing Facility Expansion and Create Jobs" Committee on **TAXATION** reporting **Ought to Pass as Amended by Committee Amendment "A" (S-400)**

(H.P. 5) (L.D. 41) Resolve, Authorizing the State Tax Assessor to Convey the Interest of the State in Certain Real Estate in the Unorganized Territory Committee on **TAXATION** reporting **Ought to Pass**

(H.P. 1328) (L.D. 1984) Bill "An Act to Correct Inconsistencies, Conflicts and Errors in the Laws of Maine" (EMERGENCY) Committee on **JUDICIARY** reporting **Ought to Pass as Amended by Committee Amendment "A" (H-725)**

Under suspension of the rules, Second Day Consent Calendar notification was given.

There being no objection, the Senate Papers were **PASSED TO BE ENGROSSED as Amended** in concurrence and the House Papers were **PASSED TO BE ENGROSSED** or **PASSED TO BE ENGROSSED as Amended** and sent for concurrence.

By unanimous consent, all matters having been acted upon were **ORDERED SENT FORTHWITH**.

ENACTORS

Emergency Measure

An Act to Establish a Moratorium on the Sale of Mobile Home Parks

(S.P. 157) (L.D. 365)
(C. "A" S-295)

Was reported by the Committee on **Engrossed Bills** as truly and strictly engrossed. This being an emergency measure, a two-thirds vote of all the members elected to the House being necessary, a total was taken. 69 voted in favor of the same and 59 against, and accordingly the Bill **FAILED PASSAGE TO BE ENACTED** and was sent to the Senate.

Emergency Measure

An Act to Address Funding Needs for State Employees Affected by Federal Funding Disruptions

(H.P. 1336) (L.D. 1988)

Was reported by the Committee on **Engrossed Bills** as truly and strictly engrossed. This being an emergency measure, a two-thirds vote of all the members elected to the House being necessary, a total was taken. 75 voted in favor of the same and 54 against, and accordingly the Bill **FAILED PASSAGE TO BE ENACTED** and was sent to the Senate.

Acts

An Act Regarding the Bind-over and Detention of Juveniles

(H.P. 6) (L.D. 42)
(C. "A" H-695)

An Act to Clarify Information Sharing Between the Department of Health and Human Services and Schools with Respect to Investigations of Child Abuse or Neglect

(H.P. 64) (L.D. 99)
(C. "A" H-700)

An Act to Provide Per Diem Payments for MaineCare Residents of the Maine Veterans' Homes

(H.P. 115) (L.D. 182)
(C. "A" H-702)

An Act Regarding Speedy Trials

(H.P. 240) (L.D. 340)
(C. "A" H-678)

An Act to Reduce Administrative Burdens and Expand Access in the Laws Governing Cannabis

(H.P. 613) (L.D. 948)
(C. "A" H-699)

An Act to Allow Residential Use Development in Commercial Districts

(H.P. 644) (L.D. 997)
(C. "A" H-686)

An Act to Provide Compensation to Individuals with Lived Experience Serving on Certain Advisory Boards, Commissions, Councils and Similar Groups

(H.P. 1024) (L.D. 1566)
(C. "A" H-677)

An Act to Amend the Laws Governing Manufactured Housing Communities to Prevent Excessive Rent and Fees Increases

(H.P. 1150) (L.D. 1723)
(C. "A" H-671)

An Act to Ensure Affordability and Stability in Residential Housing and in Manufactured Housing Communities

(H.P. 1184) (L.D. 1765)
(C. "A" H-672)

An Act to Require the Board of Counseling Professionals Licensure, Board of Dental Practice, Board of Speech, Audiology and Hearing, Board of Occupational Therapy Practice, State Board of Social Worker Licensure, Board of Osteopathic Licensure and Board of Licensure in Medicine to Obtain Fingerprint-based Federal Bureau of Investigation Criminal Background Checks for Initial Applicants and Licensees Seeking Compact Privileges

(H.P. 1238) (L.D. 1854)
(C. "A" H-698)

An Act to Add Mold to the Implied Warranty and Covenant of Habitability

(H.P. 1288) (L.D. 1927)
(C. "A" H-681)

An Act Regarding the Regulation of Tobacco

(H.P. 1297) (L.D. 1938)
(C. "A" H-676)

An Act to Protect Individuals from the Threatened Unauthorized Dissemination of Certain Private Images, Including Artificially Generated Private Images

(H.P. 1303) (L.D. 1944)
(C. "A" H-696)

Were reported by the Committee on **Engrossed Bills** as truly and strictly engrossed, **PASSED TO BE ENACTED**, signed by the Speaker and sent to the Senate.

Resolve

Resolve, to Establish the Commission to Study the Judicial Disciplinary Process

(H.P. 1211) (L.D. 1810)
(C. "A" H-680)

Was reported by the Committee on **Engrossed Bills** as truly and strictly engrossed, **FINALLY PASSED**, signed by the Speaker and sent to the Senate.

An Act to Prohibit Eminent Domain on Existing Tribal Trust Lands

(H.P. 617) (L.D. 958)
(C. "A" H-679)

Was reported by the Committee on **Engrossed Bills** as truly and strictly engrossed.

On motion of Representative DRINKWATER of Milford, was **SET ASIDE**.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the Representative from Milford, Representative Drinkwater.

Representative **DRINKWATER**: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, I've got to give a little historical context here, and I want to just read from the record from attorney Tom Tureen.

During the public hearing in 1980, before the Maine Legislature's Joint Select Committee on Indian Land Claims, the Tribe's attorney, Tom Tureen, described the negotiations as follows: As negotiations progressed, feelings of mistrust began to break down. The spirit of reconciliation made itself felt. Both sides began to attempt to understand and, to the greatest extent possible, accommodate the needs of the other. For the State, this meant, among other things, understanding the Tribe's legitimate interest in managing their internal affairs and exercising tribal power in certain areas of cultural importance such as hunting and fishing. For the Indians, it meant, among other things, understanding the legitimate interest of the State and having basic laws such as those dealing with the environment uniformly throughout the State of Maine. Increasingly, both sides found areas of mutual interest.

The plan is very much a compromise. Both sides see it as a framework within which the spirit of cooperation and mutual understanding which develop during negotiations can continue in the future. With this plan, it is my client's belief that we in Maine will be able to avoid the bitterness and rancor which all too often characterized Indian/non-Indian relations in other parts of the country. In approving the settlement in the U.S. Senate Select Committee on Indian Affairs, it was said the settlement provides that henceforth, the tribes will be free from State interference and the exercise of their internal affairs. Thus, rather than destroying the sovereignty of the tribes by recognizing their power to control their internal affairs and by withdrawing the power which Maine previously claimed to interfere in such matters, the settlement strengthens the sovereignty of the Maine tribes.

That was Tom Tureen, who was the attorney for the Maine tribes in the Indian Claims Settlement Act.

Mr. Speaker, when it comes to eminent domain, the fact is clear: It hasn't been used in over a hundred years. Yet this bill proposes granting that power exclusively to the tribes, while denying the same authority to Maine's cities and towns. That's not equality under the law, it's preferential treatment.

We've already taken significant steps to strengthen our relationship with the tribes, including passing legislation that ensures the State must confer with the tribes. But this bill, submitted at the request of the tribes, risks undermining the trust and balance that the 1980 Indian Claims Settlement Act established. This bill takes us backwards to a time of division and mistrust.

Mr. Speaker, this bill is trying to find a solution for a problem that doesn't exist. Trust is built through fairness and mutual respect, not by creating special carveouts for the one group while excluding others. Thank you, Mr. Speaker, and I request a Roll Call.

The same Representative **REQUESTED** a roll call on **PASSAGE TO BE ENACTED**.

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**: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I rise in support of the pending motion.

Mr. Speaker, I rise because my core principles tell me that it's never okay to take someone's property. And that's really what this bill is founded on. That's why I support this bill. This bill is set around a certain geographical area; the tribes, tribal reservation and tribal trust land; and I would defend one person's ability to not have eminent domain used against them the same as I would defend it for 1.5 million people.

Private property rights are essential, Mr. Speaker, and just like this ring on my finger, this is my property. It's a symbol of the bond between my wife and I. It doesn't, I mean, I don't think anybody wants to take it from me, but we have laws against theft, we have laws against people taking it from me, and I don't think that's a solution looking for a problem, I think that's a good protection, just like I think this law is a good protection if we pass it, Mr. Speaker. It doesn't matter how much someone wants it or how much someone says they're going to give me for it, it's mine and if I don't want to give it up, I shouldn't be compelled to.

That's what eminent domain is. Eminent domain is the ability to seize someone's property, and that should not exist, Mr. Speaker. Seizing someone else's property should not exist. And if I can pass a law that does it for one person or a million, I'm going to do that. And today, I'm looking to pass this bill, so that we can protect these geographical areas and the tribal land inside them, and maybe someday in the future, we can expand that to include the whole entire State, because eminent domain is wrong and you will never prove to me that it isn't. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the Representative from Newport, Representative Fredette.

Representative **FREDETTE**: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I would encourage you to remember our past conversation in regards to eminent domain. There is a process in place. I don't think anybody likes eminent domain, but as it relates to this particular bill, I will not be supporting it and ask you to vote as you previously did. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

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

Representative **HAGGAN**: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I, too, cannot support this measure. It should be; eminent domain is not liked by anybody. It's in our United States Constitution. If we're fighting to get rid of eminent domain, it should be for all of the people of Maine, just not a small population.

I've been studying the map of the proposed lands that has been posted on the website, and as we talked about earlier, there are concerns about this land, if this passes, of cutting off possible access to Interstate 95, Route 1, Route 27, other lands. We hear of easements and things like that, but I've been asking for that in writing for security and I've not received any of that, so, I have very great concerns of giving this to a small population when it could impede the progress of 1.4 million people. 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. 513

YEA - Abdi, Albert, Ankeles, Archer, Ardell, Arford, Beck, Bell, Bishop, Blier, Boyer D, Boyer M, Brennan, Bridgeo, Bunker, Cloutier, Cluchey, Collamore, Crafts, Cray, Crockett, DeBrito, Dhalac, Dill, Dodge, Doudera, Eder, Faircloth, Farrin, Faulkingham, Flynn, Friedmann, Frost, Gattine, Geiger, Gere, Golek, Graham, Gramlich, Hall, Hasenfus, Hepler, Hymes, Julia, Kessler, Kuhn, Lajoie, Lee, Lookner, Macias, Malon, Mastraccio, Mathieson, Matlack, McCabe, Meyer, Milliken, Mingo, Mitchell, Montell, Moonen, Murphy, Osher, Pluecker, Pugh, Rana, Ray, Rielly, Roberts, Roeder, Rollins, Runte, Sachs, Salisbury, Sargent, Sato, Sayre, Shagoury, Sinclair, Skold, Stover, Supica, Terry, Warren, Webb, Wood S, Yusuf, Zager, Mr. Speaker.

NAY - Arata, Babin, Bagshaw, Campbell, Carlow, Caruso, Chapman, Cimino, Collins, Cooper, Daigle, Drinkwater, Ducharme, Foley, Foster, Fredericks, Fredette, Gifford, Greenwood, Guerrette, Haggan, Henderson, Jackson, Javner, Lance, Lavigne, Lemelin, Libby, Lyman, Mason, McIntyre, Morris, Nutting, O'Halloran, Olsen, Parry, Paul, Perkins, Poirier, Pomerleau, Quint, Rudnicki, Schmearsal-Burgess, Simmons, Smith, Soboleski, Strout, Swallow, Thorne, Tuell, Wadsworth, White J, White R, Wood P, Woodsome.

ABSENT - Adams, Copeland, Lanigan, Underwood, Walker.

Yes, 89; No, 55; Absent, 5; Vacant, 0; Excused, 2.

89 having voted in the affirmative and 55 voted in the negative, with 5 being absent and 2 excused, 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**.

Emergency Measure

An Act to Implement the Recommendations of the Blue Ribbon Commission to Study Emergency Medical Services in the State

(S.P. 111) (L.D. 245)
(C. "A" S-372)

Was reported by the Committee on **Engrossed Bills** as truly and strictly engrossed. This being an emergency measure, a two-thirds vote of all the members elected to the House being necessary, a total was taken. 106 voted in favor of the same and 3 against, and accordingly the Bill was **PASSED TO BE ENACTED**, signed by the Speaker and sent to the Senate.

Emergency Measure

An Act to Ensure Fair and Equitable Recovery of Post-restructuring Stranded Costs

(S.P. 694) (L.D. 1792)
(S. "A" S-373 to C. "A" S-357)

Was reported by the Committee on **Engrossed Bills** as truly and strictly engrossed. This being an emergency measure, a two-thirds vote of all the members elected to the House being necessary, a total was taken. 105 voted in favor of the same and 3 against, and accordingly the Bill was **PASSED TO BE ENACTED**, signed by the Speaker and sent to the Senate.

Acts

An Act to Maximize Federal Funding and Protect Maine's School Meals Programs

(S.P. 258) (L.D. 577)
(C. "A" S-380)

An Act to Clarify Procedures for When a Candidate Withdraws from an Election Determined by Ranked-choice Voting or When a Candidate Dies or Becomes Disqualified in an Election Determined by Ranked-choice Voting

(S.P. 401) (L.D. 911)
(S. "A" S-378 to C. "A" S-333)

An Act to Facilitate the Establishment of an Automated Crime Victim Notification System

(S.P. 408) (L.D. 981)
(C. "A" S-384)

An Act to Expand the Dependent Exemption Tax Credit

(S.P. 524) (L.D. 1294)
(C. "A" S-389)

Were reported by the Committee on **Engrossed Bills** as truly and strictly engrossed, **PASSED TO BE ENACTED**, signed by the Speaker and sent to the Senate.

Resolves

Resolve, to Study Laws Regarding Endangering the Welfare of a Child

(S.P. 276) (L.D. 592)
(C. "A" S-385)

Resolve, Establishing the Working Group on Modernizing State Grants, Contracts and Procurement

(S.P. 590) (L.D. 1449)
(C. "A" S-381)

Resolve, Directing the Maine Developmental Disabilities Council to Examine the Unmet Needs of Children Who Need Skilled Medical Care

(S.P. 624) (L.D. 1540)
(C. "A" S-394)

Resolve, to Establish the Commission to Study and Recommend Solutions for Modernizing and Improving the Effectiveness of the Legislature

(S.P. 657) (L.D. 1649)
(C. "A" S-368)

Were reported by the Committee on **Engrossed Bills** as truly and strictly engrossed, **FINALLY PASSED**, signed by the Speaker and sent to the Senate.

An Act to Regulate Municipal Parking Space Minimums

(H.P. 281) (L.D. 427)
(S. "A" S-348 to C. "A" H-456)

Was reported by the Committee on **Engrossed Bills** as truly and strictly engrossed.

On motion of Representative COLLAMORE of Pittsfield, was **SET ASIDE**.

The same Representative **REQUESTED** a roll call on **PASSAGE TO BE ENACTED**.

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 New Gloucester, Representative Arata.

Representative **ARATA**: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I object to this bill because I think that poor people should have access to parking just as well as rich people. 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. 514

YEA - Abdi, Ankeles, Archer, Arford, Beck, Bell, Boyer M, Brennan, Bunker, Cloutier, Cluchey, Copeland, Crafts, Crockett, DeBrito, Dhalac, Dill, Dodge, Doudera, Faircloth, Farrin, Friedmann, Frost, Gattine, Geiger, Gere, Golek, Graham, Gramlich, Hasenfus, Julia, Kessler, Kuhn, Lee, Lookner, Macias, Malon, Mastraccio, Mathieson, Matlack, McCabe, Meyer, Milliken, Mitchell, Montell, Moonen, Murphy, Osher, Pluecker, Pugh, Rana, Ray, Rielly, Roeder, Runte, Sachs, Salisbury, Sargent, Sato, Sayre, Shagoury, Sinclair, Skold, Stover, Supica, Terry, Warren, Webb, Yusuf, Zager, Mr. Speaker.

NAY - Albert, Arata, Ardell, Babin, Bagshaw, Bishop, Blier, Boyer D, Bridgeo, Campbell, Carlow, Caruso, Chapman, Cimino, Collamore, Collins, Cooper, Cray, Daigle, Drinkwater, Ducharme, Eder, Faulkingham, Flynn, Foley, Foster, Fredericks, Fredette, Gifford, Greenwood, Guerrette, Haggan, Hall, Henderson, Hepler, Hymes, Jackson, Javner, Lajoie, Lance, Lavigne, Lemelin, Libby, Lyman, Mason, McIntyre, Mingo, Morris, Nutting, O'Halloran, Olsen, Parry, Paul, Perkins, Poirier, Pomerleau, Quint, Roberts, Rollins, Rudnicki, Schmiersal-Burgess, Simmons, Smith, Soboleski, Strout, Swallow, Thorne, Tuell, Wadsworth, White J, White R, Wood P, Wood S, Woodsome.

ABSENT - Adams, Lanigan, Underwood, Walker.

Yes, 71; No, 74; Absent, 4; Vacant, 0; Excused, 2.

71 having voted in the affirmative and 74 voted in the negative, with 4 being absent and 2 excused, and accordingly the Bill **FAILED PASSAGE TO BE ENACTED** and was sent to the Senate.

An Act to Advance a Clean Energy Economy by Updating Renewable and Clean Resource Procurement Laws

(S.P. 738) (L.D. 1868)

(C. "A" S-356)

Was reported by the Committee on **Engrossed Bills** as truly and strictly engrossed.

On motion of Representative FOSTER of Dexter, was **SET ASIDE**.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the Representative from Dexter, Representative Foster.

Representative **FOSTER**: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I stand in opposition to the pending motion, request a Roll Call and wish to speak to the motion.

The same Representative **REQUESTED** a roll call on **PASSAGE TO BE ENACTED**.

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

The SPEAKER: The Member may proceed.

Representative **FOSTER**: Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. This bill as it stands now is very concerning.

In a recent PUC report came out March 31st of this year, and I suggest that you take a moment and look it up on the PUC website, they stated first of all that the total cost of compliance with the RPS for 2023 was about \$83.2 million, or almost 70 cents per kilowatt-hour. Projections for this year, 2025, are that the Maine RPS will cost about \$156 million, nearly double that amount. And it's also projected, Mr. Speaker, that the RPS CES cost in 2040, and this is a conservative estimate, assuming zero inflation and a 1.2% load growth in the State of Maine per year,

the ISO estimate to 2034 extrapolated to 2040 would equal \$426 million a year.

Mr. Speaker, we do not need to pay RPS in order to build renewables. I ask that you follow my light.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the Representative from Freeport, Representative Sachs.

Representative **SACHS**: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I rise in support of the pending motion that we have previously overwhelmingly voted to pass in this Body. The reason being is this Statute is just a forward-thinking and -looking Statute that allows flexibility in a technology-neutral way to meet our energy goals that is aligned with our State Energy Plan as well. I urge the Body to support the pending motion. 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. 515

YEA - Abdi, Ankeles, Archer, Arford, Beck, Bell, Boyer M, Brennan, Bridgeo, Bunker, Cloutier, Cluchey, Copeland, Crafts, Crockett, DeBrito, Dhalac, Dill, Dodge, Doudera, Faircloth, Farrin, Friedmann, Frost, Gattine, Geiger, Gere, Golek, Graham, Gramlich, Hasenfus, Hepler, Julia, Kessler, Kuhn, Lajoie, Lee, Lookner, Macias, Malon, Mastraccio, Mathieson, Matlack, McCabe, Meyer, Milliken, Mitchell, Montell, Moonen, Murphy, O'Halloran, Osher, Pluecker, Pugh, Rana, Ray, Rielly, Roberts, Roeder, Rollins, Runte, Sachs, Salisbury, Sargent, Sato, Sayre, Shagoury, Sinclair, Skold, Stover, Supica, Terry, Warren, Webb, Yusuf, Zager, Mr. Speaker.

NAY - Albert, Arata, Ardell, Babin, Bagshaw, Bishop, Blier, Boyer D, Campbell, Carlow, Caruso, Chapman, Cimino, Collamore, Collins, Cooper, Cray, Daigle, Drinkwater, Ducharme, Eder, Faulkingham, Flynn, Foley, Foster, Fredericks, Fredette, Gifford, Greenwood, Guerrette, Haggan, Hall, Henderson, Hymes, Jackson, Javner, Lance, Lavigne, Lemelin, Libby, Lyman, Mason, McIntyre, Mingo, Morris, Nutting, Olsen, Parry, Paul, Perkins, Poirier, Pomerleau, Quint, Rudnicki, Schmiersal-Burgess, Simmons, Smith, Soboleski, Strout, Swallow, Thorne, Tuell, Wadsworth, White J, White R, Wood P, Wood S, Woodsome.

ABSENT - Adams, Lanigan, Underwood, Walker.

Yes, 77; No, 68; Absent, 4; Vacant, 0; Excused, 2.

77 having voted in the affirmative and 68 voted in the negative, with 4 being absent and 2 excused, 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**.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEE**Divided Reports**

Majority Report of the Committee on **JUDICIARY** reporting
Ought to Pass as Amended by Committee Amendment "A"
(S-361) on Bill "An Act to Prohibit the Unsecured Storage of
 Handguns in Motor Vehicles"

(S.P. 529) (L.D. 1299)

Signed:

Senators:

CARNEY of Cumberland
 TALBOT ROSS of Cumberland

Representatives:

KUHN of Falmouth
 LEE of Auburn
 PUGH of Portland
 SATO of Gorham
 SINCLAIR of Bath

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

Signed:

Senator:

HAGGAN of Penobscot

Representatives:

BABIN of Fort Fairfield
 CARUSO of Caratunk
 HENDERSON of Rumford
 O'HALLORAN of Brewer
 POIRIER of Skowhegan

Came from the Senate with the Minority **OUGHT NOT TO**
PASS Report **READ** and **ACCEPTED**.

READ.

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

Representative POIRIER of Skowhegan **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 Skowhegan, Representative Poirier.

Representative **POIRIER**: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I rise
 today in strong opposition to the pending motion. While I
 understand the bill's intention is to reduce gun theft and enhance
 public safety, I believe it overreaches. It undermines personal
 responsibility and ignores the realities of life in rural Maine.

Let me begin with a constitutional concern. The amended
 version, while softened from the original form, still treads
 dangerously close to infringing on our rights under the Second
 Amendment and Article I, Section 16 of the Maine Constitution.
 The right to keep and bear arms is presented as an absolute
 right and cannot be denied or challenged. These are not
 abstract ideas, they're guarantees. This bill places criminal
 penalties on law-abiding citizens, not for misuse, not for
 violence, not even for negligence in the traditional sense, but
 simply for leaving a legally owned firearm in their own vehicle in
 a manner the State now deems improper.

Let me give you an example. Imagine a farmer in
 Aroostook County who carries a handgun in his truck for
 protection from animals or perhaps for recreational use on
 private land. He stops at a hardware store in town. Under this
 bill, if he runs into the store for 10 minutes and the handgun is
 not locked in a secure container or hidden out of plain sight, he
 could be fined or criminally liable. Even if no theft occurred,
 even if he posed no danger to anyone. This is not theoretical.

In many parts of Maine, our vehicles are extensions of our
 homes or our workplaces. Unlike urban areas, rural Mainers
 may spend hours at a time far from their residences. And let's
 not forget, we don't all have access to high-end lockboxes or
 remote-activated security systems. For some, their truck is their
 toolbox, their barn, their lunchroom and, yes, their safe.

Mr. Speaker, this bill also ignores the principle of personal
 responsibility. Rather than educating gun owners on best
 practices, encouraging safe storage or promoting public
 awareness, this bill takes a punitive approach. It presumes
 irresponsibility instead of promoting responsibility.

Here's another example. A single mother in Bangor keeps
 a licensed firearm in her glovebox for self-defense. She works
 two jobs and after her shift at a local diner, she leaves a gun
 locked in her vehicle in a private parking lot. No child is
 endangered, no crime is committed, but under this law, she may
 face a penalty. Why? Because a bureaucratic standard doesn't
 match the nuance of her reality.

Instead of criminalizing good people, let's focus on actual
 criminal behavior like theft. Let's invest in preventing vehicle
 break-ins, supporting local law enforcement and going after
 people who steal and traffic those firearms. Let's empower gun
 owners to make informed decisions, not impose a one-size-fits-
 all mandate that works better in Portland than it does in Patten.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, we must remember that Maine's not
 Massachusetts, we're not New York; we're Maine. We're proud,
 rural and self-reliant. We should not borrow laws wholesale from
 other states that do not share our geography, our culture or our
 values.

I urge you to join me and vote no on this motion. Though
 it's well-intended, it's poorly tailored, impractical in application
 and dangerous in precedent. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

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

Representative **KUHN**: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.
 Handguns that are stolen from vehicles pose a significant public
 safety threat. At the public hearing, we learned that research
 shows that on average, at least one gun is stolen from a car
 every nine minutes in the United States. In 2022, more than half
 of gun thefts involved firearms stolen from vehicles, and vehicles
 were the single largest source of stolen firearms and the
 problem is only getting worse. The rate of gun thefts from cars
 in this country tripled from 2013 to 2023.

This bill proposes a reasonable solution to a real public
 safety problem. Five other states and the District of Columbia
 require firearms to be securely stored in motor vehicles and
 repeatedly, safe storage laws have been upheld in the courts as
 being consistent with Second Amendment rights. It's time Maine
 joined these other states and provided this important public
 safety precaution.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the Representative
 from Brewer, Representative O'Halloran.

Representative **O'HALLORAN**: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.
 I wasn't planning on speaking on this. I'd like to say that I
 actually agree with both arguments on this bill. But to me, it
 came down to the fact that in my vehicle and in many others,
 you can't store these boxes in your car, they do not fit under your
 seat, they do not fit in your glovebox, they do not fit in your
 console. If you have a car with a trunk, obviously, you can put
 it in the trunk, but those of us with Four Runners or SUVs just
 don't have the place to put it. And the argument has been made,
 well, you can throw a blanket over the box and that's legal, but
 maybe it's just the way I drive, but when I go around corners
 oftentimes things come out from the bottom, and I just would not
 want to see myself or anybody else be punished and be made,

you know, have a charge against them when they're law-abiding citizens when currently, if you don't have the box, you can lock your gun in your glove compartment and whatever that other one there is in the middle. But I just think, honestly, I think we need to get after automotive manufacturers of making more secure spaces or somehow coming up with something better to secure. Thank you.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the Representative from Paris, Representative Lance.

Representative **LANCE**: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'm sure many people in the Chamber have had a situation where they might have had to euthanize a deer that they've either hit or somebody else has hit from a secure place in their vehicle by carrying a firearm. Just something to keep in mind. Thank you.

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

Representative **SATO**: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I just wanted to add to the conversation that, one, there actually are lockboxes that would be covered under this law that can fit under a seat, and it can actually be chained to the seat, so, it wouldn't be moved; wouldn't move around when you're driving.

The other thing is under this law, it actually, it's not a criminal penalty, it's a civil violation if you are storing a handgun in your vehicle that is not unsecured. And the other thing, too, is this bill only refers to handguns. Thank you.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the Representative from Caratunk, Representative Caruso.

Representative **CARUSO**: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I understand the concept of wanting to avoid handguns from being stolen. However, this measure would make it illegal to lock up your handgun in your glovebox or lock it in your console, if that was an option. And by forcing people to place their handgun in a separate, moveable, removable box that could also be stolen by the thief. So, it wouldn't really prevent a handgun from being stolen. 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. 516

YEA - Abdi, Ankeles, Archer, Arford, Beck, Bell, Boyer M, Brennan, Cloutier, Cluchey, Copeland, Crafts, Crockett, DeBrito, Dhalac, Dodge, Doudera, Faircloth, Friedmann, Gattine, Geiger, Gere, Golek, Graham, Gramlich, Julia, Kessler, Kuhn, Lee, Lookner, Macias, Malon, Mastraccio, Mathieson, Matlack, McCabe, Meyer, Mitchell, Montell, Moonen, Murphy, Osher, Pugh, Rana, Ray, Rielly, Roeder, Rollins, Runte, Sachs, Salisbury, Sargent, Sato, Sayre, Shagoury, Sinclair, Skold, Stover, Supica, Terry, Warren, Yusuf, Zager, Mr. Speaker.

NAY - Albert, Arata, Ardell, Babin, Bagshaw, Bishop, Blier, Boyer D, Bridgeo, Bunker, Campbell, Carlow, Caruso, Chapman, Cimino, Collamore, Collins, Cooper, Cray, Daigle, Dill, Drinkwater, Ducharme, Eder, Farrin, Faulkingham, Flynn, Foley, Foster, Fredericks, Fredette, Frost, Gifford, Greenwood, Guerrette, Haggan, Hall, Hasenfus, Henderson, Hepler, Hymes, Jackson, Javner, Lajoie, Lance, Lavigne, Lemelin, Libby, Lyman, Mason, McIntyre, Milliken, Mingo, Morris, Nutting, O'Halloran, Olsen, Parry, Paul, Pluecker, Poirier, Pomerleau, Quint, Roberts, Rudnicki, Schmearsal-Burgess, Simmons, Smith, Soboleski, Strout, Swallow, Thorne, Tuell, Wadsworth, White J, White R, Wood P, Wood S, Woodsome.

ABSENT - Adams, Lanigan, Perkins, Underwood, Walker, Webb.

Yes, 64; No, 79; Absent, 6; Vacant, 0; Excused, 2.

64 having voted in the affirmative and 79 voted in the negative, with 6 being absent and 2 excused, and accordingly the Majority **Ought to Pass as Amended** Report was **NOT ACCEPTED**.

Subsequently, on motion of Representative KUHN of Falmouth, the Minority **Ought Not to Pass** Report was **ACCEPTED** in concurrence.

By unanimous consent, all matters having been acted upon were **ORDERED SENT FORTHWITH**.

Majority Report of the Committee on **JUDICIARY** reporting **Ought Not to Pass** on Resolve, Establishing the Commission to Study the Foreclosure Process

(H.P. 117) (L.D. 184)

Signed:

Senators:

CARNEY of Cumberland

TALBOT ROSS of Cumberland

Representatives:

KUHN of Falmouth

O'HALLORAN of Brewer

PUGH of Portland

SATO of Gorham

SINCLAIR of Bath

Minority Report of the same Committee reporting **Ought to Pass as Amended by Committee Amendment "A" (H-726)** on same Resolve.

Signed:

Senator:

HAGGAN of Penobscot

Representatives:

BABIN of Fort Fairfield

CARUSO of Caratunk

HENDERSON of Rumford

LEE of Auburn

POIRIER of Skowhegan

READ.

Representative KUHN of Falmouth moved that the House **ACCEPT** the Majority **Ought Not to Pass** Report.

Representative POIRIER of Skowhegan **REQUESTED** a roll call on the motion to **ACCEPT** the Majority **Ought Not to Pass** 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 Skowhegan, Representative Poirier.

Representative **POIRIER**: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I rise today in opposition to the pending motion, in strong support of the amended version of the bill. This is a measured, bipartisan step, not to eliminate foreclosure, not to interfere with the rights of lenders, but to study and understand how Maine's foreclosure process functions in 2025 and whether it serves the best interests of our people, our economy and our communities.

Let me begin with sobering facts. Between 2019 and 2024, Maine experienced a 37% increase in residential foreclosures, and that's according to the Maine Bureau of Consumer Credit Protection. In 2023 alone, more than 1,800 foreclosure filings were made statewide. And that number is projected to rise in 2025 due to the lingering affects of inflation, rising property taxes and variable rate mortgage resets. Yet we haven't updated our foreclosure framework in over a decade.

We haven't studied the cumulative effect of these changes on Mainers, on seniors, on veterans, on working families trying to hold on to generational homes.

The purpose of this bill is simple: Let's get the facts. Let's study how our judicial foreclosure system is working and where it's failing. Let's examine timelines, notice requirement, mediation practices, access to legal counsel and rural court disparities. It isn't just an abstract legal exercise, Mr. Speaker. It's about real people. People like a retired couple in Oxford County who were foreclosed on in the middle of a loan modification review without notice. A disabled veteran from Washington County who didn't receive proper legal counsel and lost their home over a \$6,000 arrearage. A single parent in Lewiston whose property was auctioned before the court process fully played out. Shouldn't we at least ask whether these situations are outliers or symptoms of something broken?

Mr. Speaker, we're not alone in this concern. Over 30 states have undertaken similar studies or reforms in the past five years, including states like Vermont, Connecticut and Michigan. They found that with modest adjustments, better mediation access, clear notice and early intervention, foreclosure rates declined while lender rates remained fully protected.

Foreclosures cost municipalities dearly. When a home is foreclosed and sits vacant, property values decline, tax revenues dip. In Portland alone, it's estimated that each vacant foreclosure costs the city between \$19,000 and \$34,000 in lost value, policing, code enforcement and neighborhood deterioration. Passing this bill doesn't cost the State millions, it doesn't interfere with private contracts, it simply brings people to the table, stakeholders that can study the system and report back. If data shows that the process is working fine, Mr. Speaker, then we'll know. But if it shows hardship, systematic flaws or uneven application, then shame on us if we do nothing. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the Representative from Madison, Representative Ducharme.

Representative **DUCHARME**: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I rise today in opposition to the Ought Not to Pass motion. This bill, in the 131st Legislature, passed unanimously in both Chambers. It died on the desk of the Chief Executive for lack of \$36,000.

What the bill does, as the Good Representative from Skowhegan spoke to, it talks about specific procedures. It talks about how those timelines affect the availability of foreclosed property, for affordable housing. It talks about the ability of small financial institutions in the State of Maine to work to keep property owners out of foreclosure and how to make foreclosed property available for sale quickly. It does not speak to removing existing consumer protections. The current bill before us as amended takes those same things and simply adds two members of the Judicial Branch to the process.

According to Fannie Mae, as recently as March, the State of Maine from complaint to resolution is 1,320 days. According to the *Portland Press Herald* of May 2025, Maine is facing a tsunami of foreclosures from USDA loans. One attorney that testified against the bill used the 2014 report ordered by then-Attorney General Janet Mills as a defense of not passing this. At that time, complaint to resolution was 390 days. So, since 2014, after we passed this report, we've taken it from 390 days to 1,320. That's an increase of 250%.

Mr. Speaker, this bill was put in in an effort to try and move these properties from foreclosure to back on the market, if that was the case, or back to the homeowner quicker. As you well know, we have a housing problem. This could be part of the

solution. We just need to get the process right. I urge you to defeat this motion. Thank you.

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

Representative **KUHN**: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I just wanted to share briefly that I think the majority of the Committee was concerned, based on the membership and the duties, that the study commission might not be as neutral in its approach and might really be to explore how to turn around distressed properties faster, in ways that could potentially undermine protections for mortgage holders.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the Representative from Readfield, Representative Hasenfus.

Representative **HASENFUS**: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. You know, I don't view this as a particularly partisan issue, I view it as an issue that is affecting the State of Maine.

These foreclosure cases are incredibly complex, tedious, and they tie up properties for a long time, both in terms of, you know, the former occupant often moving out and not having a place to stay and in terms of new occupants moving in and potential repurchases of that property. I do think it would be advantageous to move this bill forward to see if, you know, how it fits in our funding priorities and see if there is something we can look at to both provide better protections for people who are in the process of foreclosure proceedings and perhaps allow them to stay in their house longer, and to make sure that the title can be cleared and turned around quicker to get the properties back out before they are dilapidated and can no longer be used for housing. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

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

Representative **MOONEN**: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, Colleagues of the House, I heard that this bill was passed unanimously last Session. That did not match my memory, so, I looked it up and I want to inform the Body that this bill was rejected in both Chambers last Session, meaning that both Chambers accepted the Ought Not to Pass Report. The concerns then are the same as they are now.

This was maybe worth looking at. I was here the last time we did comprehensive reform on foreclosure following the 2008 housing crisis as part of the 2008 financial crisis. All of our current foreclosure laws were heavily, heavily negotiated for well over a year, a balance was carefully struck between all the parties. I'm not necessarily opposed to revisiting what was done a decade later, but this proposed bill has no balance in terms of the membership of the commission. It proposes no consumer advocates at all and for that reason, I support the Ought Not to Pass.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the Representative from Brewer, Representative O'Halloran.

Representative **O'HALLORAN**: Thank you. I also wasn't planning on speaking on this motion, but I can tell you as somebody who works in this industry and has worked on countless foreclosures and short sales that the odds are stacked against Mainers. Most Mainers are self-employed, so, when you get hurt, you might be out 30, 60 days, recovering in the hospital, have cancer. They've already started the foreclosure process before your second payment is due. And I really think people need to think about that.

And these banks, especially our out-of-state banks; it's not so much your local banks, you can reach your local bank, you can walk in to your local bank and you can have a conversation, but with these online banks, their rules and regulations are so detrimental to homeowners and the process is totally stacked against you. I can tell you personally from my own experiences

of trying to reach anybody who has any kind of authority on these online banks is almost impossible. And sometimes when they call you, it's at two o'clock in the morning because they're in some other country or other crazy details.

And, you know, everybody wants to think that it's because people are lazy or they're unemployed, or they just don't work hard enough. And I'm here to tell you that that is absolutely not true. It is less than probably five percent of the foreclosures. The majority of them are due to cancer, you know, of one of the homeowners or children; a loss of a spouse; divorce has a big impact; some mental health issues, but these are people that are losing their homes, 99% of time are very hardworking, self-employed people. And when you're late, you get astronomical charges added on by these banks that nobody can catch up on. And all of a sudden, then, they tell you, 'well, you have to pay the whole amount.' I mean, just, it is just not fair, and this definitely should not pass.

And for the people sitting here who have a problem with the vacant houses after they've been foreclosed on, it is not those homeowners' fault; it is those banks. And it is used to their advantage, because they get credit through incentives through the federal government on a whole slew of things by letting them sit there. They can take depreciation, they can get further losses, there's a whole bunch of things that they do. So, it's not the homeowners' fault if they're sitting there vacant for so long. On that aspect, it's definitely the banks, and, again, 99% of the time, it is your huge corporation, online banks; it's not your local banks.

And I just would urge people, especially self-employed people or people that know other people that are self-employed that if these rules change, it is going to be detrimental and more of our properties are not going to be bought by Mainers; they're going to be bought by more out-of-staters who are coming here, renting these properties by the week or by the month, with major increases of rental prices. So, I would just encourage people to really put a pause on this. Thank you.

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

Representative **LEE**: I'm sorry, Mr. Speaker, this is far too many people speaking on a study bill, I understand. I rise in opposition to the motion.

To say our foreclosure process has been confusing and unpredictable is an understatement. In 2017, in the *Pushard* case, Maine's foreclosure law was interpreted to find that a remedy of a free and clear mortgage was proper for an incorrectly accelerated note. In 2024, the law court in *Finch*, on facts almost identical to *Pushard* and on the very same Statute, interpreted that Statute to find the exact opposite. We are ping-ponging back and forth as our foreclosure law has been established. The last time we looked at it was 2014. To me, it makes sense that we take a look at it before we do anything to react to *Finch* or *Pushard* and perhaps come up with a better solution.

The scope of this Committee was narrowed and actually made far more neutral in the process of amending it. I think we should have some folks looking at this, so, there's an opportunity that we have an equitable and meaningful foreclosure law in the State of Maine.

The SPEAKER: A roll call has been ordered. The pending question before the House is Acceptance of the Majority Ought Not to Pass Report. All those in favor will vote yes, those opposed will vote no.

ROLL CALL NO. 517

YEA - Ankeles, Archer, Beck, Bell, Boyer M, Brennan, Bunker, Cloutier, Cluchey, Copeland, Crafts, Crockett, DeBrito, Dhalac, Dill, Dodge, Doudera, Faircloth, Gattine, Geiger, Gere, Golek, Gramlich, Hepler, Kuhn, Lookner, Macias, Malon, Mastraccio, Mathieson, Matlack, McCabe, Meyer, Milliken, Mitchell, Montell, Moonen, Murphy, O'Halloran, Osher, Pluecker, Pugh, Rana, Ray, Rielly, Roberts, Roeder, Rollins, Runte, Sachs, Salisbury, Sargent, Sato, Shagoury, Sinclair, Skold, Stover, Supica, Terry, Warren, Webb, Yusuf, Zager.

NAY - Abdi, Albert, Arata, Ardell, Arford, Babin, Bagshaw, Bishop, Blier, Boyer D, Bridgeo, Campbell, Carlow, Caruso, Chapman, Cimino, Collamore, Collins, Cooper, Cray, Daigle, Drinkwater, Ducharme, Eder, Farrin, Faulkingham, Flynn, Foley, Foster, Fredericks, Fredette, Friedmann, Frost, Gifford, Graham, Greenwood, Guerrette, Haggan, Hall, Hasenfus, Henderson, Hymes, Jackson, Javner, Julia, Kessler, Lajoie, Lance, Lavigne, Lee, Lemelin, Libby, Lyman, Mason, McIntyre, Mingo, Morris, Nutting, Olsen, Parry, Paul, Perkins, Poirier, Pomerleau, Quint, Rudnicki, Sayre, Schmursal-Burgess, Simmons, Smith, Soboleski, Strout, Swallow, Thorne, Tuell, Wadsworth, White J, White R, Wood P, Wood S, Woodsome, Mr. Speaker.

ABSENT - Adams, Lanigan, Underwood, Walker.

Yes, 63; No, 82; Absent, 4; Vacant, 0; Excused, 2.

63 having voted in the affirmative and 82 voted in the negative, with 4 being absent and 2 excused, and accordingly the Majority **Ought Not to Pass** Report was **NOT ACCEPTED**.

Subsequently, on motion of Representative KUHN of Falmouth, the Minority **Ought to Pass as Amended** Report was **ACCEPTED**.

The Resolve was **READ ONCE**. **Committee Amendment "A" (H-726)** was **READ** by the Clerk and **ADOPTED**.

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

Under further suspension of the rules the Resolve was **PASSED TO BE ENGROSSED as Amended by Committee Amendment "A" (H-726)** and sent for concurrence.

Majority Report of the Committee on **JUDICIARY** reporting **Ought to Pass as Amended by Committee Amendment "A" (H-727)** on Bill "An Act to Address Coercive Control in Domestic Abuse Cases"

(H.P. 438) (L.D. 670)

Signed:

Senators:

CARNEY of Cumberland

TALBOT ROSS of Cumberland

Representatives:

KUHN of Falmouth

CARUSO of Caratunk

O'HALLORAN of Brewer

PUGH of Portland

SATO of Gorham

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

Signed:

Senator:

HAGGAN of Penobscot

Representatives:

BABIN of Fort Fairfield

HENDERSON of Rumford

LEE of Auburn

POIRIER of Skowhegan

SINCLAIR of Bath

READ.

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

Representative POIRIER of Skowhegan **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 Skowhegan, Representative Poirier.

Representative **POIRIER**: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I rise today in respectful opposition to the pending motion.

I want to be clear that I believe domestic abuse is real, it's devastating, it must be taken seriously. No person; man, woman, child or elder; should be made to live in fear or manipulation. But in our pursuit for justice, we must not trample on the principles of fairness, due process and clarity that define our legal system.

This bill, even in its amended form, would expand the definition of 'abuse' to include coercive control, a term that remains vague and deeply subjective. What exactly constitutes 'coercive control?' The bill attempts to define it as a pattern of behavior designed to isolate, intimidate or dominate. That sounds reasonable until we realize that in practice, these determinations can hinge on perception, not objective fact.

Some examples. A man and woman are going through a bitter divorce. Emotions are high, trust is gone and arguments are frequent. One party claims that the other controls who the other talks to, referring to a disagreement over their child's exposure to certain friends. Under this bill, that could be framed as coercive control. Or imagine a couple in financial distress. One partner insists that the other not spend money. Is that economic abuse or responsible budgeting in a crisis? Under this Statute, the answer may depend less on the facts and more on who gets to the courtroom first.

We're venturing into legal territory where common relationship conflicts could be criminalized. This bill risks creating a legal environment where allegation equals consequence, and where people; often men, but not exclusively; may face protection orders, arrest, or custody loss based not on physical harm or threat, but only behavior subjectively interpreted through the lens of conflict.

Mr. Speaker, if we care about justice, we should ensure laws are clear, enforceable and grounded in evidence. We can't protect people from abuse by broadening the law to the point where it's no longer distinguishable from everyday conflict. When everything is abuse, nothing is. Mr. Speaker, I urge you to oppose the pending motion. Thank you.

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

Representative **KUHN**: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I just wanted to address the question of vagueness and the standard of what might constitute coercive behavior.

Some examples that we've heard from the public hearing included restricting a person of financial resources so as to create dependency or limit their ability to leave a relationship; monitoring or restricting movements, communications or daily activities; isolating the person from friends, family and support systems; using intimidation, threats, coercion against the person to create fear or dependency and exploiting vulnerabilities of the person such as disabilities or mental health conditions to ensure their dependence.

The standard is not vague. In fact, we heard that it's already in law and it's already considered to be part of the PFA Statute, the definition of 'abuse.' And that judges in fact evaluate these kind of factors all the time very effectively. Maine Coalition to End Domestic Violence testified that enactment of this bill may be helpful in educating unrepresented parties about the type of conduct that qualifies as abuse under the Statute. Somewhere around 80% of persons seeking protection from abuse orders are unrepresented and without having the specific word 'coercion' in the Statute and in the forms that are prepared by the Judicial Branch, someone seeking one of these protection orders might not realize that they have a valid basis to pursue it.

And so, for those reasons, the majority voted to support the motion. Thank you.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the Representative from Newport, Representative Fredette.

Representative **FREDETTE**: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I practiced family law for over 30 years, and domestic violence is real and many of the bills regarding protection from abuse laws were amended and upgraded during my previous time in the Legislature from 2010 to 2018. And I will tell you that in regards to practicing family law, it's one of the most stressful times in anybody's lives, particularly children. And when you have either a parental rights action or a divorce, emotions are high, and regardless of the situation, trying to manage it from a legal perspective is always difficult, because emotions are high. And many times, when you have either a parental rights action or a divorce action, which then includes a protection from abuse, it then compounds the case and makes it even more difficult.

Now, understand that if you file for a protection from abuse, many times, at the very beginning of a divorce case and if the court finds that there's abuse, the court will immediately address matters of who gets primary residence of the child, who gets custody, who gets child support; there's lots of things that sort of get decided in a one- or two-hour hearing which oftentimes, in the normal course of a divorce, might take six months, maybe nine months. So, I'm very cautious about adding the word 'coercive' to the Statute, which is a pretty settled Statute. I think judges have a pretty good sense of the Statute, and while there may be some people that are not represented, I think judges do a very good job of using the current Statute and protecting people that need to be properly protected.

As somebody that has to work with these words all the time, I do sometimes wonder, what does the word 'coercive' mean? It can mean lots of things to maybe different people. And so, I think it's a slippery slope. Obviously, if this was something I thought that was needed, I would be supporting it, but given sort of the vagueness of it, I will not be supporting it, as I think, you know, the process has enough to protect people as it is. We can't protect everything and everybody, but I think adding a vague word like 'coercive' will not be helpful, and I will not be supporting the motion. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

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

Representative **SATO**: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. What I will add to this conversation is that the actions that are encompassed in what we're calling 'coercive control' already exist in our abuse Statute, so, we're not actually expanding, we're not expanding the definition of 'abuse' right now. What we're really doing is we're ensuring that those who are *pro se* litigants who cannot afford an attorney, and they're trying to seek protection when they're experiencing coercive control, that when they look at the Statute, they know that this is included to get protection from abuse. 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. 518

YEA - Abdi, Ankeles, Archer, Arford, Beck, Bell, Boyer M, Brennan, Bridgeo, Bunker, Caruso, Cloutier, Cluchey, Copeland, Crafts, Crockett, DeBrito, Dhalac, Dill, Dodge, Doudera, Faircloth, Farrin, Friedmann, Frost, Gattine, Geiger, Gere, Golek, Graham, Gramlich, Hasenfus, Hepler, Julia, Kessler, Kuhn, Lajoie, Lookner, Macias, Malon, Mastraccio, Mathieson, Matlack, McCabe, Meyer, Milliken, Mitchell, Montell, Moonen, Murphy, O'Halloran, Osher, Pluecker, Pugh, Rana, Ray, Rielly, Roberts, Roeder, Rollins, Runte, Sachs, Salisbury, Sargent, Sato, Sayre, Shagoury, Skold, Stover, Supica, Terry, Warren, Webb, Yusuf, Zager, Mr. Speaker.

NAY - Albert, Arata, Ardell, Babin, Bagshaw, Bishop, Blier, Boyer D, Campbell, Carlow, Chapman, Cimino, Collamore, Collins, Cooper, Cray, Daigle, Drinkwater, Ducharme, Eder, Faulkingham, Flynn, Foley, Foster, Fredericks, Fredette, Gifford, Greenwood, Guerrette, Haggan, Hall, Henderson, Hymes, Jackson, Javner, Lance, Lavigne, Lee, Lemelin, Libby, Lyman, Mason, McIntyre, Mingo, Morris, Nutting, Olsen, Parry, Paul, Perkins, Poirier, Pomerleau, Quint, Rudnicki, Schmearsal-Burgess, Simmons, Sinclair, Smith, Soboleski, Strout, Swallow, Thorne, Tuell, Wadsworth, White J, White R, Wood P, Wood S, Woodsome.

ABSENT - Adams, Lanigan, Underwood, Walker.

Yes, 76; No, 69; Absent, 4; Vacant, 0; Excused, 2.

76 having voted in the affirmative and 69 voted in the negative, with 4 being absent and 2 excused, and accordingly the Majority **Ought to Pass as Amended** Report was **ACCEPTED**.

The Bill was **READ ONCE**. **Committee Amendment "A" (H-727)** 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-727)** and sent for concurrence.

By unanimous consent, all matters having been acted upon were **ORDERED SENT FORTHWITH**.

Majority Report of the Committee on **JUDICIARY** reporting **Ought to Pass as Amended by Committee Amendment "A" (H-721)** on Resolve, Directing the Attorney General to Convene a Working Group to Propose a Plan for Expanding the Reach of Treatment Courts

(H.P. 841) (L.D. 1266)

Signed:

Senators:

CARNEY of Cumberland
TALBOT ROSS of Cumberland

Representatives:

KUHN of Falmouth
BABIN of Fort Fairfield
LEE of Auburn
O'HALLORAN of Brewer
PUGH of Portland
SATO of Gorham
SINCLAIR of Bath

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

Signed:

Senator:

HAGGAN of Penobscot

Representatives:

CARUSO of Caratunk
HENDERSON of Rumford
POIRIER of Skowhegan

READ.

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

Representative POIRIER of Skowhegan **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 Skowhegan, Representative Poirier.

Representative **POIRIER**: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I rise today in respectful opposition to this motion. I do fully support the treatment courts and their missions, but I do have some concerns with the way that this Resolve is set up.

This Resolve hands the Attorney General's Office the task of creating a plan that gives very little direction. What kind of expansion are we talking about? More courts? Different eligibility criteria? Mandatory diversion? Expanding State funding? We don't know, because the bill doesn't say. And yet, we're planting a seed for potentially expansive, far-reaching policy shift that could remake our criminal justice system without the Legislature first agreeing to the scope.

We haven't evaluated how our current treatment courts are working. Before we talk about expansion, shouldn't we talk about results? What's the recidivism rate of participants? What's the cost per case? How many people are succeeding and how many people are not? We don't have any statewide data or information on this yet. Expanding a system without an evidence-based review of its current form isn't smart policy; it's blind faith, Mr. Speaker.

There's better ways to improve access to treatment. If our goal is to expand access to mental health and substance use support, let's do that outside a courtroom. Let's invest in community-based clinics, mobile crisis response teams, housing-first models and peer recovery programs. Those efforts cost less, reach more people and avoid the complication of judicial supervision.

Mr. Speaker, this Resolve may sound modest, just a working group, but we all know working groups shape policy. This bill plants the idea of treatment court expansion without defining it, measuring it or questioning it, and it should give us pause. Let's support treatment, not expand the footprint of the justice system without a clear plan. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

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

Representative **KUHN**: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I wanted to clarify initially that the amended bill that is under consideration changes the agency that's directed to do the work from the Office of the Attorney General to the Department of Health and Human Services, and they are charged to establish a working group to develop a plan for expanding the availability of drug treatment courts, family treatment courts, veterans courts, so that defendants in every prosecutorial district in the State will have access to that opportunity.

Also, I wanted to just consider the question of whether there has been an evaluation of the results measuring and looking at impacts, and I wanted to clarify that we do have an annual report on the specialty dockets, this is from February 14, 2025, and I just wanted to share with you some of the results that are identified here. "Treatment courts are the single most successful intervention in our nation's history for leading criminally involved people living with substance use disorders and mental health disorders out of the justice system and into the lives of recovery and stability." The treatment courts initiated a collaborative system that views substance use as a medical disease rather than a moral failing. This approach enables treatment courts to include medical and recovery professionals, where individuals receive personalized, evidence-based treatment. The result is a public health approach to justice reform using judicial intervention with treatment responses and compassion instead of punitive impartiality. All of the treatment courts are required to adhere to national standards. These evidence-based models have been shown to reduce recidivism and lower costs while promoting recovery and stability.

So, these are actually proven models in our State that lead to good outcomes both for the individuals involved and for the people of Maine in terms of cost, public safety and many other things. So, I hope the Body will support this motion and seek to expand the availability of these opportunities across the State.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the Representative from Brewer, Representative O'Halloran.

Representative **O'HALLORAN**: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I just want to say that this bill does not create a new court; it doesn't spend a single new dollar. What it does is to start the work intentionally, collaboratively, transparently, determining how Maine can better utilize treatment courts to get people healthy, reduce; I can never say this word; recidivism and improve public safety.

We all know what's not working. Maine jails are overwhelmed, our court dockets are backed up, too many people are cycling through the system not because they are violent or unredeemable, but because they are sick. They need care, not just custody. Treatment courts offer accountability with support. Participants must follow strict conditions, undergo regular testing and supervision, and I would say the data backs this up.

The State's robust treatment court programs report lower recidivism rates, better health outcomes and cost savings over incarceration. And I just want to say this is not being soft on crime; this is just being smart with our dollars and helping to provide people to get the help that they need, and I'm definitely in support of this bill.

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. 519

YEA - Abdi, Ankeles, Archer, Arford, Babin, Beck, Bell, Boyer M, Brennan, Bridgeo, Bunker, Cloutier, Cluchey, Collamore, Copeland, Crafts, Crockett, DeBrito, Dhalac, Dill, Dodge, Doudera, Faircloth, Farrin, Friedmann, Frost, Gattine, Geiger, Gere, Golek, Graham, Gramlich, Hasenfus, Hepler, Julia, Kessler, Kuhn, Lajoie, Lanigan, Lee, Lookner, Macias, Malon, Mastraccio, Mathieson, Matlack, McCabe, Meyer, Milliken, Mitchell, Montell, Moonen, Murphy, O'Halloran, Osher, Pluecker, Pugh, Rana, Ray, Rielly, Roberts, Roeder, Rollins, Runte, Sachs, Salisbury, Sargent, Sato, Sayre, Shagoury, Sinclair, Skold, Stover, Strout, Supica, Terry, Tuell, Warren, Webb, Woodsome, Yusuf, Zager, Mr. Speaker.

NAY - Albert, Arata, Ardell, Bagshaw, Bishop, Blier, Boyer D, Campbell, Carlow, Caruso, Chapman, Cimino, Collins, Cooper, Cray, Daigle, Drinkwater, Ducharme, Eder, Faulkingham, Flynn, Foley, Foster, Fredericks, Fredette, Gifford, Greenwood, Guerrette, Haggan, Hall, Henderson, Hymes, Jackson, Javner, Lance, Lavigne, Lemelin, Libby, Lyman, Mason, McIntyre, Mingo, Morris, Nutting, Olsen, Parry, Paul, Perkins, Poirier, Pomerleau, Quint, Rudnicki, Schmersal-Burgess, Simmons, Smith, Soboleski, Swallow, Thorne, Wadsworth, White J, White R, Wood P, Wood S.

ABSENT - Adams, Underwood, Walker.

Yes, 83; No, 63; Absent, 3; Vacant, 0; Excused, 2.

83 having voted in the affirmative and 63 voted in the negative, with 3 being absent and 2 excused, and accordingly the Majority **Ought to Pass as Amended** Report was **ACCEPTED**.

The Resolve was **READ ONCE**. **Committee Amendment "A" (H-721)** was **READ** by the Clerk and **ADOPTED**.

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

Under further suspension of the rules the Resolve was **PASSED TO BE ENGROSSED as Amended by Committee Amendment "A" (H-721)** and sent for concurrence.

By unanimous consent, all matters having been acted upon were **ORDERED SENT FORTHWITH**.

Majority Report of the Committee on **VETERANS AND LEGAL AFFAIRS** reporting **Ought to Pass as Amended by Committee Amendment "A" (H-713)** on Bill "An Act Regarding Sun-grown Cultivation in the Medical Use and Adult Use Cannabis Industries"

(H.P. 1268) (L.D. 1897)

Signed:

Senator:

HICKMAN of Kennebec

Representatives:

SUPICA of Bangor

CHAPMAN of Auburn

FAIRCLOTH of Bangor

FREDERICKS of Sanford

FROST of Belgrade

GRAHAM of North Yarmouth

HYMES of Waldo

MALON of Biddeford

TERRY of Gorham

Minority Report of the same Committee reporting **Ought to Pass as Amended by Committee Amendment "B" (H-714)** on same Bill.

Signed:

Senator:

TIMBERLAKE of Androscoggin

Representative:

BOYER of Poland

READ.

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

Representative OSHER of Orono **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 Orono, Representative Osher.

Representative **OSHER**: Mr. Speaker and Colleagues of the House, I'm the proud Sponsor of LD 1897. I urge you to reject the pending motion, because I support the Minority Report.

The Majority Report is Ought to Pass with Amendment "A," and Amendment "A" eliminates the adjustment to the microbial testing requirements for sun-grown; for cannabis. The Minority Report, which I support, raises the microbial testing limit for total yeast and mold from 10,000 to 100,000 colony forming units; that's abbreviated as CFUs.

Maine's microbial testing rules were established in 2018. Our State codified the testing rules put into Statute in other early-adopting states that set allowable total yeast and mold at very low levels, 10,000 CFUs, before studies were available to identify the actual dangerous levels of total yeast and mold on these crops. The present rules were written by those familiar with the conditions of growing cannabis indoors, but the rules put an undue burden on those growing this crop outside under the sun.

The American Herbal Pharmacopeia, the education organization dedicated to promoting the responsible use of herbal products and herbal medicine, states that "the recommended limits may require adjustment over time." It also states that higher levels of mold can also occur in seasons of heavy rain without undue damage to the crop and may justify a

material existing and proposed limits as long as there is no visible damage to the plant and other qualitative specifications are met.

Well, in Maine, growing these crops outdoors, what this bill codifies as 'sun-grown,' often we experience very rainy growing seasons. This relentless rain year has put all growers of sun-grown cannabis in danger of having their entire crops destroyed, because the yeast and mold growing on the plant puts the crop over the very low limit that is presently in Statute. In addition, organic farming best practices include inoculating plants with beneficial microbes. These beneficial microbial communities improve plant health and, because the beneficial microbes occupy surface area that may otherwise be colonized by detrimental microbial communities, they help decrease the presence and growth of pathogens on those plants.

I bring this part of the bill to your attention because the test for microbial yeast and mold is for all populations of microbes. The beneficial microbes get counted, too. This means that growers who have growing plants outside in rainy conditions and those using organic best practices will fail the test, despite the fact that there are maybe no microbes present that are harmful to humans.

As most studies have shown; as more studies have shown that higher numbers of CFUs on cannabis plants; that is, between 10,000 and 100,000 CFUs; are not harmful to human health, regulators in several states have moved away from the original low total yeast and mold thresholds. Connecticut, Maryland, and Michigan all recently raised their threshold from 10,000 to 100,000. They join New Jersey and Florida, that were already using the higher thresholds. New York State removed any CFU limit and the pass/fail impact of testing in an effort to support outdoor cultivators. That state requires only that growers test their plants and report the test results to the state. Twelve states don't require total yeast and mold testing at all, and instead test for specific pathogens; pathogens to humans. The states that don't require testing for; one state that doesn't require testing for total yeast and mold is California, and that state has the largest cannabis market in the country.

Maine is failing and not allowing growers to market products that would make it to market in 18 other states. This is an economic factor for our farmers in Maine, that's why I would like you to follow my light. The Minority Report will raise the microbial testing limit from 10,000 to 100,000 CFUs. At present, the regulation is not actually guaranteeing better health and safety, but it is inhibiting growers who use organic and sun-grown practices. I encourage you to follow my light and vote against the pending resolution, with the goal of passing the Minority Report.

The **SPEAKER**: The Chair recognizes the Representative from Poland, Representative Boyer.

Representative **BOYER**: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I rise in support of the Minority Report, which is exactly identical to the Majority Report except for this 100,000 CFUs that we've been talking about last week and today.

Both Reports would allow medicinal cannabis caregivers to cultivate the same number of plants outdoors during the growing season as could be produced indoors annually, creating an equal opportunity. It amends the definition of 'outdoor' to include sun-grown cultivation practices that utilize three-season greenhouses. This would help lower Maine's cannabis energy footprint and support sustainable growing practices.

Connecticut, Maryland, Michigan join New Jersey, Florida in raising the limit from 10,000 to 100,000, because our limit is so low right now, Mr. Speaker, our small businesses are losing money. If a batch fails, say it's at 11,000 CFUs, that reduces

their value from the flower per pound drastically from, some estimates, \$3,200 down to \$800, because they turn the flower into distillate, which goes into the cartridges and edibles. Then they have to retest it. A retest is \$560. I'm a fan of DMX as well, a good Representative from the County; young at heart, young at heart. So, Alaska, Arizona, Arkansas, California, Hawaii, Montana, Missouri, New Mexico, Oregon, Vermont, Washington, they all don't even test for this. New York, in their adult use program, they don't have a pass/fail threshold, they say just label it and let the consumer decide.

So, Maine is falling behind to our neighboring adult use states and, Mr. Speaker, because of our current policy, operators are buying radiation machines. They cost a quarter-million dollars. So, all the big boys, they get to buy the radiation machines and they blast all the weed right through it and zap it, and then the cannabis passes. Is the mold gone? I don't know. Is the radiation bad for your health? I don't know. There's not a lot of studies on it. So, our current policy just encourages the big corporations to use the radiation machines as a loophole, even, and then, the small growers who want to grow outdoors, they can't afford a \$250,000 machine that came from China, that may or may not even be calibrated correctly. So, I mean, we're talking about labor safety down in Massachusetts because of lax regulations, someone died from inhaling trim in one of the rooms.

So, we don't have our arms appropriately wrapped around these radiation machines. The way to get rid of the radiation machines is change the policy to begin with, raise the limit to 100,000 and let our farmers farm. So, I would hope that folks follow my light and the Representative from Orono's light and give our farmers a fighting chance. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

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

Representative **MALON**: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I rise in support of the pending motion and in support of the strong 10-2 bipartisan Majority Report of the Committee on Veterans and Legal Affairs. This Report was carefully crafted and is a result of a significant amount of time invested by many Members of the Committee, none less so than our Honorable House Chair, my good friend from Bangor, who worked with fairly strident voices on both sides of the issues facing our Committee and helped craft the compromise.

The reason why I do not support the Minority Report is that there are going to be discussions over the offseason involving a number of different pieces of legislation and over the subject of testing and what is important to test, what levels are important to test for, what levels are safe and we're going to incorporate the voices of science, of the public health community, of operators, of a wide variety of stakeholders, so that we can figure out the best way to move forward with testing. So, in my view, making changes to the testing requirement, as the Minority Report does, is premature, because you will hear from people who think that certain levels of total yeast and mold are relatively safe to consume and to smoke. You will also hear from other public health experts, people who have studied what things do to the human body, that certain levels are too high.

So, I would urge the Body to support the Majority Report, which helps reform regulations, so that the small sun-grown operators can get moving in the right direction and can help improve their businesses and do so as soon as possible, which I support. And support the Committee work that has happened and will continue to happen. Please follow my light. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the Representative from Bangor, Representative Supica.

Representative **SUPICA**: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I hadn't intended on standing, but since I was brought up in the conversation, I thought I would stand and speak for myself.

I actually support the policy of raising from 10,000 to 100,000 CFUs. I do. And the Representative from Biddeford is correct that we did come up with a compromise, and part of what was happening is that there is a lot of new Members on the Committee who, when you come to VLA and you learn about cannabis, I kind of; it's almost like it's a wall of cannabis and it's a lot of people coming at you and a lot of them are really upset and a lot of them are really upset about overregulation and how hard it is to operate a business and to make any money. An example I'll give: In adult use, you can put your heart and soul into raising a crop; because it is a crop, these are farmers; and even if it fails the testing requirements for the total yeast and mold, so, you know, if it's over 10,000 CFUs, you can't sell it, but you still have to pay an excise tax on it. So, when looking at the science and what is harmful and what is not, there are a lot of experts that say 100,000 is also acceptable.

I did vote on the Majority Report in an effort to try to advance some form of policy, because I did work with an organic farmer who is working with MOFGA to try to develop organic farming standards for cannabis, so that we can grow outdoors in adult use, so that we can use less electricity, so that we can have craft cannabis. And I have to say, if there's one thing that the entire Committee heard loud and clear is that there is an opportunity in Maine for us to have craft cannabis much in the same way that we have craft beer. Because when; and it will happen; when it becomes legal federally, all of these large corporate grows that use a lot of electricity will move down south where they have more sunshine, more grow time. And what will we have left, but small farmers? And we want organic farming practices to thrive here. We want to have a Maine cannabis trail like we have a Maine beer trail. And we want people to come to our State and partake of the things that we grow from the soil. Raising it to 100,000 CFUs, I do not think would harm folks.

I do think that we have a tendency in VLA to get really dug in, and in cannabis, we often get so dug in that we're never able to find compromise. And I'm going back and forth on this one; I'm having a really hard time, because I don't want to hurt any of the Members on my side of the aisle that voted on the Majority. In fact, I don't want them to feel betrayed by me, but I also agree with the policy in Report "B." So, you know, at this point, I'm going to sit down and if anybody else has anything to say, I'm just going to; I'm going to listen. So, thank you, Mr. Speaker.

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

Representative **CHAPMAN**: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Just a clarifying point. If I vote no for this, I'll have the opportunity to vote yes on Amendment "B?" Report "B," excuse me.

The SPEAKER: The Chair would say that if this Report that's before us fails, it's likely that the next Report that would be moved is the Minority Report.

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. 520

YEA - Abdi, Ankeles, Arata, Archer, Arford, Bell, Brennan, Bridgeo, Bunker, Carlow, Cloutier, Cluchey, Copeland, Crafts, Doudera, Faircloth, Farrin, Frost, Gattine, Gere, Golek, Graham, Gramlich, Hasenfus, Hepler, Kuhn, Lajoie, Lee, Malon, Mastraccio, Mathieson, Matlack, Meyer, Mitchell, Montell, Moonen, Murphy, O'Halloran, Olsen, Rielly, Roberts, Runte, Sachs, Salisbury, Sargent, Sayre, Shagoury, Skold, Stover, Terry, Tuell, Webb, Zager, Mr. Speaker.

NAY - Albert, Ardell, Babin, Bagshaw, Beck, Bishop, Blier, Boyer D, Boyer M, Campbell, Caruso, Chapman, Cimino, Collamore, Collins, Cooper, Cray, Crockett, Daigle, DeBrito, Dhalac, Dill, Dodge, Drinkwater, Ducharme, Eder, Faulkingham, Flynn, Foley, Foster, Fredericks, Fredette, Friedmann, Geiger, Gifford, Greenwood, Guerrette, Haggan, Hall, Henderson, Hymes, Jackson, Javner, Julia, Kessler, Lance, Lanigan, Lavigne, Lemelin, Libby, Lookner, Lyman, Macias, Mason, McCabe, McIntyre, Milliken, Mingo, Morris, Nutting, Osher, Parry, Paul, Perkins, Pluecker, Poirier, Pomerleau, Pugh, Quint, Rana, Ray, Roeder, Rollins, Rudnicki, Sato, Schmursal-Burgess, Simmons, Sinclair, Smith, Soboleski, Strout, Supica, Swallow, Thorne, Wadsworth, Warren, White J, White R, Wood P, Wood S, Woodsome, Yusuf.

ABSENT - Adams, Underwood, Walker.

Yes, 54; No, 92; Absent, 3; Vacant, 0; Excused, 2.

54 having voted in the affirmative and 92 voted in the negative, with 3 being absent and 2 excused, and accordingly the Majority **Ought to Pass as Amended** Report was **NOT ACCEPTED**.

Subsequently, Representative SUPICA of Bangor moved that the House **ACCEPT** the Minority **Ought to Pass as Amended** Report.

Representative MALON of Biddeford **REQUESTED** a roll call on the motion to **ACCEPT** the Minority **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: A roll call has been ordered. The pending question before the House is Acceptance of the Minority Ought to Pass as Amended Report. All those in favor will vote yes, those opposed will vote no.

ROLL CALL NO. 521

YEA - Abdi, Albert, Ankeles, Ardell, Babin, Bagshaw, Beck, Bell, Bishop, Blier, Boyer D, Boyer M, Bunker, Campbell, Caruso, Chapman, Cluchey, Collamore, Collins, Cooper, Cray, Crockett, Daigle, DeBrito, Dhalac, Dill, Dodge, Doudera, Drinkwater, Ducharme, Eder, Faulkingham, Flynn, Foley, Fredericks, Fredette, Friedmann, Geiger, Gere, Gifford, Golek, Greenwood, Guerrette, Haggan, Hall, Hasenfus, Henderson, Hepler, Hymes, Jackson, Javner, Julia, Kessler, Lance, Lanigan, Lavigne, Lee, Libby, Lookner, Lyman, Macias, Mason, Mathieson, Matlack, McCabe, McIntyre, Milliken, Mingo, Mitchell, Montell, Morris, Nutting, Osher, Parry, Paul, Perkins, Pluecker, Poirier, Pomerleau, Pugh, Quint, Rana, Ray, Roeder, Rollins, Rudnicki, Runte, Sargent, Sato, Schmursal-Burgess, Simmons, Sinclair, Skold, Smith, Soboleski, Stover, Strout, Supica, Swallow, Terry, Thorne, Wadsworth, Warren, Webb, White J, White R, Wood P, Wood S, Woodsome, Yusuf.

NAY - Arata, Archer, Arford, Brennan, Bridgeo, Carlow, Cimino, Cloutier, Copeland, Crafts, Faircloth, Farrin, Foster, Frost, Gattine, Graham, Gramlich, Kuhn, Lajoie, Malon, Mastraccio, Meyer, Moonen, Murphy, O'Halloran, Olsen, Rielly, Roberts, Sachs, Salisbury, Sayre, Shagoury, Tuell, Zager, Mr. Speaker.

ABSENT - Adams, Lemelin, Underwood, Walker.

Yes, 110; No, 35; Absent, 4; Vacant, 0; Excused, 2.

110 having voted in the affirmative and 35 voted in the negative, with 4 being absent and 2 excused, and accordingly the Minority **Ought to Pass as Amended** Report was **ACCEPTED**.

The Bill was **READ ONCE**. Committee Amendment "B" (H-714) 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 "B" (H-714)** and sent for concurrence.

By unanimous consent, all matters having been acted upon were **ORDERED SENT FORTHWITH**.

CONSENT CALENDAR

First Day

In accordance with House Rule 519, the following item appeared on the Consent Calendar for the First Day:

(H.P. 990) (L.D. 1506) Bill "An Act to Amend the Personal Property Tax Exemption for Individually Owned Personal Property" Committee on **TAXATION** reporting **Ought to Pass as Amended by Committee Amendment "A" (H-729)**

Under suspension of the rules, Second Day Consent Calendar notification was given.

There being no objection, the House Paper was **PASSED TO BE ENGROSSED as Amended** and sent for concurrence.

By unanimous consent, all matters having been acted upon were **ORDERED SENT FORTHWITH**.

ENACTORS

Emergency Measure

Resolve, to Establish a Task Force to Create a Court Navigation Program Plan

(S.P. 772) (L.D. 1965)

(C. "A" S-383)

Was reported by the Committee on **Engrossed Bills** as truly and strictly engrossed. This being an emergency measure, a two-thirds vote of all the members elected to the House being necessary, a total was taken. 104 voted in favor of the same and 6 against, and accordingly the Resolve was **FINALLY PASSED**, signed by the Speaker and sent to the Senate.

By unanimous consent, all matters having been acted upon were **ORDERED SENT FORTHWITH**.

CONSENT CALENDAR

First Day

In accordance with House Rule 519, the following item appeared on the Consent Calendar for the First Day:

(H.P. 982) (L.D. 1498) Bill "An Act to Limit Municipal Impact Fees on Housing Development" Committee on **HOUSING AND ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT** reporting **Ought to Pass as Amended by Committee Amendment "A" (H-734)**

Under suspension of the rules, Second Day Consent Calendar notification was given.

There being no objection, the House Paper was **PASSED TO BE ENGROSSED as Amended** and sent for concurrence.

By unanimous consent, all matters having been acted upon were **ORDERED SENT FORTHWITH**.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEE

Divided Reports

Majority Report of the Committee on **ENERGY, UTILITIES AND TECHNOLOGY** reporting **Ought to Pass as Amended by Committee Amendment "A" (S-401)** on Bill "An Act Concerning Energy, Utilities and Technology"

(S.P. 281) (L.D. 597)

Signed:

Senators:

LAWRENCE of York
GROHOSKI of Hancock
HARRINGTON of York

Representatives:

SACHS of Freeport
FOSTER of Dexter
GEIGER of Rockland
KESSLER of South Portland
MCINTYRE of Lowell
RUNTE of York
WARREN of Scarborough
WEBB of Durham

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

Signed:

Representative:

PAUL of Winterport

Came from the Senate with the Majority **OUGHT TO PASS AS AMENDED** Report **READ** and **ACCEPTED** and the Bill **PASSED TO BE ENGROSSED AS AMENDED BY COMMITTEE AMENDMENT "A" (S-401)**.

READ.

On motion of Representative SACHS of Freeport, the Majority **Ought to Pass as Amended** Report was **ACCEPTED**.

The Bill was **READ ONCE**. **Committee Amendment "A" (S-401)** 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" (S-401)** in concurrence.

By unanimous consent, all matters having been acted upon were **ORDERED SENT FORTHWITH**.

Majority Report of the Committee on **HOUSING AND ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT** reporting **Ought to Pass as Amended by Committee Amendment "A" (S-321)** on Bill "An Act to Protect Maine Consumers by Simplifying Subscription Cancellations"

(S.P. 650) (L.D. 1642)

Signed:

Senators:

CURRY of Waldo
BENNETT of Oxford

Representatives:

GERE of Kennebunkport
EDER of Waterboro
GOLEK of Harpswell
JULIA of Waterville
MALON of Biddeford
MINGO of Calais
ROBERTS of South Berwick
YUSUF of Portland

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

Signed:

Representative:

COLLAMORE of Pittsfield

Came from the Senate with the Majority **OUGHT TO PASS AS AMENDED** Report **READ** and **ACCEPTED** and the Bill **PASSED TO BE ENGROSSED AS AMENDED BY COMMITTEE AMENDMENT "A" (S-321) AS AMENDED BY SENATE AMENDMENT "A" (S-391)** thereto.

READ.

On motion of Representative GERE of Kennebunkport, the Majority **Ought to Pass as Amended** Report was **ACCEPTED**.

The Bill was **READ ONCE**. **Committee Amendment "A" (S-321)** was **READ** by the Clerk.

Senate Amendment "A" (S-391) to **Committee Amendment "A" (S-321)** was **READ** by the Clerk and **ADOPTED**.

Committee Amendment "A" (S-321) as Amended by Senate Amendment "A" (S-391) thereto was **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" (S-321) as Amended by Senate Amendment "A" (S-391)** thereto in concurrence.

By unanimous consent, all matters having been acted upon were **ORDERED SENT FORTHWITH**.

Majority Report of the Committee on **JUDICIARY** reporting **Ought Not to Pass** on Bill "An Act to Require Age Verification for Online Obscene Matter"

(H.P. 1244) (L.D. 1873)

Signed:

Senators:

CARNEY of Cumberland

TALBOT ROSS of Cumberland

Representatives:

KUHN of Falmouth

LEE of Auburn

O'HALLORAN of Brewer

PUGH of Portland

SATO of Gorham

SINCLAIR of Bath

Minority Report of the same Committee reporting **Ought to Pass as Amended by Committee Amendment "A" (H-722)** on same Bill.

Signed:

Senator:

HAGGAN of Penobscot

Representatives:

BABIN of Fort Fairfield

CARUSO of Caratunk

HENDERSON of Rumford

POIRIER of Skowhegan

READ.

Representative KUHN of Falmouth moved that the House **ACCEPT** the Majority **Ought Not to Pass** Report.

Representative POIRIER of Skowhegan **REQUESTED** a roll call on the motion to **ACCEPT** the Majority **Ought Not to Pass** 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 Skowhegan, Representative Poirier.

Representative **POIRIER**: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I rise today in opposition to the pending motion.

This bill isn't about censorship, it's not about restricting lawful adult content. What it's about is protecting our children from harmful, explicit material online. Material that's already illegal to provide to minors under Maine law, but it's become nearly impossible to regulate in the digital world without proper tools.

I want to just paint a quick picture, what parents in Maine already know too well. A 13-year-old boy uses his tablet to look up a game on a search engine. With a few clicks, without intending to, he stumbles across violent, degrading, pornographic content. Not a pay wall, not a warning, not an age gate; just explicit material, instantly accessible, permanently imprinted. Or consider a 15-year-old girl, curious and vulnerable, who follows a social media link to a site with graphic content. That site makes no attempt to verify her age, just asks if she's 18 or older. She clicks yes and in seconds, she's exposed to material that's psychologically damaging, dehumanizing and often violent.

Mr. Speaker, we would never allow this in a physical store. In Maine, you can't sell a pack of cigarettes or a lottery ticket to a 16-year-old, and yet, when it comes to online obscene matter, which can be very harmful, we have allowed zero barriers. This bill simply says if you're distributing commercially obscene material online, you must take reasonable steps to verify age. This bill does not ban adult content, it does not criminalize private viewing; what it does is require online platforms to do

what brick and mortar businesses have done for decades: keep harmful content away from kids.

The technology already exists to do this safely and securely. Other states like Utah, Virginia and Louisiana have passed similar laws, and platforms are adapting with privacy-protective age verification methods that don't store data, but simply verify the user is of age.

Some have raised First Amendment concerns, and that's valid, but this bill is straightforward. It applies only to obscene material, which is not protected speech under the United States Constitution, and it does so with the least restrictive means necessary. Courts across the country have upheld age verification laws when they're carefully written like this one.

Mr. Speaker, this is a parenting issue, a child safety issue, a societal decency issue. We regulate what minors can see in libraries and theaters and on television; why should the internet, the most powerful, unfiltered and addictive social media tool in the world, be exempt? If we do nothing, the consequences are not theoretical. According to a 2023 report by Common Sense Media, more than 70% of teenagers have encountered pornography online by age 17, often with no warning or filter. And much of what they see promotes violence, misogyny and exploitation. That's what shapes their expectations, their understanding of relationships and their sense of self. This bill gives a common-sense, constitutional and technologically feasible way to draw that line, to say childhood still matters, boundaries still matter and, yes, responsibility still matters.

Mr. Speaker, please join me and oppose the pending motion. Thank you.

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

Representative **SMITH**: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, I rise to oppose this motion.

We should all recognize the dangers that unrestricted access to explicit content poses to young minds. Studies have shown that exposure to pornography can lead to issues like predatory behavior, abuse, anxiety, depression and distorted views of relationship. Present-day pornography is not the same as things we found in magazines from the '70s, simply naked pictures. Pornography of this day and age is more likely to be violent, sadistic and have emotionally traumatizing content that children are unable to handle.

In 2022, a report noted that 54% of teens surveyed first saw online pornography at age 13 or younger, with 15% exposed before age 11. The Institute for Family Studies highlights that 93% of boys and 63% of girls report exposure to internet pornography before age 18, with the average age of first exposure being 12. This early exposure is particularly concerning, because children's developing brains are more vulnerable to forming addictive patterns when exposed to rewarding stimuli like pornography.

We have a domestic abuse problem here in Maine, and pornography is a root cause. Much of pornography includes aggressive or nonconsensual acts which can normalize such behaviors. Research shows that 30% to 40% of teens exposed to violent porn may view it as acceptable in relationships.

This bill requires businesses to prevent minors from accessing this material while also prohibiting them from retaining any identifying information after verification. This is already in place in 24 states, including the country of France just this past month, which also required online age verification. I ask that you vote against the motion and make protecting our children our priority. Thank you.

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

Representative **KUHN**: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I just wanted to raise a couple of points with respect to this Majority Report.

First, I think the Committee had some concern that these parameters could limit young people's access to sexual and reproductive health care information on websites that might fall under the definition of 'obscenity' but really be intended for educational purposes for their use.

Also, there are, in fact, First Amendment challenges pending all over the country on laws like this. Courts have interpreted it in different ways. There is currently a case pending before the Supreme Court, and I think the majority of the Committee felt we should wait and get a result on that and then potentially craft a law that is compliant with the constitutional demands.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the Representative from Brewer, Representative O'Halloran.

Representative **O'HALLORAN**: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I rise in opposition to LD 1873, because this bill is not just about pornography, even though that's what we're hearing about here today.

Let's be clear: Every one of us in this Chamber wants to protect children. We want families to be safe, we want digital spaces to be healthy and secure. But LD 1873 doesn't stop at protection; it walks us straight into overreach.

LD 1873 opens a door to broad, vague and potentially unconstitutional regulation of the internet. While it's marketed as a way to block explicit content, it's written so broadly that it risks censoring legal speech, artistic expression, education materials, sexual health resources and even news content. If this becomes law, the chilling effect will be real and it will hit hardest on marginalized and medically underserved communities. And who decides what qualifies as sexually explicit? A private filter company? A state bureaucracy? The loudest voice in the room? This bill doesn't define its boundaries; it invites confusion, lawsuits and, let's be honest, government overreach.

LD 1873 also sets a dangerous precedent. If the State of Maine begins requiring adult citizens to submit identification to access constitutionally protected speech, what's next? I mean, I ask you, what's next? Will we regulate what books people can read? What medical websites they can access? This is not how a free society operates. And let's not forget, Maine already has laws against child pornography. We have very strong laws against child pornography. We have laws against exploitation. This bill is not about strengthening these tools; it's about expanding State control over the internet under the banner of morality.

Let me say it again, I support protecting children. I support internet safety. But I do not support a bill that risks treating all Mainers like suspects. I don't like that. That confuses censorship with safety and that could block vital, lawful content that people need to live informed, healthy lives.

LD 1873 is not about safety; it's about surveillance. It's not about justice; it's about control. We do not need to create a digital dragnet to address very real harms. We need smarter tools, better education and technology that works with our rights, not against them. And I encourage my fellow legislators to vote Ought Not to Pass. Thank you.

The SPEAKER: A roll call has been ordered. The pending question before the House is Acceptance of the Majority Ought Not to Pass Report. All those in favor will vote yes, those opposed will vote no.

ROLL CALL NO. 522

YEA - Abdi, Ankeles, Archer, Arford, Beck, Bell, Boyer D, Boyer M, Brennan, Bridgeo, Bunker, Cloutier, Cluchey, Copeland, Crafts, Crockett, DeBrito, Dhalac, Dill, Dodge, Doudera, Faircloth, Farrin, Friedmann, Frost, Gattine, Geiger, Gere, Golek, Graham, Gramlich, Hasenfus, Hepler, Julia, Kessler, Kuhn, Lajoie, Lanigan, Lee, Lookner, Macias, Malon, Mastraccio, Mathieson, Matlack, McCabe, Meyer, Milliken, Mitchell, Montell, Moonen, Murphy, O'Halloran, Osher, Pluecker, Pugh, Rana, Ray, Rielly, Roberts, Roeder, Rollins, Runte, Sachs, Salisbury, Sargent, Sato, Sayre, Shagoury, Sinclair, Skold, Stover, Supica, Terry, Warren, Webb, Yusuf, Zager, Mr. Speaker.

NAY - Albert, Arata, Ardell, Babin, Bagshaw, Bishop, Blier, Campbell, Carlow, Caruso, Chapman, Cimino, Collamore, Collins, Cooper, Cray, Daigle, Drinkwater, Ducharme, Eder, Faulkingham, Flynn, Foley, Foster, Fredericks, Fredette, Gifford, Greenwood, Guerrette, Haggan, Hall, Henderson, Hymes, Jackson, Javner, Lance, Lavigne, Lemelin, Libby, Lyman, Mason, McIntyre, Mingo, Morris, Nutting, Olsen, Parry, Paul, Perkins, Poirier, Pomerleau, Quint, Rudnicki, Schmersal-Burgess, Simmons, Smith, Soboleski, Strout, Swallow, Thorne, Tuell, Wadsworth, Walker, White J, White R, Wood P, Wood S, Woodsome.

ABSENT - Adams, Underwood.

Yes, 79; No, 68; Absent, 2; Vacant, 0; Excused, 2.

79 having voted in the affirmative and 68 voted in the negative, with 2 being absent and 2 excused, and accordingly the Majority **Ought Not to Pass** Report was **ACCEPTED** and sent for concurrence.

By unanimous consent, all matters having been acted upon were **ORDERED SENT FORTHWITH**.

The following items were taken up out of order by unanimous consent:

BILLS RECALLED FROM GOVERNOR

(Pursuant to Joint Order - House Paper 1337)

An Act to Clarify Licensing Jurisdiction for Manufactured Housing Communities

(H.P. 614) (L.D. 949)

(C. "A" H-491)

- In House, **PASSED TO BE ENACTED** on June 9, 2025.

- In Senate, **PASSED TO BE ENACTED** on June 9, 2025.

On motion of Representative **GOLEK** of Harpswell, the rules were **SUSPENDED** for the purpose of **RECONSIDERATION**.

On further motion of the same Representative, the House **RECONSIDERED** its action whereby the Bill was **PASSED TO BE ENACTED**.

On further motion of the same Representative, the rules were **SUSPENDED** for the purpose of **FURTHER RECONSIDERATION**.

On further motion of the same Representative, the House **RECONSIDERED** its action whereby the Bill was **PASSED TO BE ENGROSSED as Amended by Committee Amendment "A" (H-491)**.

On further motion of the same Representative, the rules were **SUSPENDED** for the purpose of **FURTHER RECONSIDERATION**.

On further motion of the same Representative, the House **RECONSIDERED** its action whereby **Committee Amendment "A" (H-491)** was **ADOPTED**.

The same Representative **PRESENTED** House **Amendment "A" (H-735)** to **Committee Amendment "A" (H-491)** which was **READ** by the Clerk and **ADOPTED**.

Committee Amendment "A" (H-491) as Amended by **House Amendment "A" (H-735)** thereto was **ADOPTED**.

The Bill was **PASSED TO BE ENGROSSED** as Amended by **Committee Amendment "A" (H-491)** as Amended by **House Amendment "A" (H-735)** thereto in **NON-CONCURRENCE** and sent for concurrence.

By unanimous consent, all matters having been acted upon were **ORDERED SENT FORTHWITH**.

CONSENT CALENDAR First Day

In accordance with House Rule 519, the following items appeared on the Consent Calendar for the First Day:

(S.P. 543) (L.D. 1313) Bill "An Act to Promote Equity in the Forest Products Industry by Allowing Commercial Wood Haulers to Be Eligible for Certain Sales Tax Exemptions and Refunds" Committee on **TAXATION** reporting **Ought to Pass as Amended by Committee Amendment "A" (S-410)**

(H.P. 352) (L.D. 533) Bill "An Act to Allow Residents of the Department of Corrections to Opt In to Additional Restitution for Their Victims" Committee on **CRIMINAL JUSTICE AND PUBLIC SAFETY** reporting **Ought to Pass as Amended by Committee Amendment "A" (H-736)**

Under suspension of the rules, Second Day Consent Calendar notification was given.

There being no objection, the Senate Paper was **PASSED TO BE ENGROSSED** as Amended in concurrence and the House Paper was **PASSED TO BE ENGROSSED** as Amended and sent for concurrence.

By unanimous consent, all matters having been acted upon were **ORDERED SENT FORTHWITH**.

ENACTORS Acts

An Act to Modify the Excise Tax on Camper Trailers
(S.P. 62) (L.D. 15)
(C. "A" S-399)

An Act Regarding the Management of Wastewater Treatment Plant Sludge at the State-owned Landfill
(H.P. 197) (L.D. 297)
(C. "A" H-537; S. "A" S-392)

An Act to Amend the Maine Death with Dignity Act to Ensure Access by Qualified Patients
(H.P. 381) (L.D. 613)
(S. "A" S-365 to C. "A" H-433)

An Act to Protect Health Care for Rural and Underserved Areas by Prohibiting Discrimination by Participants in a Federal Drug Discount Program
(S.P. 435) (L.D. 1018)
(C. "A" S-402)

An Act to Amend the Maine Medical Use of Cannabis Act
(S.P. 723) (L.D. 1840)
(S. "A" S-398 to C. "A" S-374)

An Act to Promote Food Processing and Manufacturing Facility Expansion and Create Jobs
(S.P. 758) (L.D. 1951)
(C. "A" S-400)

Were reported by the Committee on **Engrossed Bills** as truly and strictly engrossed, **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**.

SENATE PAPERS Non-Concurrent Matter

Bill "An Act to Remove Barriers to Becoming a Lawyer by Establishing a Law Office Study Program"
(H.P. 480) (L.D. 738)

Majority (9) **OUGHT TO PASS AS AMENDED** Report of the Committee on **JUDICIARY READ** and **ACCEPTED** and the Bill **PASSED TO BE ENGROSSED AS AMENDED BY COMMITTEE AMENDMENT "A" (H-168)** in the House on May 20, 2025.

Came from the Senate with the Minority (4) **OUGHT NOT TO PASS** Report of the Committee on **JUDICIARY READ** and **ACCEPTED** in **NON-CONCURRENCE**.

Speaker FECTEAU of Biddeford moved that the House **INSIST**.

Representative POIRIER of Skowhegan **REQUESTED** a roll call on the motion to **INSIST**.

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

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

ROLL CALL NO. 523

YEA - Abdi, Adams, Albert, Ankeles, Arata, Archer, Ardell, Arford, Babin, Bagshaw, Beck, Bell, Bishop, Blier, Boyer D, Campbell, Carlow, Caruso, Chapman, Cimino, Cluchey, Collamore, Collins, Cooper, Cray, Crockett, Daigle, DeBrito, Dill, Drinkwater, Ducharme, Eder, Farrin, Faulkingham, Flynn, Foley, Foster, Fredericks, Fredette, Friedmann, Gifford, Golek, Greenwood, Guerrette, Haggan, Hall, Henderson, Hepler, Hymes, Jackson, Javner, Lance, Lavigne, Lee, Lemelin, Libby, Lookner, Lyman, Mason, McCabe, McIntyre, Milliken, Mingo, Morris, Nutting, Olsen, Parry, Paul, Perkins, Pluecker, Poirier, Pomerleau, Pugh, Quint, Rana, Roeder, Rudnicki, Runte, Sato, Schmursal-Burgess, Simmons, Sinclair, Skold, Smith, Soboleski, Strout, Supica, Swallow, Terry, Thorne, Tuell, Wadsworth, Walker, Warren, White J, White R, Wood P, Wood S, Woodsome, Yusuf, Zager.

NAY - Boyer M, Brennan, Bridgeo, Bunker, Cloutier, Copeland, Crafts, Dhalac, Dodge, Doudera, Faircloth, Frost, Gattine, Geiger, Gere, Graham, Gramlich, Hasenfus, Julia, Kessler, Kuhn, Lajoie, Macias, Malon, Mastraccio, Mathieson, Matlack, Meyer, Mitchell, Montell, Moonen, Murphy, O'Halloran, Osher, Ray, Rielly, Roberts, Rollins, Sachs, Salisbury, Sargent, Sayre, Shagoury, Stover, Webb, Mr. Speaker.

ABSENT - Lanigan, Underwood.

Yes, 101; No, 46; Absent, 2; Vacant, 0; Excused, 2.

101 having voted in the affirmative and 46 voted in the negative, with 2 being absent and 2 excused, and accordingly the House voted to **INSIST**.

Non-Concurrent Matter

Bill "An Act to Allow Participation in the Adult Use Cannabis Tracking System to Be Voluntary"

(H.P. 1107) (L.D. 1672)

Report "A" (6) **OUGHT TO PASS AS AMENDED** of the Committee on **VETERANS AND LEGAL AFFAIRS READ and ACCEPTED** and the Bill **PASSED TO BE ENGROSSED AS AMENDED BY COMMITTEE AMENDMENT "A" (H-583) AS AMENDED BY HOUSE AMENDMENT "A" (H-617)** thereto in the House on June 10, 2025.

Came from the Senate with Report "B" (6) **OUGHT NOT TO PASS** of the Committee on **VETERANS AND LEGAL AFFAIRS READ and ACCEPTED** in **NON-CONCURRENCE**.

Speaker FECTEAU of Biddeford moved that the House **INSIST**.

Representative BOYER of Poland **REQUESTED** a roll call on the motion to **INSIST**.

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

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

ROLL CALL NO. 524

YEA - Abdi, Albert, Ardell, Babin, Bagshaw, Beck, Bishop, Blier, Boyer D, Boyer M, Campbell, Carlow, Caruso, Chapman, Cimino, Cluchey, Collamore, Collins, Cooper, Cray, Daigle, DeBrito, Dill, Drinkwater, Ducharme, Eder, Faulkingham, Flynn, Foster, Fredericks, Fredette, Friedmann, Gifford, Guerrette, Haggan, Hall, Hasenfus, Henderson, Jackson, Javner, Julia, Kessler, Lavigne, Lee, Lemelin, Libby, Lookner, Lyman, Macias, Mathieson, Matlack, McIntyre, Milliken, Mingo, Montell, Morris, Nutting, Olsen, Osher, Parry, Paul, Perkins, Pluecker, Poirier, Pugh, Quint, Rana, Roeder, Rudnicki, Sato, Schmiersal-Burgess, Simmons, Sinclair, Smith, Soboleski, Strout, Supica, Swallow, Thorne, Wadsworth, Warren, White J, White R, Wood P, Wood S, Woodsome.

NAY - Adams, Ankeles, Arata, Archer, Arford, Bell, Brennan, Bridgeo, Bunker, Cloutier, Copeland, Crafts, Crockett, Dhalac, Dodge, Doudera, Faircloth, Farrin, Foley, Frost, Gattine, Geiger, Gere, Golek, Graham, Gramlich, Greenwood, Hepler, Hymes, Kuhn, Lajoie, Lance, Malon, Mason, Mastraccio, McCabe, Meyer, Mitchell, Moonen, Murphy, O'Halloran, Pomerleau, Ray, Rielly, Roberts, Rollins, Runte, Sachs, Salisbury, Sargent, Sayre, Shagoury, Skold, Stover, Terry, Tuell, Walker, Webb, Yusuf, Zager, Mr. Speaker.

ABSENT - Lanigan, Underwood.

Yes, 86; No, 61; Absent, 2; Vacant, 0; Excused, 2.

86 having voted in the affirmative and 61 voted in the negative, with 2 being absent and 2 excused, and accordingly the House voted to **INSIST**.

Non-Concurrent Matter

Bill "An Act to Amend the Laws Regarding Legislative Reimbursement"

(H.P. 1312) (L.D. 1968)

PASSED TO BE ENGROSSED AS AMENDED BY COMMITTEE AMENDMENT "A" (H-559) in the House on June 9, 2025.

Came from the Senate **PASSED TO BE ENGROSSED AS AMENDED BY COMMITTEE AMENDMENT "A" (H-559) AS AMENDED BY SENATE AMENDMENT "A" (S-404)** thereto in **NON-CONCURRENCE**.

Speaker FECTEAU of Biddeford moved that the House **RECEDE AND CONCUR**.

Representative GREENWOOD of Wales moved that the House **RECEDE**.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the Representative from Wales, Representative Greenwood.

Representative **GREENWOOD**: Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, there is a piece of this legislation that I do support. However, Committee Amendment "A" and Senate Amendment "A," I do not.

I believe it is the duty of the Legislature to set compensation and *per diems* and mileage reimbursement rates, not that of Leg Council. However, the portion of the bill that I do support, which would be as brought forth from the Good Representative from Portland, that would allow Members who were brought in by special election to be fairly compensated. I do support that. But the bill in its current form, I do not support.

I move that we Reconsider our actions whereby we passed the Majority Report.

The SPEAKER: The Chair would inform the Member that that motion is not in order. You cannot move Reconsideration until a motion to Recede succeeds.

The Chair recognizes the Representative from Portland, Representative Moonen.

Representative **MOONEN**: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. We've already debated this once, so, I will say just as I did before that I appreciate that there is one piece of this bill that we have bipartisan agreement on, but both this Chamber and the other have already moved forward on this bill and I see no reason to go back, and I ask you to oppose the Recede motion.

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

ROLL CALL NO. 525

YEA - Adams, Albert, Arata, Ardell, Babin, Bagshaw, Bishop, Blier, Boyer D, Campbell, Caruso, Chapman, Cimino, Collamore, Collins, Cooper, Cray, Daigle, Drinkwater, Ducharme, Eder, Faulkingham, Flynn, Foley, Foster, Fredericks, Fredette, Gifford, Greenwood, Guerrette, Haggan, Hall, Henderson, Hymes, Jackson, Javner, Lance, Lavigne, Lemelin, Libby, Lyman, Mason, McIntyre, Mingo, Morris, Nutting, Olsen, Parry, Paul, Perkins, Poirier, Pomerleau, Quint, Rudnicki, Schmiersal-Burgess, Simmons, Smith, Soboleski, Strout, Swallow, Thorne, Tuell, Wadsworth, Walker, White J, White R, Wood P, Wood S, Woodsome.

NAY - Abdi, Ankeles, Archer, Arford, Beck, Bell, Boyer M, Brennan, Bridgeo, Bunker, Cloutier, Cluchey, Copeland, Crafts, Crockett, DeBrito, Dhalac, Dill, Dodge, Doudera, Faircloth, Farrin, Friedmann, Frost, Gattine, Geiger, Gere, Golek, Graham, Gramlich, Hasenfus, Hepler, Julia, Kessler, Kuhn, Lajoie, Lee, Lookner, Macias, Malon, Mastraccio, Mathieson, Matlack, McCabe, Meyer, Milliken, Mitchell, Montell, Moonen, Murphy, O'Halloran, Osher, Pluecker, Pugh, Rana, Ray, Rielly, Roberts, Roeder, Rollins, Runte, Sachs, Salisbury, Sargent,

Sato, Sayre, Shagoury, Sinclair, Skold, Stover, Supica, Terry, Warren, Webb, Yusuf, Zager, Mr. Speaker.

ABSENT - Carlow, Lanigan, Underwood.

Yes, 69; No, 77; Absent, 3; Vacant, 0; Excused, 2.

69 having voted in the affirmative and 77 voted in the negative, with 3 being absent and 2 excused, and accordingly the motion to **RECEDE FAILED**.

Subsequently, the House voted to **RECEDE AND CONCUR**.

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

Non-Concurrent Matter

Bill "An Act to Prohibit Biological Males from Participating in School Athletic Programs and Activities Designated for Females When State Funding Is Provided to the School"

(H.P. 156) (L.D. 233)

Report "A" (6) **OUGHT TO PASS AS AMENDED** of the Committee on **JUDICIARY READ** and **ACCEPTED** and the Bill **PASSED TO BE ENGROSSED AS AMENDED BY COMMITTEE AMENDMENT "A" (H-692)** in the House on June 13, 2025.

Came from the Senate with Report "B" (6) **OUGHT NOT TO PASS** of the Committee on **JUDICIARY READ** and **ACCEPTED** in **NON-CONCURRENCE**.

The House voted to **INSIST**.

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

ENACTORS

Emergency Measure

An Act to Direct the Public Utilities Commission to Conduct Procurements for Energy or Renewable Energy Credits

(S.P. 281) (L.D. 597)

(C. "A" S-401)

Was reported by the Committee on **Engrossed Bills** as truly and strictly engrossed. This being an emergency measure, a two-thirds vote of all the members elected to the House being necessary, a total was taken. 131 voted in favor of the same and 0 against, and accordingly the Bill was **PASSED TO BE ENACTED**, signed by the Speaker and sent to the Senate.

Emergency Measure

An Act to Correct Inconsistencies, Conflicts and Errors in the Laws of Maine

(H.P. 1328) (L.D. 1984)

(C. "A" H-725)

Was reported by the Committee on **Engrossed Bills** as truly and strictly engrossed. This being an emergency measure, a two-thirds vote of all the members elected to the House being necessary, a total was taken. 119 voted in favor of the same and 0 against, and accordingly the Bill was **PASSED TO BE ENACTED**, signed by the Speaker and sent to the Senate.

Acts

An Act to Clarify the Rights of Crime Victims and Witnesses Regarding Professional Investigator Communications

(H.P. 353) (L.D. 534)

(C. "A" H-704)

An Act to Amend the Tax Expenditure Review Process and Centralize Incentive Data Collection

(H.P. 726) (L.D. 1107)

(C. "A" H-708)

An Act to Protect Maine Consumers by Simplifying Subscription and Health Club Membership Cancellations

(S.P. 650) (L.D. 1642)

(S. "A" S-391 to C. "A" S-321)

An Act to Enhance Businesses' Understanding of Labor Standards and Grow Maine's Energy Economy Through Project Development Information Resources

(H.P. 1166) (L.D. 1748)

(C. "A" H-688)

An Act to Regulate Nonwater-dependent Floating Structures on Maine's Waters

(H.P. 1182) (L.D. 1763)

(H. "A" H-711 to C. "A" H-684)

An Act to Require Police Departments to Publish and Make Accessible Their Policies and Procedures and Require Training of Officers

(H.P. 1195) (L.D. 1784)

(C. "A" H-703)

Were reported by the Committee on **Engrossed Bills** as truly and strictly engrossed, **PASSED TO BE ENACTED**, signed by the Speaker and sent to the Senate.

Resolves

Resolve, Authorizing the State Tax Assessor to Convey the Interest of the State in Certain Real Estate in the Unorganized Territory

(H.P. 5) (L.D. 41)

Resolve, to Improve Interagency Coordination and Information Accessibility Regarding Renewable Energy Construction Projects

(H.P. 1234) (L.D. 1850)

(C. "A" H-705)

Were reported by the Committee on **Engrossed Bills** as truly and strictly engrossed, **FINALLY PASSED**, signed by the Speaker and sent to the Senate.

By unanimous consent, all matters having been acted upon were **ORDERED SENT FORTHWITH**.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEE

Divided Reports

Majority Report of the Committee on **HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES** reporting **Ought to Pass as Amended by Committee Amendment "A" (H-728)** on Bill "An Act to Reduce Cost and Increase Access to Disease Prevention by Expanding the Universal Childhood Immunization Program to Include Adults"

(H.P. 58) (L.D. 93)

Signed:

Senator:

INGWERSEN of York

Representatives:

MEYER of Eliot

DEBRITO of Waterville

GRAHAM of North Yarmouth

MCCABE of Lewiston

SHAGOURY of Hallowell

ZAGER of Portland

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

Signed:

Senator:

MOORE of Washington

Representatives:

DAIGLE of Fort Kent

GRIFFIN of Levant

JAVNER of Chester

LEMELIN of Chelsea

READ.

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

Representative JAVNER of Chester **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 Chester, Representative Janver.

Representative **JAVNER**: I rise in opposition to LD 93. While the intent behind this bill may seem noble, to reduce costs and increase access to vaccines, it represents a significant and concerning expansion of a program that was never designed for this purpose.

The Universal Childhood Immunization Program was created to ensure that children, our most vulnerable, had access to life-saving vaccines. Now, with this legislation, we are proposing to stretch that mission to cover adults, without fully understanding the long-term fiscal implications or operational challenges. This bill would effectively create a new government entitlement, placing an unfunded burden on the State's already strained health care infrastructure. It raises serious questions about cost sharing, sustainability and whether this approach is even the most efficient way to serve adult populations. Additionally, this expansion could unintentionally duplicate existing services already available to adults through private insurance, pharmacies or federally funded programs.

We should be focusing on ensuring transparency, accountability and targeted support, not widening the scope of State programs without a full understanding of the downstream consequences. Let's not expand a program designed for children into something it was never meant to be. I urge a no vote on LD 93. Thank you.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the Representative from Eliot, Representative Meyer.

Representative **MEYER**: Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Women and Men of the House. For more than decade, Maine's Universal Childhood Immunization Program has proven to be one of our smartest investments in public health. By pooling resources and bulk purchasing vaccines, Maine has reduced cost and increased access to ensure that every child, no matter their insurance status, can be protected from preventable disease.

This bill seeks to expand the success of Maine's Universal Childhood Immunization Program to include recommended vaccines for adults in our State. This expansion ensures that all Mainers, regardless of age, can access vaccines to protect against preventable diseases. It does not impose any new requirements for vaccination, simply lowers barriers for adults seeking them. Instead of insurers reimbursing for vaccines at the per claim rate of vaccines procured at the manufacturer price, quarterly up-front payments are made to the program for their childhood members. Maine's CDC Maine Immunization Program purchases the vaccine on their behalf at a 28% reduced cost. Maine's Universal Childhood Immunization Program has been in place for over a decade and just last year, it saved insurers more than seven million dollars. Expanding the program for adults age 19 to 64 is estimated to produce over \$10 million in total cost savings. Over one million of that savings is for MaineCare-paid claims alone. It will also support more than \$30 million that Maine's providers will no longer have to purchase up front.

LD 93 removes financial barriers for patients and providers and provides a net savings to insurance carriers, including the State, through MaineCare. It does all this while protecting our communities from preventable diseases. Thank you.

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

Representative **ZAGER**: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I will be very brief, because the Good Representative from Eliot has already made an excellent argument. I would just add that other states; Rhode Island, Alaska, Vermont; have already done this, have already started to save a lot of money; 19% in Rhode Island, 26% in Alaska, 33% in Vermont; on par with what we have done in terms of savings for the childhood vaccines and microbes don't really care what age we are. 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. 526

YEA - Abdi, Ankeles, Arata, Archer, Arford, Beck, Bell, Boyer M, Brennan, Bridgeo, Bunker, Cloutier, Cluchey, Copeland, Crafts, Crockett, DeBrito, Dhalac, Dill, Dodge, Doudera, Faircloth, Farrin, Friedmann, Frost, Gattine, Geiger, Gere, Golek, Graham, Gramlich, Hasenfus, Hepler, Julia, Kessler, Kuhn, Lajoie, Lee, Lookner, Macias, Malon, Mastraccio, Mathieson, Matlack, McCabe, Meyer, Milliken, Mitchell, Montell, Moonen, Murphy, O'Halloran, Osher, Pluecker, Pugh, Rana, Ray, Rielly, Roberts, Roeder, Rollins, Runte, Sachs, Salisbury, Sargent, Sato, Sayre, Shagoury, Sinclair, Skold, Stover, Supica, Terry, Warren, Webb, Yusuf, Zager, Mr. Speaker.

NAY - Adams, Albert, Ardell, Babin, Bagshaw, Bishop, Blier, Boyer D, Campbell, Caruso, Chapman, Cimino, Collamore, Collins, Cooper, Cray, Daigle, Drinkwater, Ducharme, Eder, Faulkingham, Flynn, Foley, Foster, Fredericks, Fredette, Gifford, Greenwood, Guerrette, Haggan,

Hall, Henderson, Hymes, Jackson, Javner, Lance, Lanigan, Lavigne, Lemelin, Libby, Lyman, Mason, McIntyre, Mingo, Morris, Nutting, Olsen, Parry, Paul, Perkins, Poirier, Pomerleau, Quint, Rudnicki, Schmiersal-Burgess, Simmons, Smith, Soboleski, Strout, Swallow, Thorne, Tuell, Wadsworth, Walker, White J, White R, Wood P, Wood S, Woodsome.

ABSENT - Carlow, Underwood.

Yes, 78; No, 69; Absent, 2; Vacant, 0; Excused, 2.

78 having voted in the affirmative and 69 voted in the negative, with 2 being absent and 2 excused, and accordingly the Majority **Ought to Pass as Amended** Report was **ACCEPTED**.

The Bill was **READ ONCE**. Committee Amendment "A" (H-728) 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-728)** and sent for concurrence.

By unanimous consent, all matters having been acted upon were **ORDERED SENT FORTHWITH**.

Majority Report of the Committee on **TAXATION** reporting **Ought to Pass as Amended by Committee Amendment "A" (H-730)** on Bill "An Act to Remove the 12-month Waiting Period for the Maine Resident Homestead Property Tax Exemption" (H.P. 167) (L.D. 264)

Signed:

Senators:

GROHOSKI of Hancock

TIPPING of Penobscot

Representatives:

CLOUTIER of Lewiston

CROCKETT of Portland

FRIEDMANN of Bar Harbor

MATLACK of St. George

SAYRE of Kennebunk

Minority Report of the same Committee reporting **Ought to Pass as Amended by Committee Amendment "B" (H-731)** on same Bill.

Signed:

Senator:

BICKFORD of Androscoggin

Representatives:

LAVIGNE of Berwick

QUINT of Hodgdon

RUDNICKI of Fairfield

SWALLOW of Houlton

WHITE of Ellsworth

READ.

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

Representative RUDNICKI of Fairfield **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 Fairfield, Representative Rudnicki.

Representative **RUDNICKI**: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, the Committee Amendment "B" is something that is reasonably asked for. What this bill does is it basically opens up the homestead exemption if you're just moving into the area. What the Committee Amendment "B" does is it allows for, whether it's a spouse or a family member that passes away, and it's the one that passed away's name was on the house, the new person has to wait the 12 months as of right now. So, if it's a spouse that wasn't originally on the house, they have to wait 12 months right now. Committee Amendment "B" allows for that, because they are already permanent residents, that's why we went that way with Committee Amendment "B."

Committee Amendment "A" just opens it up, and I don't think that we should be opening it up for somebody that just moves into the State or, you know, to get that. I think by being a spouse, that's a reasonable request on the homestead exemption. The rest of it is not. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The **SPEAKER**: The Chair recognizes the Representative from Woolwich, Representative Hepler.

Representative **HEPLER**: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I rise in support of the pending motion. This bill seeks property tax relief by eliminating the 12-month waiting period for Maine residents to receive the homestead property tax exemption. This is quite simply an effort to simplify the process and make the exemption more accessible to the public.

First, there is the matter of equity. There is no waiting period for new residents who are applying for the blind exemption and/or for the veteran's exemption. As soon as they receive their first tax bill following their applications, those exemptions are applied to their property value. This bill would do the same for those applying for a homestead exemption, which leads me to my second point.

The current 12-month waiting period can be cumbersome and overly lengthy. The date of record is April 1st. So, if you lived in, say, Wiscasset and sold your house in February of 2024 and needed to rent until you bought a house in July; in Woolwich until July 2024; your date of record for taxes is April 1, 2025. That's when the 12-month clock begins, so, you would not be able to take advantage of the homestead exemption until you received your September 2026 property tax bill. This seems unfair.

Third, any concerns about whether a new resident is legally claiming their actual primary residence or homestead is simply and quickly resolved by a phone call by the assessor in your new town to their counterpart in the previous town. And that is, indeed, what happens on a regular basis. These questions are easily resolved, and also, the application form is an affidavit, with the new taxpayer asserting that they are being truthful.

Finally, as a historian, I looked into why this 12-month exemption is, I looked back into when this first started. I have to say I have no idea, but I did look into this.

Finally, the proposed legislation provides property tax relief more quickly, goes directly to the qualifying taxpayer and simplifies the administrative tasks that towns are already providing. I urge you to support this pending motion. Thank you.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the Representative from Arundel, Representative Parry.

Representative **PARRY**: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. May I ask a question through the Chair?

The SPEAKER: The Member may proceed.

Representative **PARRY**: With this bill, is the State picking up the full amount of the homestead on this, or is this going to be a mandate to the towns on their amount?

The SPEAKER: The Representative from Arundel, Representative Parry, has posed a question through the Chair to any Member who wishes to answer.

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. 527

YEA - Ankeles, Arata, Archer, Arford, Beck, Bell, Boyer M, Brennan, Bridgeo, Bunker, Cloutier, Copeland, Crafts, Crockett, DeBrito, Dhalac, Dill, Dodge, Doudera, Faircloth, Farrin, Friedmann, Frost, Gattine, Geiger, Gere, Golek, Graham, Gramlich, Hasenfus, Hepler, Julia, Kessler, Kuhn, Lajoie, Lee, Lookner, Macias, Malon, Mastraccio, Mathieson, Matlack, McCabe, Meyer, Milliken, Mitchell, Montell, Moonen, Murphy, O'Halloran, Osher, Pluecker, Pugh, Rana, Ray, Rielly, Roberts, Roeder, Rollins, Runte, Sachs, Salisbury, Sargent, Sato, Sayre, Shagoury, Sinclair, Skold, Stover, Supica, Terry, Warren, Webb, Yusuf, Zager, Mr. Speaker.

NAY - Adams, Albert, Ardell, Babin, Bagshaw, Bishop, Blier, Boyer D, Campbell, Caruso, Chapman, Cimino, Cluchey, Collamore, Collins, Cooper, Cray, Daigle, Drinkwater, Ducharme, Eder, Faulkingham, Flynn, Foley, Foster, Fredericks, Fredette, Gifford, Greenwood, Guerrette, Haggan, Hall, Henderson, Hymes, Jackson, Javner, Lance, Lanigan, Lavigne, Lemelin, Libby, Lyman, Mason, McIntyre, Mingo, Morris, Nutting, Olsen, Parry, Paul, Perkins, Poirier, Pomerleau, Quint, Rudnicki, Schmiersal-Burgess, Simmons, Smith, Soboleski, Strout, Swallow, Thorne, Tuell, Wadsworth, Walker, White J, White R, Wood P, Wood S, Woodsome.

ABSENT - Abdi, Carlow, Underwood.

Yes, 76; No, 70; Absent, 3; Vacant, 0; Excused, 2.

76 having voted in the affirmative and 70 voted in the negative, with 3 being absent and 2 excused, and accordingly the Majority **Ought to Pass as Amended** Report was **ACCEPTED**.

The Bill was **READ ONCE**. **Committee Amendment "A" (H-730)** 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-730)** and sent for concurrence.

By unanimous consent, all matters having been acted upon were **ORDERED SENT FORTHWITH**.

Majority Report of the Committee on **TAXATION** reporting **Ought to Pass as Amended by Committee Amendment "A" (H-732)** on Bill "An Act to Eliminate the Lodging Tax on Campground Sites and Revert to Using the Current Sales Tax" (H.P. 191) (L.D. 291)

Signed:

Senator:

BICKFORD of Androscoggin

Representatives:

CROCKETT of Portland

LAVIGNE of Berwick

QUINT of Hodgdon

RUDNICKI of Fairfield

SWALLOW of Houlton

WHITE of Ellsworth

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

Signed:

Senators:

GROHOSKI of Hancock

TIPPING of Penobscot

Representatives:

CLOUTIER of Lewiston

FRIEDMANN of Bar Harbor

MATLACK of St. George

SAYRE of Kennebunk

READ.

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

Representative RUDNICKI of Fairfield **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 Skowhegan, Representative Poirier.

Representative **POIRIER**: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I actually just wanted to rise real quick just to explain what this bill does. What it does is, beginning January 1st of '26, it excludes the rental of a campground site from the lodging tax, which is nine percent.

Basically, what's happening now is you can bring a tent or you can bring your own camper to a campground and you're going to get charged a lodging tax, which seems quite ridiculous, especially when some of these sites don't even have electricity or water hookups. It would revert it back to the 5.5% standard tax rate, and it actually sets out what a 'campground site' is defined as, basically "bare land or land in which a person may pitch a tent or park a camper, trailer, motor home or truck camper," regardless of whether it has a hookup. 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. 528

YEA - Adams, Albert, Arata, Ardell, Babin, Bagshaw, Bishop, Blier, Boyer D, Campbell, Carlow, Caruso, Chapman, Cimino, Collamore, Collins, Cooper, Cray, Crockett, Daigle, Drinkwater, Ducharme, Eder, Faulkingham, Flynn, Foley, Foster, Fredericks, Fredette, Gifford, Greenwood, Guerrette, Haggan, Hall, Henderson, Hepler, Hymes, Jackson, Javner, Lance, Lanigan, Lavigne, Lemelin, Libby, Lyman, Mason, McIntyre, Mingo, Morris, Nutting, Olsen, Parry, Paul, Perkins, Poirier, Pomerleau, Quint, Rudnicki, Schmearsal-Burgess, Simmons, Smith, Soboleski, Strout, Swallow, Thorne, Tuell, Wadsworth, Walker, White J, White R, Wood P, Wood S, Woodsome.

NAY - Abdi, Ankeles, Archer, Arford, Beck, Bell, Boyer M, Brennan, Bridgeo, Bunker, Cloutier, Cluchey, Copeland, Crafts, DeBrito, Dhalac, Dill, Dodge, Doudera, Faircloth, Farrin, Friedmann, Frost, Gattine, Geiger, Gere, Golek, Graham, Gramlich, Hasenfus, Julia, Kessler, Kuhn, Lajoie, Lee, Lookner, Macias, Malon, Mastraccio, Mathieson, Matlack, McCabe, Meyer, Milliken, Mitchell, Montell, Moonen, Murphy, O'Halloran, Osher, Pluecker, Pugh, Rana, Ray, Rielly, Roberts, Roeder, Rollins, Runte, Sachs, Salisbury, Sargent, Sato, Sayre, Shagoury, Sinclair, Skold, Stover, Supica, Terry, Warren, Webb, Yusuf, Zager, Mr. Speaker.

ABSENT - Underwood.

Yes, 73; No, 75; Absent, 1; Vacant, 0; Excused, 2.

73 having voted in the affirmative and 75 voted in the negative, with 1 being absent and 2 excused, and accordingly the Majority **Ought to Pass as Amended** Report was **NOT ACCEPTED**.

Subsequently, on motion of Representative CLOUTIER of Lewiston, the Minority **Ought Not to Pass** Report was **ACCEPTED** and sent for concurrence.

By unanimous consent, all matters having been acted upon were **ORDERED SENT FORTHWITH**.

Majority Report of the Committee on **TAXATION** reporting **Ought Not to Pass** on Bill "An Act to Establish an Educational Tax Credit Program to Help Parents Pay for Nonpublic School Tuition and Fees"

(H.P. 1237) (L.D. 1853)

Signed:

Senators:

GROHOSKI of Hancock

TIPPING of Penobscot

Representatives:

CLOUTIER of Lewiston

CROCKETT of Portland

FRIEDMANN of Bar Harbor

MATLACK of St. George

SAYRE of Kennebunk

Minority Report of the same Committee reporting **Ought to Pass as Amended by Committee Amendment "A" (H-733)** on same Bill.

Signed:

Senator:

BICKFORD of Androscoggin

Representatives:

LAVIGNE of Berwick

QUINT of Hodgdon

RUDNICKI of Fairfield

SWALLOW of Houlton

WHITE of Ellsworth

READ.

Representative CLOUTIER of Lewiston moved that the House **ACCEPT** the Majority **Ought Not to Pass** Report.

Representative RUDNICKI of Fairfield **REQUESTED** a roll call on the motion to **ACCEPT** the Majority **Ought Not to Pass** 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 Houlton, Representative Swallow.

Representative **SWALLOW**: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'd like to speak to this motion.

In a 1983 report, *A Nation at Risk*, commissioned by then-President Reagan due to concerns that American students even then were falling behind academically, noted that the average verbal SAT scores had plummeted 50 points and the mathematics SAT scores had fallen nearly 40 points between 1963 and 1980. Now, 42 years after that report, our results continue to decline.

Furthermore, a 1997 report, *The Learning State: Maine's Schooling for the 21st Century*, published by the Maine Department of Education, the executive summary states Maine schools are not ready for the 21st century. In order for Maine to flourish, it states dramatic change must occur in Maine schools. Maine has one of the most expensive public school systems in the nation, yet our results by multiple indices are flat through recent years. The only thing that's changed since that 1997 report is our indices are no longer flat, they are declining. The report then goes on to recommend expanding the current opportunities for school choice. And what has the legislative response been to expanding school choice? Greater public school consolidation, a State-versus-parent battle to not allow State school funding dollars to flow to sectarian schools and a limit on the number of charter schools.

Internationally, when U.S. public schools, elementary and secondary, are compared with other countries, the U.S. for years has placed between third and fourth in per pupil expenditures, compared to all OECD nations. In the most recent report, the average for OECD nations' expenses per pupil was \$11,300, whereas the U.S. average was \$15,500 per pupil, 38% higher than the average for other nations. Noting that per pupil public school expenditures in grades K-12 are inordinately high in the United States, where does Maine fall on the spectrum when compared with other states? Well, according to the National Center for Education Statistics, division of the Department of Education, in 2020, Maine was 23.5% higher than the state average and now 10th highest state in the nation for per pupil expenditures.

When one looks at the expenditures and then looks at how the U.S. fares in international testing for academic achievement, there are two primary tests: the PISA test, Program for International Student Assessment, and the TIMSS test, Trends

in Math and Science Studies. I'll just speak to one of these tests for brevity today, Mr. Speaker, although both tests are declining. The TIMSS test began in '95, with the most recent study completed in 2025. U.S. fourth grade and eighth grade math scores were lower in 2023 than in 2019 by 18 and 27 points, respectively. In fact, U.S. fourth grade and eighth grade math scores in 2023 were the lowest ever recorded since the testing began in 1995. These math scores resulted in 27th and 24th place ranking for fourth and eighth graders, respectively. In science in the TIMSS test, fourth grade science test scores were the lowest ever recorded and eighth grade science tests were the lowest since they began in 1995.

Moving over to national testing compared to international testing, the most respected indicator of how students in states are performing on a national basis are the National Assessment for Education Progress tests administered through the Department of Education. It tests students for grade-level proficiency in math and reading at fourth and eighth grade levels. So, let's go back and take a look how Maine students are doing compared to the nation. In 1992 in the NAEP tests, Maine fourth graders ranked number one in math and number two in reading. In 2024, 32 years later, Maine fourth graders ranked 42 in math and 42nd in reading. As for eighth graders, in the NAEP tests in '92, Maine eighth graders ranked number four in math and first took the reading test in 1998, ranking number one. By 2024, in those tests, Maine eighth graders' rank dropped to 29th in math and 37th in reading among all states. The nation's report card confirms that less than one-third of Maine students are at grade level proficiency in both reading and math. While we've moved down considerably in results, both internationally as a nation and nationally as a state, our per pupil expenditures have skyrocketed in both cases. Since 1992, Maine has moved up from 27th in per pupil public school expenditures to where it is today; 10th.

A comparative analysis between states to determine how spending correlates with achievement is very eye-opening, Mr. Speaker. For example, Idaho, in the most recent tests, they ranked 51st in expenditures; however, they ranked ninth in grade eight reading and 15th in grade eight math. Utah was 50th in expenditures on a per pupil basis as a state, they ranked seventh in fourth grade reading and fifth in fourth grade math. In fact, Utah spends less than half of what Maine spends in per pupil expenditures. And where's Maine? Maine is number 10 in per pupil expenditures, ranks 37th in eighth grade reading, 29th in eighth grade math and 42nd in fourth grade reading and 42nd in eighth grade math.

This bill, Mr. Speaker, is a tuition tax credit. It's refundable and it's tied to the average per pupil cost in Maine of public schools at 55% of the cost of the public school student. It's only for Maine residents and can only be used in Maine schools, and they must file a Maine income tax return. It does not include students who are enrolled in non-public schools as of October 1, 2025, just those going forward.

I began testifying in hearings for school choice as far back as 2003, and what I heard then and continue to hear is, all we need is just a little more time and a little more money. And I can remember hearing that in 2003 from the MEA, along with, 'wait till you see the change that the Maine Learning Results is going to make.' Well, I've seen the change, Mr. Speaker. Incidentally, charter schools spend 70% and parochial schools spend 65% on average of what is spent in public schools on a per pupil basis and has shown far better results in empirical analysis.

Let's give Maine parents a choice, let's allow competition and let's finally move forward with a better education for our children. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER: A roll call has been ordered. The pending question before the House is Acceptance of the Majority Ought Not to Pass Report. All those in favor will vote yes, those opposed will vote no.

ROLL CALL NO. 529

YEA - Abdi, Ankeles, Archer, Arford, Beck, Bell, Boyer M, Brennan, Bridgeo, Bunker, Cloutier, Cluchey, Copeland, Crafts, Crockett, DeBrito, Dhalac, Dill, Dodge, Doudera, Faircloth, Farrin, Friedmann, Frost, Gattine, Geiger, Gere, Golek, Graham, Gramlich, Hasenfus, Julia, Kessler, Kuhn, Lajoie, Lee, Lookner, Macias, Malon, Mastraccio, Mathieson, Matlack, McCabe, Meyer, Milliken, Mingo, Mitchell, Montell, Moonen, Murphy, O'Halloran, Osher, Pluecker, Pugh, Rana, Ray, Rielly, Roberts, Roeder, Rollins, Runte, Sachs, Salisbury, Sargent, Sato, Sayre, Shagoury, Sinclair, Skold, Stover, Supica, Terry, Warren, Webb, Yusuf, Zager, Mr. Speaker.

NAY - Adams, Albert, Arata, Ardell, Babin, Bagshaw, Bishop, Blier, Boyer D, Campbell, Carlow, Caruso, Chapman, Cimino, Collamore, Collins, Cooper, Cray, Daigle, Drinkwater, Ducharme, Eder, Faulkingham, Flynn, Foley, Foster, Fredericks, Fredette, Gifford, Greenwood, Guerrette, Haggan, Hall, Henderson, Hepler, Hymes, Jackson, Javner, Lance, Lanigan, Lavigne, Lemelin, Libby, Lyman, Mason, McIntyre, Morris, Nutting, Olsen, Parry, Paul, Perkins, Poirier, Pomerleau, Quint, Rudnicki, Schmiersal-Burgess, Simmons, Smith, Soboleski, Strout, Swallow, Thorne, Tuell, Wadsworth, Walker, White J, White R, Wood P, Wood S, Woodsome.

ABSENT - Underwood.

Yes, 77; No, 71; Absent, 1; Vacant, 0; Excused, 2.

77 having voted in the affirmative and 71 voted in the negative, with 1 being absent and 2 excused, and accordingly the Majority **Ought Not to Pass** Report was **ACCEPTED** and sent for concurrence.

By unanimous consent, all matters having been acted upon were **ORDERED SENT FORTHWITH**.

Majority Report of the Committee on **CRIMINAL JUSTICE AND PUBLIC SAFETY** reporting **Ought to Pass** on Bill "An Act Regarding the Authority to Transport Prisoners Confined in Jail and the Use of Physical Force with Respect to Prisoners and Persons Who Have Been Arrested"

(H.P. 1145) (L.D. 1710)

Signed:

Senators:

BEEBE-CENTER of Knox
CYRWAY of Kennebec

Representatives:

ARDELL of Monticello
BUNKER of Farmington
LAJOIE of Lewiston
MCINTYRE of Lowell
NUTTING of Oakland
PERKINS of Dover-Foxcroft

Minority Report of the same Committee reporting **Ought to Pass as Amended by Committee Amendment "A" (H-738)** on same Bill.

Signed:

Representatives:

HASENFUS of Readfield
ABDI of Lewiston
LOOKNER of Portland
MILLIKEN of Blue Hill

READ.

Representative HASENFUS of Readfield moved that the House **ACCEPT** the Minority **Ought to Pass as Amended** Report.

Representative NUTTING of Oakland **REQUESTED** a roll call on the motion to **ACCEPT** the Minority **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 Fairfield, Representative Rudnicki.

Representative **RUDNICKI**: We just know I have to do it. Again, we moved the Minority Report. As we can see, we've done really well at moving the Majority Reports, and if they don't go, going to the Minority. So, again, it's bypassing all the committee work and just going along with what individuals want. Thank you.

The **SPEAKER**: The Chair recognizes the Representative from Westbrook, Representative Salisbury.

Representative **SALISBURY**: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, I just wanted to say that I'm the Sponsor of the bill, and I am okay with Committee Amendment "A" and the Minority Report.

There's a lot of work that went into this bill, working with Sheriff Joyce; I'm not supposed to say that; but working with people that were stakeholders in this bill, and I appreciate the Committee's work coming up with the Amendment "A," so, I am okay with passing that Minority Report.

The **SPEAKER**: The Chair recognizes the Representative from Readfield, Representative Hasenfus.

Representative **HASENFUS**: Thank you, Mr. Speaker, and thank you to the Good Representative from Fairfield for pointing out the Report I am moving. And the reason that I'm moving the Minority Report is because the original bill did not have any training requirements built into that, and I feel that if we are going to offer a correctional officer to use force, whether it be deadly or non-deadly force, outside of the correctional facility, that they must be trained in using that force. Currently, they do not have that training and the Minority Report of this bill, the bill in which we are moving now here, the Report which we are moving here would require the requisite training to go along with the use of force authorized through this proposal. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The **SPEAKER**: The Chair recognizes the Representative from Oakland, Representative Nutting.

Representative **NUTTING**: Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I rise because the difference between these two Reports is minor.

As you just heard, the Minority Report requires the correctional officers to get special training at the Criminal Justice Academy. They've already been to the Criminal Justice Academy to learn how to do their work inside the facility, inside the jails. They're mandated to do that. Once they have that training; it may surprise you to learn, it did me; that these correction officers who move people around from the jail to the courthouse to the jail or wherever they're moving them, whenever they move them, the power that they have to use force to restrain these inmates, to restrain them or to keep them from running away, disappears. Inside the facility, they're able to use force to restrain them, once they get out in their car or once they get outside the walls and they're outside and they're headed somewhere in the car or not, they can't restrain the prisoners. I mean, that makes absolutely no sense to me, but that's the way it is.

So, this bill allows them to do the same thing outside the prison walls as they do inside. The idea that they need additional training at the Criminal Justice Academy, because life is so much different for the correctional officer outside of the wall than it is inside the wall, makes no sense to me, either. I encourage you to defeat the pending motion and move on to the other. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

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

Representative **PERKINS**: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I appreciate the fact that my colleagues on the other side of the aisle are willing to put this forward with some training, but our opposition to the training is that people that go through the basic corrections course already receive the training; they do this, they just don't have the authority. If were to look at the syllabus for the Criminal Justice Academy's basic corrections course, Unit 7.2.0 is eight hours of situational use of force and 7.2.8, I believe, is three hours of security in a non-secure setting.

So, while we agree that training is extremely important and we push for it every time, the people that go through the Criminal Justice Academy for the basic corrections course already receive all the training, so that when they are given the authority, they can do this effectively and safely, and our objective is to, with all corrections officers we have in the State, to then say, 'okay, now, everybody who's already received this training, now you have to go back to the Academy to get the exact same training, simply because we feel we should train it again.' That would be a severe cost limitation and a severe operational inconvenience to these agencies. That's why our Report is different, and I will support, I would ask everybody to support the other Report, the Majority Report. Thank you.

The **SPEAKER**: The Chair recognizes the Representative from Readfield, Representative Hasenfus.

Representative **HASENFUS**: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'd just like to point out that in the Committee, the Director of the Maine Criminal Justice Academy specifically stated that they do not provide training to correctional officers on the use of force outside of a correctional facility. And I pose the question to this Body, is it appropriate to authorize immunity and allow an individual of the State to use force without having the proper training in that setting? I pose the answer to that question is no, and I ask you to follow me in voting for this motion that would require the appropriate training. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

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

Representative **PERKINS**: Thank you, Mr. Speaker, for allowing me to rise again on this. I would just like to clarify the question that was asked is whether there was one training specifically for use of force outside of a correctional facility. There is no unit number in the syllabus for situational use of force outside of a secure setting. It is broken up. They do, however, get the training in two separate allotments, one the eight-hour situational use of force and the other is the three-hour security in a non-secure setting, and those things combine to provide all of the training needed that when we authorize authority for these correctional officers, that they can do it in a safe and effective manner. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The **SPEAKER**: The Chair recognizes the Representative from East Machias, Representative Tuell.

Representative **TUELL**: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I wish to pose a question.

The SPEAKER: The Member may proceed.

Representative **TUELL**: I'm wondering by with pushing forward with the training requirement, would that trigger a mandate preamble?

The SPEAKER: The Representative from East Machias, Representative Tuell, has posed a question through the Chair to any Member who wishes to answer. The Chair recognizes the Representative from Westbrook, Representative Salisbury.

Representative **SALISBURY**: Thank you. I'd like to answer that question.

As stated before, this training is already happening. The basis behind this bill was to provide the authority to use that training. So, there is already training provided, as has been mentioned by previous speakers. What this is allowing is for authority.

So, if I can offer an example. If a transport officer; currently, if a transport officer is with a resident at the hospital, either because of an emergent situation or they are staying in the hospital, if that resident decides to escape or tries to physically harm one of the health care providers, that transport officer does not have the authority to go hands-on to stop that attack or to stop that escape. This bill would allow that authority to; with that authority to happen. So, for example, we want to make sure that they have the authority to prevent either an attack or an escape.

What this Amendment will do is to indicate that training will include offsite instances where that might happen. It's already given at the Criminal Justice Academy; it's already provided. I checked in with stakeholders that worked with me when I presented this bill, the training is happening. It's just giving the authority so that they can use that training when they are outside of the facility, because those transport officers, once they leave the walls of either the jails or the prisons, they don't currently have the authority to use the training that they've received already, that they have inside. So, it's providing that authority.

This is just adding more wording on, and I hope that everyone can understand that the importance of this bill and to allowing this to happen if; I checked in with the stakeholders earlier today, we reaffirmed this, by adding this wording, it's already happening, but if we need to add this wording to make people more comfortable, then we're willing to accept that.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the Representative from Guilford, Representative White.

Representative **WHITE**: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. My previous position was County Commissioner. I dealt with a lot of the county jail issues. And a common trip for these correctional officers are to escort a patient to a hospital and, you know, any number of different scenarios where a person in custody is outside of the jail. Historically, this was truly never an issue, and we had had incidents where a person would try to attack a nurse or a doctor, and the corrections officer that had been transporting the individual would physically restrain them.

I think it's just ludicrous to believe that if that nurse or doctor is going to the jail to prescribe meds and they are attacked, that that same correction officer could restrain the individual that's attacking them; however, if there's a reason why they brought the person in custody to the local hospital or care facility, and they attack that same nurse or doctor, they couldn't restrain them there. And I think it would be absurd to make the individual observe the doctor or nurse being abused by the person in custody without doing anything. I know as a passerby, I don't think I would just stand there and watch.

The only other scenario is to lay another tax burden on the citizens of each county by having the county fund a law enforcement officer that should either be on patrol or on their

time off to come in and escort that person to the jail; I mean, to the hospital or to court or to whatever other venue that they have an appointment at. And I think that's a totally ridiculous burden to put on these counties that are struggling to get by right now, and it's an undue burden to put on the police academy to have these trained individuals go back for the same training that they deal with every day. I mean, this is a mistake, at best, but we certainly should get this passed and move on and let the counties go about their business. Thank you.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the Representative from Oakland, Representative Nutting.

Representative **NUTTING**: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I stand to prolong the agony.

Just so we're clear, I'm reading a line from the Amendment, which is part of the Minority Report. In the summary, it says, "if a corrections officer or corrections supervisor does not complete this additional training, the corrections officer or corrections supervisor is not justified in the use or direction of such force." So, it's not just a question of them having had the training, now we need to approve it; it's that they need to have additional training, according to the Minority Report, and I urge you to defeat the Report. Thank you.

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

ROLL CALL NO. 530

YEA - Abdi, Ankeles, Archer, Beck, Bell, Boyer M, Brennan, Bridgeo, Bunker, Cloutier, Cluchey, Copeland, Crafts, Crockett, DeBrito, Dhalac, Dill, Dodge, Doudera, Faircloth, Farrin, Friedmann, Frost, Gattine, Geiger, Gere, Golek, Graham, Gramlich, Hasenfus, Hepler, Julia, Kessler, Kuhn, Lajoie, Lee, Lookner, Macias, Malon, Mastraccio, Mathieson, Matlack, McCabe, Meyer, Milliken, Mitchell, Montell, Moonen, Murphy, O'Halloran, Osher, Pluecker, Pugh, Rana, Ray, Rielly, Roberts, Roeder, Rollins, Runte, Sachs, Salisbury, Sargent, Sato, Sayre, Shagoury, Sinclair, Skold, Stover, Supica, Terry, Warren, Webb, Yusuf, Zager, Mr. Speaker.

NAY - Adams, Albert, Arata, Ardell, Arford, Babin, Bagshaw, Bishop, Blier, Boyer D, Campbell, Carlow, Caruso, Chapman, Cimino, Collamore, Collins, Cooper, Cray, Daigle, Drinkwater, Ducharme, Eder, Faulkingham, Flynn, Foley, Foster, Fredericks, Fredette, Gifford, Greenwood, Guerrette, Haggan, Hall, Henderson, Hymes, Jackson, Javner, Lance, Lanigan, Lavigne, Lemelin, Libby, Lyman, Mason, McIntyre, Mingo, Morris, Nutting, Olsen, Parry, Paul, Perkins, Poirier, Pomerleau, Quint, Rudnicki, Schmearsal-Burgess, Simmons, Smith, Soboleski, Strout, Swallow, Thorne, Tuell, Wadsworth, Walker, White J, White R, Wood P, Wood S, Woodsome.

ABSENT - Underwood.

Yes, 76; No, 72; Absent, 1; Vacant, 0; Excused, 2.

76 having voted in the affirmative and 72 voted in the negative, with 1 being absent and 2 excused, and accordingly the Minority **Ought to Pass as Amended** Report was **ACCEPTED**.

The Bill was **READ ONCE**. Committee Amendment "A" (H-738) 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-738)** and sent for concurrence.

By unanimous consent, all matters having been acted upon were **ORDERED SENT FORTHWITH**.

Majority Report of the Committee on **ENERGY, UTILITIES AND TECHNOLOGY** reporting **Ought Not to Pass** on Bill "An Act to Reverse Recent Changes Made to the Law Governing Net Energy Billing and Distributed Generation"

(H.P. 333) (L.D. 515)

Signed:

Senators:

LAWRENCE of York
GROHOSKI of Hancock

Representatives:

SACHS of Freeport
GEIGER of Rockland
KESSLER of South Portland
RUNTE of York
WARREN of Scarborough
WEBB of Durham

Minority Report of the same Committee reporting **Ought to Pass as Amended by Committee Amendment "A" (H-737)** on same Bill.

Signed:

Senator:

HARRINGTON of York

Representatives:

FOSTER of Dexter
MCINTYRE of Lowell
PAUL of Winterport
WADSWORTH of Hiram

READ.

Representative SACHS of Freeport moved that the House **ACCEPT** the Majority **Ought Not to Pass** Report.

Representative FAULKINGHAM of Winter Harbor **REQUESTED** a roll call on the motion to **ACCEPT** the Majority **Ought Not to Pass** Report.

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

The SPEAKER: A roll call has been ordered. The pending question before the House is Acceptance of the Majority Ought Not to Pass Report. All those in favor will vote yes, those opposed will vote no.

ROLL CALL NO. 531

YEA - Abdi, Ankeles, Archer, Arford, Beck, Bell, Boyer M, Brennan, Bridgeo, Bunker, Cloutier, Cluchey, Copeland, Crafts, Crockett, DeBrito, Dhalac, Dill, Dodge, Doudera, Faircloth, Farrin, Friedmann, Frost, Gattine, Geiger, Gere, Golek, Graham, Gramlich, Hasenfus, Hepler, Julia, Kessler, Kuhn, Lajoie, Lee, Lookner, Macias, Malon, Mastraccio, Mathieson, Matlack, McCabe, Meyer, Milliken, Mitchell, Montell, Moonen, Murphy, O'Halloran, Osher, Pluecker, Pugh, Rana, Ray, Rielly, Roberts, Roeder, Rollins, Runte, Sachs, Salisbury, Sargent, Sato, Sayre, Shagoury, Sinclair, Skold, Stover, Supica, Terry, Warren, Webb, Yusuf, Zager, Mr. Speaker.

NAY - Adams, Albert, Arata, Ardell, Babin, Bagshaw, Bishop, Blier, Boyer D, Campbell, Carlow, Caruso, Chapman, Cimino, Collamore, Collins, Cooper, Cray, Daigle, Drinkwater, Ducharme, Eder, Faulkingham, Flynn, Foley, Foster, Fredericks, Fredette, Gifford, Greenwood, Guerrette, Haggan, Hall, Henderson, Hymes, Jackson, Javner, Lance, Lanigan, Lavigne, Lemelin, Libby, Lyman, Mason, McIntyre, Mingo, Morris, Nutting, Olsen, Parry, Paul, Perkins, Poirier, Pomerleau, Quint, Rudnicki, Schmiersal-Burgess, Simmons, Smith,

Soboleski, Strout, Swallow, Thorne, Tuell, Wadsworth, Walker, White J, White R, Wood P, Wood S, Woodsome.

ABSENT - Underwood.

Yes, 77; No, 71; Absent, 1; Vacant, 0; Excused, 2.

77 having voted in the affirmative and 71 voted in the negative, with 1 being absent and 2 excused, and accordingly the Majority **Ought Not to Pass** Report was **ACCEPTED** and sent for concurrence.

By unanimous consent, all matters having been acted upon were **ORDERED SENT FORTHWITH**.

Majority Report of the Committee on **JUDICIARY** reporting **Ought Not to Pass** on Bill "An Act to Enhance Data Collection Requirements Related to Immigration Status and Asylum Seekers to Safeguard Services for Legal Residents"

(S.P. 548) (L.D. 1318)

Signed:

Senators:

CARNEY of Cumberland
TALBOT ROSS of Cumberland

Representatives:

KUHN of Falmouth
LEE of Auburn
O'HALLORAN of Brewer
PUGH of Portland
SATO of Gorham
SINCLAIR of Bath

Minority Report of the same Committee reporting **Ought to Pass as Amended by Committee Amendment "A" (S-405)** on same Bill.

Signed:

Senator:

HAGGAN of Penobscot

Representatives:

BABIN of Fort Fairfield
CARUSO of Caratunk
HENDERSON of Rumford
POIRIER of Skowhegan

Came from the Senate with the Majority **OUGHT NOT TO PASS** Report **READ** and **ACCEPTED**.

READ.

Representative KUHN of Falmouth moved that the House **ACCEPT** the Majority **Ought Not to Pass** Report.

Representative POIRIER of Skowhegan **REQUESTED** a roll call on the motion to **ACCEPT** the Majority **Ought Not to Pass** Report.

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

The SPEAKER: A roll call has been ordered. The pending question before the House is Acceptance of the Majority Ought Not to Pass Report. All those in favor will vote yes, those opposed will vote no.

ROLL CALL NO. 532

YEA - Abdi, Ankeles, Archer, Arford, Beck, Bell, Boyer M, Brennan, Bridgeo, Bunker, Cloutier, Cluchey, Copeland, Crafts, Crockett, DeBrito, Dhalac, Dill, Dodge, Doudera, Faircloth, Farrin, Friedmann, Frost, Gattine, Geiger, Gere, Golek, Graham, Gramlich, Hasenfus, Hepler, Julia, Kessler, Kuhn, Lajoie, Lanigan, Lee, Lookner, Macias, Malon, Mastraccio, Mathieson, Matlack, McCabe, Meyer, Milliken, Mitchell, Montell, Moonen, Murphy, O'Halloran, Osher, Pluecker, Pugh, Rana,

Ray, Rielly, Roberts, Roeder, Rollins, Runte, Sachs, Salisbury, Sargent, Sato, Sayre, Shagoury, Sinclair, Skold, Stover, Supica, Terry, Warren, Webb, Yusuf, Zager, Mr. Speaker.

NAY - Adams, Albert, Arata, Ardell, Babin, Bagshaw, Bishop, Blier, Boyer D, Campbell, Carlow, Caruso, Chapman, Cimino, Collamore, Collins, Cooper, Cray, Daigle, Drinkwater, Ducharme, Eder, Faulkingham, Flynn, Foley, Foster, Fredericks, Fredette, Gifford, Greenwood, Guerrette, Haggan, Hall, Henderson, Hymes, Jackson, Javner, Lance, Lavigne, Lemelin, Libby, Lyman, Mason, McIntyre, Mingo, Morris, Nutting, Olsen, Parry, Paul, Perkins, Poirier, Pomerleau, Quint, Rudnicki, Schmiersal-Burgess, Simmons, Smith, Soboleski, Strout, Swallow, Thorne, Tuell, Wadsworth, Walker, White J, White R, Wood P, Wood S, Woodsome.

ABSENT - Underwood.

Yes, 78; No, 70; Absent, 1; Vacant, 0; Excused, 2.

78 having voted in the affirmative and 70 voted in the negative, with 1 being absent and 2 excused, and accordingly the Majority **Ought Not to Pass** Report was **ACCEPTED** in concurrence.

By unanimous consent, all matters having been acted upon were **ORDERED SENT FORTHWITH**.

Majority Report of the Committee on **JUDICIARY** reporting **Ought to Pass as Amended by Committee Amendment "A" (S-256)** on RESOLUTION, Proposing an Amendment to the Constitution of Maine to Amend the Appointment and Confirmation Process for Certain Judicial, Civil and Military Officers

(S.P. 668) (L.D. 1715)

Signed:

Senators:

HAGGAN of Penobscot
TALBOT ROSS of Cumberland

Representatives:

BABIN of Fort Fairfield
CARUSO of Caratunk
HENDERSON of Rumford
LEE of Auburn
POIRIER of Skowhegan
SATO of Gorham
SINCLAIR of Bath

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

Signed:

Senator:

CARNEY of Cumberland

Representatives:

KUHN of Falmouth
O'HALLORAN of Brewer
PUGH of Portland

Came from the Senate with the Majority **OUGHT TO PASS AS AMENDED** Report **READ** and **ACCEPTED** and the RESOLUTION **PASSED TO BE ENGROSSED AS AMENDED BY COMMITTEE AMENDMENT "A" (S-256)**.

READ.

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

The same Representative **REQUESTED** a roll call on her 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 Falmouth, Representative Kuhn.

Representative **KUHN**: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I have moved the Ought to Pass as Amended Report, but I voted against it, so, I wanted to take a moment and explain the basis for that.

Under current law, the Senate can only overturn a Committee Report recommending confirmation by a two-thirds vote, and this Majority Report would essentially allow the Senate to start from scratch and confirm nominations by a simple majority vote in the Senate. I think the view is that the current system puts too much power in the hands of House Members, because House Members make up a majority of committees, and trying to relodge that, cede that power in the Senate. In my view, the committee that hears the confirmation is the best body to make that recommendation, because they were present for a public hearing, they're most familiar with the position, the background of the nominee, the additional witnesses who came to testify for and against and for Senators to come in with less background of the very subject matter that the candidate's going to be working in, let alone the candidate itself, doesn't seem like a better system. So, I will not be supporting the pending motion.

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. 533

YEA - Abdi, Adams, Albert, Arata, Ardell, Babin, Bagshaw, Bishop, Blier, Boyer D, Campbell, Carlow, Chapman, Cimino, Collamore, Collins, Cooper, Crafts, Cray, Daigle, Drinkwater, Ducharme, Faulkingham, Flynn, Foley, Foster, Fredericks, Gifford, Greenwood, Guerrette, Haggan, Hall, Henderson, Hymes, Jackson, Javner, Lance, Lanigan, Lavigne, Lee, Lemelin, Libby, Lyman, Mason, McIntyre, Mingo, Morris, Olsen, Paul, Perkins, Poirier, Pomerleau, Quint, Rana, Rudnicki, Sargent, Sato, Schmiersal-Burgess, Simmons, Sinclair, Smith, Soboleski, Strout, Swallow, Terry, Thorne, Tuell, Wadsworth, Walker, White R, Wood P, Wood S, Woodsome.

NAY - Ankeles, Archer, Arford, Beck, Bell, Boyer M, Brennan, Bridgeo, Bunker, Caruso, Cloutier, Cluchey, Copeland, Crockett, DeBrito, Dhalac, Dill, Dodge, Doudera, Eder, Faircloth, Farrin, Fredette, Friedmann, Frost, Gattine, Geiger, Gere, Golek, Graham, Gramlich, Hasenfus, Hepler, Julia, Kessler, Kuhn, Lajoie, Lookner, Macias, Malon, Mastraccio, Mathieson, Matlack, McCabe, Meyer, Milliken, Mitchell, Montell, Moonen, Murphy, Nutting, O'Halloran, Osher, Parry, Pluecker, Pugh, Ray, Rielly, Roberts, Roeder, Rollins, Runte, Sachs, Salisbury, Sayre, Shagoury, Skold, Stover, Supica, Warren, Webb, White J, Yusuf, Zager, Mr. Speaker.

ABSENT - Underwood.

Yes, 73; No, 75; Absent, 1; Vacant, 0; Excused, 2.

73 having voted in the affirmative and 75 voted in the negative, with 1 being absent and 2 excused, and accordingly the Majority **Ought to Pass as Amended** Report was **NOT ACCEPTED**.

Subsequently, on motion of Representative KUHN of Falmouth, the Minority **Ought Not to Pass** Report was **ACCEPTED** in **NON-CONCURRENCE** and sent for concurrence.

By unanimous consent, all matters having been acted upon were **ORDERED SENT FORTHWITH**.

Majority Report of the Committee on **JUDICIARY** reporting **Ought to Pass as Amended by Committee Amendment "A" (S-407)** on Bill "An Act to Establish a Post-conviction Review Process for Crimes Committed by Victims of Sex Trafficking and Sexual Exploitation"

(S.P. 705) (L.D. 1805)

Signed:
Senators:

CARNEY of Cumberland
TALBOT ROSS of Cumberland

Representatives:

KUHN of Falmouth
BABIN of Fort Fairfield
CARUSO of Caratunk
LEE of Auburn
O'HALLORAN of Brewer
PUGH of Portland
SATO of Gorham
SINCLAIR of Bath

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

Signed:
Senator:

HAGGAN of Penobscot

Representatives:

HENDERSON of Rumford
POIRIER of Skowhegan

Came from the Senate with the Majority **OUCHT TO PASS AS AMENDED** Report **READ** and **ACCEPTED** and the Bill **PASSED TO BE ENGROSSED AS AMENDED BY COMMITTEE AMENDMENT "A" (S-407)**.

READ.

On motion of Representative KUHN of Falmouth, the Majority **Ought to Pass as Amended** Report was **ACCEPTED**.

The Bill was **READ ONCE**. **Committee Amendment "A" (S-407)** 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" (S-407)** in concurrence.

By unanimous consent, all matters having been acted upon were **ORDERED SENT FORTHWITH**.

Majority Report of the Committee on **JUDICIARY** reporting **Ought to Pass as Amended by Committee Amendment "A" (S-408)** on Bill "An Act to Permit Sealing Criminal History Record Information of Victims of Sex Trafficking or Sexual Exploitation" (S.P. 741) (L.D. 1871)

Signed:

Senators:

CARNEY of Cumberland
TALBOT ROSS of Cumberland

Representatives:

KUHN of Falmouth
BABIN of Fort Fairfield
CARUSO of Caratunk
LEE of Auburn
O'HALLORAN of Brewer
PUGH of Portland
SATO of Gorham
SINCLAIR of Bath

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

Signed:

Senator:

HAGGAN of Penobscot

Representatives:

HENDERSON of Rumford
POIRIER of Skowhegan

Came from the Senate with the Majority **OUCHT TO PASS AS AMENDED** Report **READ** and **ACCEPTED** and the Bill **PASSED TO BE ENGROSSED AS AMENDED BY COMMITTEE AMENDMENT "A" (S-408)**.

READ.

On motion of Representative KUHN of Falmouth, the Majority **Ought to Pass as Amended** Report was **ACCEPTED**.

The Bill was **READ ONCE**. **Committee Amendment "A" (S-408)** 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" (S-408)** in concurrence.

By unanimous consent, all matters having been acted upon were **ORDERED SENT FORTHWITH**.

Majority Report of the Committee on **HOUSING AND ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT** reporting **Ought to Pass as Amended by Committee Amendment "A" (H-740)** on Bill "An Act to Preserve Affordability in Publicly Assisted Housing Developments"

(H.P. 670) (L.D. 1041)

Signed:

Senators:

CURRY of Waldo
BAILEY of York
BENNETT of Oxford

Representatives:

GERE of Kennebunkport
EDER of Waterboro
GOLEK of Harpswell
JULIA of Waterville
MALON of Biddeford
MINGO of Calais
ROBERTS of South Berwick
YUSUF of Portland

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

Signed:

Representative:

COLLAMORE of Pittsfield

READ.

On motion of Representative GERE of Kennebunkport, the Majority **Ought to Pass as Amended** Report was **ACCEPTED**.

The Bill was **READ ONCE**. **Committee Amendment "A" (H-740)** 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-740)** and sent for concurrence.

By unanimous consent, all matters having been acted upon were **ORDERED SENT FORTHWITH**.

Majority Report of the Committee on **HOUSING AND ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT** reporting **Ought to Pass as Amended by Committee Amendment "A" (H-739)** on Resolve, to Establish a Commission to Study the Role of Private Equity in Maine's Economy and in Key Economic Sectors

(H.P. 1302) (L.D. 1943)

Signed:

Senators:

CURRY of Waldo
BAILEY of York
BENNETT of Oxford

Representatives:

GERE of Kennebunkport
EDER of Waterboro
GOLEK of Harpswell
JULIA of Waterville
MALON of Biddeford
WALKER of Naples
YUSUF of Portland

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

Signed:

Representatives:

COLLAMORE of Pittsfield
MINGO of Calais

READ.

On motion of Representative GERE of Kennebunkport, the Majority **Ought to Pass as Amended** Report was **ACCEPTED**.

The Resolve was **READ ONCE**. **Committee Amendment "A" (H-739)** was **READ** by the Clerk and **ADOPTED**.

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

Under further suspension of the rules the Resolve was **PASSED TO BE ENGROSSED as Amended by Committee Amendment "A" (H-739)** and sent for concurrence.

By unanimous consent, all matters having been acted upon were **ORDERED SENT FORTHWITH**.

UNFINISHED BUSINESS

The following matter, in the consideration of which the House was engaged at the time of adjournment Friday, June 13, 2025, had preference in the Orders of the Day and continued with such preference until disposed of as provided by House Rule 502.

Bill "An Act to Direct the Public Utilities Commission to Seek Informational Bids Regarding Small Modular Nuclear Reactors in the State"

(H.P. 243) (L.D. 343)

- In House, Majority (7) **OUGHT TO PASS AS AMENDED** Report of the Committee on **ENERGY, UTILITIES AND TECHNOLOGY** **READ** and **ACCEPTED** and the Bill **PASSED TO BE ENGROSSED AS AMENDED BY COMMITTEE AMENDMENT "A" (H-285)** on May 28, 2025.

- In Senate, Minority (6) **OUGHT NOT TO PASS** Report of the Committee on **ENERGY, UTILITIES AND TECHNOLOGY** **READ** and **ACCEPTED** in **NON-CONCURRENCE**.

TABLED - June 10, 2025 (Till Later Today) by Representative FAULKINGHAM of Winter Harbor.

PENDING - **FURTHER CONSIDERATION**.

On motion of Representative SACHS of Freeport, the Bill and all accompanying papers were **COMMITTED** to the Committee on **ENERGY, UTILITIES AND TECHNOLOGY** in **NON-CONCURRENCE** and sent for concurrence.

By unanimous consent, all matters having been acted upon were **ORDERED SENT FORTHWITH**.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEE

Divided Reports

Seven Members of the Committee on **JUDICIARY** report in Report "A" **Ought Not to Pass** on Bill "An Act to Enact the Maine Consumer Data Privacy Act"

(H.P. 710) (L.D. 1088)

Signed:

Senators:

CARNEY of Cumberland
TALBOT ROSS of Cumberland

Representatives:

KUHN of Falmouth
O'HALLORAN of Brewer
PUGH of Portland
SATO of Gorham
SINCLAIR of Bath

Five Members of the same Committee report in Report "B" **Ought to Pass as Amended by Committee Amendment "A" (H-718)** on same Bill.

Signed:

Senator:

HAGGAN of Penobscot

Representatives:

BABIN of Fort Fairfield
CARUSO of Caratunk
HENDERSON of Rumford
POIRIER of Skowhegan

One Member of the same Committee reports in Report "C" **Ought to Pass as Amended by Committee Amendment "B" (H-719)** on same Bill.

Signed:

Representative:

LEE of Auburn

READ.

On motion of Representative KUHN of Falmouth, **TABLED** pending **ACCEPTANCE** of any Report and later today assigned.

Eight Members of the Committee on **JUDICIARY** report in Report "A" **Ought to Pass as Amended by Committee Amendment "A" (H-716)** on Bill "An Act to Enact the Maine Online Data Privacy Act"

(H.P. 1220) (L.D. 1822)

Signed:

Senators:

CARNEY of Cumberland
TALBOT ROSS of Cumberland

Representatives:

KUHN of Falmouth
LEE of Auburn
O'HALLORAN of Brewer
PUGH of Portland
SATO of Gorham
SINCLAIR of Bath

Four Members of the same Committee report in Report "B" **Ought to Pass as Amended by Committee Amendment "B" (H-717)** on same Bill.

Signed:

Senator:

HAGGAN of Penobscot

Representatives:

BABIN of Fort Fairfield
CARUSO of Caratunk
HENDERSON of Rumford

One Member of the same Committee reports in Report "C" **Ought Not to Pass** on same Bill.

Signed:

Representative:

POIRIER of Skowhegan

READ.

On motion of Representative KUHN of Falmouth, **TABLED** pending **ACCEPTANCE** of any Report and later today assigned.

Nine Members of the Committee on **TAXATION** report in Report "A" **Ought to Pass as Amended by Committee Amendment "A" (H-709)** on Bill "An Act to Invest in Maine's Families and Workforce by Amending the Real Estate Transfer Tax"

(H.P. 704) (L.D. 1082)

Signed:

Senators:

GROHOSKI of Hancock
TIPPING of Penobscot

Representatives:

CLOUTIER of Lewiston
CROCKETT of Portland
FRIEDMANN of Bar Harbor
LAVIGNE of Berwick
MATLACK of St. George
SAYRE of Kennebunk
WHITE of Ellsworth

Two Members of the same Committee report in Report "B" **Ought to Pass as Amended by Committee Amendment "B" (H-710)** on same Bill.

Signed:

Senator:

BICKFORD of Androscoggin

Representative:

SWALLOW of Houlton

Two Members of the same Committee report in Report "C" **Ought Not to Pass** on same Bill.

Signed:

Representatives:

QUINT of Hodgdon
RUDNICKI of Fairfield

READ.

On motion of Representative CLOUTIER of Lewiston, **TABLED** pending **ACCEPTANCE** of any Report and later today assigned.

The SPEAKER: There are a couple Supplements coming in that are Consent Calendar items as well as some Enactors, so, we'll put those before the Body before we take off.

I also wanted to quickly make an announcement related to floor amendments. Just a reminder that we have still a good amount of work left to do, a lot of that work is being handled by the production offices. The nonpartisan staff, they're working earnestly to try to take the work that you all have worked on in Committee and get it up to our Chambers, but they have seen more Members requesting floor amendments than in any session in recent memory. And every time that someone walks into their office, into the Revisor's Office, asking for a floor amendment, they immediately stop the work they're doing on those bills that are still in Committees and they start working on floor amendments. And so, I would ask folks that if you are

interested in having a floor amendment produced by the nonpartisan staff, please consider whether or not the bill will ever be in a position to have that floor amendment considered. There's been a lot of folks asking for floor amendments to the Minority Reports of bills, there's also been a lot of amendments requested for bills that have Fiscal Notes that will likely require amendments off the Appropriations Table, which at that point might be a more prudent time for the amendment to be added.

So, just really think long and hard about whether or not the floor amendment is truly necessary at this stage in the game, given the late hour of the work before us.

The following items were taken up out of order by unanimous consent:

CONSENT CALENDAR

First Day

In accordance with House Rule 519, the following items appeared on the Consent Calendar for the First Day:

(H.P. 639) (L.D. 979) Resolve, Regarding Legislative Review of Chapter 113: Assisted Housing Programs Licensing Rule, a Late-filed Major Substantive Rule of the Department of Health and Human Services (EMERGENCY) Committee on **HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES** reporting **Ought to Pass as Amended by Committee Amendment "A" (H-743)**

(H.P. 685) (L.D. 1056) Bill "An Act to Clarify the Tax Treatment of Prepaid Wireless Telecommunications Service in Maine" Committee on **TAXATION** reporting **Ought to Pass as Amended by Committee Amendment "A" (H-747)**

(H.P. 1224) (L.D. 1829) Bill "An Act to Build Housing for Maine Families and Attract Workers to Maine Businesses by Amending the Laws Governing Municipal Land Use Decisions" Committee on **HOUSING AND ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT** reporting **Ought to Pass as Amended by Committee Amendment "A" (H-748)**

Under suspension of the rules, Second Day Consent Calendar notification was given.

There being no objection, the House Papers were **PASSED TO BE ENGROSSED as Amended** and sent for concurrence.

By unanimous consent, all matters having been acted upon were **ORDERED SENT FORTHWITH**.

Representative MOONEN of Portland assumed the Chair. The House was called to order by the Speaker Pro Tem.

SENATE PAPERS

Non-Concurrent Matter

An Act to Regulate Municipal Parking Space Minimums

(H.P. 281) (L.D. 427)

(S. "A" S-348 to C. "A" H-456)

FAILED of PASSAGE TO BE ENACTED in the House on June 16, 2025.

Came from the Senate **PASSED TO BE ENACTED in NON-CONCURRENCE**.

Representative FECTEAU of Biddeford moved that the House **RECEDE AND CONCUR**.

The SPEAKER PRO TEM: The Chair recognizes the Representative from Biddeford, Speaker Fecteau.

Representative **FECTEAU**: Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. We have talked about this issue quite a bit in the last several days, but I don't think the essence of this issue has really been captured in the floor debate.

I know that in previous weeks' discussion, there were concerns from Members of this Body about a provision in the bill related to transit; proximity to transit and being exempted from all parking requirements. The motion before us, Recede and Concur, would move us to an aspect; to the new version of this bill as amended that would strike the entirety of that section related to transit. So, the question of whether or not we're exempting all parking requirements in close proximity to transit is no longer before this Body. But what is before this Body is a proposal that would require parking requirements that match the number of units. So, if a developer is building a 30-unit building, they would be required to have 30 parking spaces onsite for that development. In some communities, there's a per bedroom requirement. And so, you might have a 30-unit building, they're all two bedrooms, and the municipality is requiring 60 parking spaces. It's not only excessive, it's costly and it takes up space for absolutely no purpose whatsoever.

Now, I also know there's a provision in this bill that says there can be an offsite parking agreement, and we've heard a lot about that in previous debate, about there will be an offsite parking agreement and then, what if that agreement doesn't come to fruition, or if down the line, the agreement is dissolved? The parking agreement is part of a site plan approval. If the parking agreement is dissolved, the owner of that property is going to have to find a way to satisfy the parking requirement onsite or they're going to have to find another parking garage or parking lot to enter into an agreement. Otherwise, they're going to have to face consequences from the municipality for having no longer been in compliance with the site plan approval that they got from planning board.

So, the question before this Body is, do we want to impose greater costs on those who are building housing in designated growth areas; not throughout the State, only in the places that communities have designated for growth; which, by the way, not all of them even have comp plans where they do this. There are about 200 towns in the State that have comp plans with designated growth areas, there are about 200+ more that don't. So, we're talking about a very limited scope.

Now, we like to talk about what's happening in New Hampshire in this Body pretty often, and just a few weeks ago, the New Hampshire Legislature sent a bill to the Governor's desk there that does the exact same thing this bill entails, except unlike this bill, it applies to the entire state of New Hampshire.

And so, I'm asking this Body to Recede and Concur, because this is smart policy. It is going to reduce costs for developers and it is going to make sure that there are not unnecessary parking in place of where we should be building, housing for people and our families, so that people have a place to call home and not a parking spot to park their car and no place to put their head on a pillow at night. So, I ask for your support in the motion before us.

Representative COLLAMORE of Pittsfield **REQUESTED** a roll call on the motion to **RECEDE AND CONCUR**.

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

The SPEAKER PRO TEM: The Chair recognizes the Representative from Pittsfield, Representative Collamore.

Representative **COLLAMORE**: Thank you very much. While I appreciate the Speaker's remarks and our goals and what we're trying to do with housing, and thank you for bringing up New Hampshire, I would love to remind this Body that we are Maine, not New Hampshire.

But also, I think what's important here is while we did remove; or the Senate did remove, not this Body; the 0.25 mile requirement for the transit stops, it does not remove the 0.25 mile for our parking garages, should they have an offsite thing. It also did not include exemptions for onsite required parking for ADA requirements. Which, again, makes a municipality choose between having to follow State law or follow Americans with Disabilities Act rules from the federal government. Because 0.25 miles is a really long way to go when you do not have the ability to walk.

Another thing that it doesn't keep in mind is the fact that we have safety things that are in mind. Many of our roads in our rural towns, including downtown areas that could potentially be part of a growth area, are not wide enough for on-street parking and would have to have off-street parking. This is a situation that is a case in my community, where a house burned down and a woman lost her life. If we had had on-street parking, there could've been way worse consequences, because the houses that are way too close to it, because of how they were built in past times, could've caught fire if the fire trucks were not able to be there and we could've lost a lot more of our town in that fire.

And so, I would like the Body to please keep in mind that there is a reason that we have continued in this Body to vote against this bill. There is so much more that our municipalities know about their parking and what's available in their communities than we at the State level could ever understand. Thank you.

The SPEAKER PRO TEM: The Chair recognizes the Representative from Buxton, Representative Blier.

Representative **BLIER**: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Just listening to the Good Representative from Biddeford, I would say that I would agree with everything he said. I think that the requirements that we're going to be requiring for designated growth area of one parking spot, I think is more than adequate, and I'll be voting in favor of this motion. Thank you.

The SPEAKER PRO TEM: The Chair recognizes the Representative from New Gloucester, Representative Arata.

Representative **ARATA**: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. So, if you can't satisfy a parking agreement, the parking agreement is very difficult to enforce or not enforceable, and if you have to have an alternative parking plan, what are you going to do if that alternative parking doesn't exist? Will you force the developer to tear down the building? Will you evict people and then force them out?

And frankly, I believe that developers are making enough money and I support having enough parking for poor people. Parking shouldn't just be for wealthy people who can afford it, it should also be for people of modest means who need to have upward mobility, and in order to have that in the State of Maine, you need to have a vehicle. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER PRO TEM: The Chair recognizes the Representative from Newport, Representative Fredette.

Representative **FREDETTE**: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I'd like to pose a question through the Chair.

The SPEAKER PRO TEM: The Member may proceed.

Representative **FREDETTE**: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Generally speaking, I think, as I understand the bill, it sounds to me like basically reducing the number of parking spots. And I guess the question that I have is, is that to some degree, it sounds like a mandate to the local communities, because I understand that there's only going to be some communities affected, which I get that, but to me, I guess, Saco knows Saco better than I do, Biddeford knows Biddeford better than I do and I just; I don't necessarily like the idea of us from Augusta mandating what is going to happen in Saco and Biddeford, because I think they know best what's for their communities.

And so, I'm definitely conflicted with the bill, because I certainly understand the concept. I have a son who lives in South Portland and, you know, when I go to visit him, parking is atrocious and I can't figure out where I'm supposed to park or not park. And so, parking is a big deal. So, certainly, I'm conflicted with the bill and I guess I don't like the idea that we're sort of telling municipalities what they're going to do and what they're not going to do, because I think local control is an important aspect in this State.

The SPEAKER PRO TEM: The Representative from Newport, Representative Fredette, has posed a question through the Chair to any Member who wishes to answer. The Chair recognizes the Representative from Biddeford, Speaker Fecteau.

Representative **FECTEAU**: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. The bill does not have a mandate preamble, so that, I think, speaks for itself.

The SPEAKER PRO TEM: The Chair recognizes the Representative from Arundel, Representative Parry.

Representative **PARRY**: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. May I ask a question through the Chair?

The SPEAKER PRO TEM: The Member may proceed.

Representative **PARRY**: How does this work if we limit it to one parking space per apartment unit or whatever, if there's a husband and wife and they both work, one works, you know, say they live in Biddeford and one works in Sanford and the other one works in Portland, how do they do this if we're going to mandate only one space?

The SPEAKER PRO TEM: The Representative from Arundel has posed a question through the Chair to any Member who wishes to answer. The Chair recognizes the Representative from Biddeford, Speaker Fecteau.

Representative **FECTEAU**: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I feel like I'm at a public hearing, in a way.

Listen, I mean, the property owner is going to be pretty explicit to those that they're renting to about what the parking availability is. And if someone is a two-family; if they're a two-car household and there isn't parking available for two vehicles onsite, they probably are not going to be interested in renting from that property owner. That's what happens in the real world. This is what happens.

But what otherwise is going to occur is the requirements that exist in communities across the State are oftentimes out of alignment with the way in which household formation occurs in today's world. And there are fewer and fewer people living in households together and these requirements which have been adopted over time and have, in many cases, not been revisited, only add additional cost and do not reduce the cost of development.

And at the end of the day, it's on the property owner to have to deal with the drama that comes with parking and if they don't want to deal with that drama, they'll make sure there's additional parking spaces, and most of the time, there is. So, if

you have a 30-unit building, you probably are going to build; you're probably going to have a parking lot that has 36, 38 spots, because you want to make; you want to have that flexibility. But too often, the requirements are way in excess of that, and it's not; not only do you have underutilized parking lots, you have additional costs being borne by the developer, and then subsequently being borne by the tenants, and I think that's wrong.

The SPEAKER PRO TEM: The Chair recognizes the Representative from Kennebunkport, Representative Gere.

Representative **GERE**: Thank you, Mr. Speaker Pro Tem. I wanted to just respond to a few of the comments that we've heard today.

I want to make sure that everyone's aware that you cannot violate the Americans with Disabilities Act. And I think that that's something that we discussed in Committee. I want to make sure that there is clear understanding that you wouldn't be able to not provide the required number of ADA spots for any kind of development, that is federal law.

In addition, the Speaker alluded to a key point here, where the idea of not having a parking minimum that can exceed one parking space for one unit does not take away flexibility from communities or from developers who are building housing to meet the community's needs. As we talked about a little bit before, the developers are going to make sure that they are understanding who the market is that they're targeting. So, for example, in my area, we need a lot of senior housing, we have a lot of older folks. Most of those folks, whether they're in a couple or a single, they've downsized to one vehicle at that point. And so, you would be targeting and thinking about the parking needs of that audience in particular versus if you are thinking about a property where you're going to be renting to families, those folks might have multiple jobs and have two cars. The point is, it puts the flexibility in the developer's hands and in the community's hands to make sure you're understanding who is really going to be living in the housing that's being developed.

And lastly, I just want to make the point yet again. We know in this Body that we need 84,000 units of housing to meet the needs of Maine's population, and if we do not create that housing, we will not have folks here and able to work in our businesses and work in our growing industries, and that is the main problem that we hear from everyone testifying in our Committee on a daily basis, that they need folks who can live near where they work, so that they can grow their businesses for the future of Maine. And in order to do that, one of the key ways that you make that affordable for developers to do, make the cost of the project low enough so that it can actually be built, is to make sure that you are right-sizing the parking for the needs of the marketplace.

And so, I would just echo what the Speaker is saying, this is one of the key tools; if you look around the country, twice as many small towns have implemented the removal of parking minimums or the reduction of parking minimums as we're considering today than large cities. It is a key tool and New Hampshire is, again, the best example that is a very close analog to Maine, they're very similar to how we have; the needs that we have for housing. And they did it. If New Hampshire can do it, so can we. Thank you.

The SPEAKER PRO TEM: The Chair recognizes the Representative from South Portland, Representative Kessler.

Representative **KESSLER**: Thank you, Mr. Speaker Pro Tem. I just couldn't resist chiming in about parking. This is really exciting, guys.

I was rising to just answer the question from the Representative from Arundel, to just share my own personal experience. I live in South Portland and we are a one-car family and the place that we live, we purchased eight years ago and it really was the only place that we could afford to live. And it was a purposeful decision, because we loved our community so much that we couldn't leave it. And the area in which we live, we are close to the shopping centers, close to public transportation, so, we're able to make it work. So, that's just one example. Thank you very much.

The SPEAKER PRO TEM: The Chair recognizes the Representative from Naples, Representative Walker.

Representative **WALKER**: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. My understanding is that designated growth areas are so designated by municipalities and if this bill passes, would a municipality be free to un-designate an area if they found this bill untenable?

The SPEAKER PRO TEM: The Member has posed a question through the Chair to anyone who cares to answer. The Chair recognizes the Representative from Kennebunkport, Representative Gere.

Representative **GERE**: Thank you, Mr. Speaker Pro Tem, and thank you for that excellent question.

I think this is really core to what we're thinking about with regard to housing and the growth area. I think when you think about what a growth area is, it is actually a place where the community has said, we intentionally intend to grow here. So, it would be very counterintuitive to say we're going to designate our growth area in a part of our community that can't accommodate growth. I think that's a really excellent point, Mr. Speaker Pro Tem. And I think that in order for communities to think about what changes they might need to make, it really is a chance to re-examine what are we calling our growth area, where have we designated that, and does it really accommodate what we want to intend to do for growth? Especially for housing development, and to make sure that those things are in line.

So, absolutely, you can always amend your comprehensive plan and there are tools available to do that, and I think that is something that would make a lot of sense when you're thinking about the availability of land and/or buildings for housing and for parking. Thank you.

The SPEAKER PRO TEM: The Chair recognizes the Representative from Buxton, Representative Blier.

Representative **BLIER**: Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. So, I think that one parking space is sufficient. If we get this bill, this bill passes, we're years and years away before we really have a parking issue. The way technology is moving today with Uber, self-driving cars, pretty soon, nobody's going to even have a car. I got my license when I was 16, I couldn't wait to get it. My nephews, they didn't get it until like 24. I'm like, come on.

The point is, is this, this is not awesome, but one parking space is enough. By the time this becomes a real issue, you won't need; people won't even have any cars anymore. Thank you.

The SPEAKER PRO TEM: The Chair recognizes the Representative from Pittsfield, Representative Collamore.

Representative **COLLAMORE**: Thank you, Mr. Speaker Pro Tem. I was actually rising to answer the question about the mandate.

The question, just to put it out there, it's Section 3 of the Committee Amendment, which I think is now Section 2 with the Senate Amendment, having removed the transit spot part. But it says a municipality may not require more than one off street, and then for the off street, Section 4, which I think is now

renumbered to Section 3 in the Senate Amendment, a municipality must allow. Therefore, making these mandates, and even in Committee, we were told that there would be a mandate clause, I found it very interesting when it came out of Committee that it did not have one, and I heard the reasoning was because only some municipalities have the growth management or the growth area designation, and other municipalities don't have it, so, it would only be for a certain portion, but if they all had it, then it would've been a mandate. Thank you.

The SPEAKER PRO TEM: The Chair recognizes the Representative from New Gloucester, Representative Arata.

Representative **ARATA**: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. If you don't think that parking drama impacts peoples' lives, then I suggest you go onto "Lewiston Rocks" or whatever Facebook page you follow after a snowstorm when people have had a parking ban and they're getting their cars towed and they have to choose between buying groceries or getting their car out of impound. Thank you.

The SPEAKER PRO TEM: The Chair recognizes the Representative from Bangor, Representative Roeder.

Representative **ROEDER**: Thank you, Mr. Speaker Pro Tem. I just want to highlight and double underline something that was asked and answered before.

If a developer is hoping to attract a buyer that wants a four-car garage, they're going to build a four-car garage. But for decades, we have treated parking like the highest and best use of land, as if a half-empty asphalt lot is more valuable than a home, a business or green space. This bill turns that outdated thinking on its head. It says in our growth areas, the places we've already identified for dense, walkable, sustainable development, we should no longer require or allow parking to overwhelm the landscape.

If I had had my druthers on this bill, as I'm the Sponsor, there would be no parking minimums. The Housing and Economic Development Committee carefully, carefully crafted this to work for Maine towns. Thank you.

The SPEAKER PRO TEM: The Chair recognizes the Representative from Augusta, Representative Rollins.

Representative **ROLLINS**: The queue has shortened, I just pushed the button.

I'm standing up in support of this. It's an interesting concept. It's very counterintuitive if you live in central Maine and above, it doesn't make sense, you know, off the cuff. But if you get down and travel into southern Maine and into New Hampshire, Northern Massachusetts, there's all kinds of new communities being developed. Some of them are very much tight clusters, limited parking, bicycle racks with rental bikes that you pick up and you drive on the other side of town, drop it off there, walk to your destination, pick up another bike, come home. And that's all new stuff to us. But builders and money doesn't go to places where it won't work. It's not a mandate, it's an ordinance that has a concept that helps certain developers that want to build certain developments and they're not going to build it where it doesn't work. This won't go into Albion for a long time.

So, I'm going to sit here and say, let's give it a shot. I would predict southern Maine would be the area that we see, you know, kind of test this, develop it, but it is working in places, and I see it in my travels, so, I think it's worth trying.

The SPEAKER PRO TEM: A roll call has been ordered. The pending question before the House is to Recede and Concur. All those in favor will vote yes, those opposed will vote no.

ROLL CALL NO. 534

YEA - Abdi, Ankeles, Archer, Arford, Babin, Beck, Bell, Blier, Boyer M, Brennan, Bridgeo, Bunker, Campbell, Cloutier, Cluchey, Cooper, Copeland, Crafts, Crockett, DeBrito, Dhalac, Dill, Dodge, Doudera, Faircloth, Farrin, Friedmann, Frost, Gattine, Geiger, Gere, Golek, Graham, Gramlich, Hasenfus, Jackson, Julia, Kessler, Kuhn, Lajoie, Lee, Lookner, Macias, Malon, Mastraccio, Mathieson, Matlack, McCabe, Meyer, Milliken, Mitchell, Montell, Moonen, Murphy, Osher, Parry, Pluecker, Pugh, Rana, Ray, Rielly, Roberts, Roeder, Rollins, Runte, Sachs, Salisbury, Sargent, Sato, Sayre, Shagoury, Sinclair, Skold, Stover, Supica, Terry, Warren, Webb, Woodsome, Yusuf, Zager, Mr. Speaker.

NAY - Adams, Albert, Arata, Ardell, Bagshaw, Bishop, Boyer D, Carlow, Caruso, Chapman, Cimino, Collamore, Collins, Cray, Daigle, Drinkwater, Ducharme, Eder, Faulkingham, Flynn, Foley, Foster, Fredette, Gifford, Greenwood, Guerrette, Haggan, Hall, Henderson, Hepler, Hymes, Javner, Lance, Lanigan, Lavigne, Lemelin, Libby, Lyman, Mason, McIntyre, Mingo, Morris, Nutting, O'Halloran, Olsen, Paul, Perkins, Poirier, Pomerleau, Quint, Rudnicki, Schmersal-Burgess, Simmons, Smith, Soboleski, Strout, Swallow, Thorne, Tuell, Wadsworth, Walker, White J, White R, Wood P, Wood S.

ABSENT - Fredericks, Underwood.

Yes, 82; No, 65; Absent, 2; Vacant, 0; Excused, 2.

82 having voted in the affirmative and 65 voted in the negative, with 2 being absent and 2 excused, and accordingly the House voted to **RECEDE AND CONCUR**.

Non-Concurrent Matter

Bill "An Act Regarding Superintendent Agreements for Transfer Students"

(S.P. 672) (L.D. 1719)

Majority (8) **OUGHT TO PASS AS AMENDED** Report of the Committee on **EDUCATION AND CULTURAL AFFAIRS** **READ** and **ACCEPTED** and the Bill **PASSED TO BE ENGROSSED AS AMENDED BY COMMITTEE AMENDMENT "A" (S-345)** in the House on June 13, 2025.

Came from the Senate with that Body having **INSISTED** on its former action whereby the Minority (4) **OUGHT NOT TO PASS** Report of the Committee on **EDUCATION AND CULTURAL AFFAIRS** was **READ** and **ACCEPTED** in **NON-CONCURRENCE**.

The House voted to **INSIST**.

Non-Concurrent Matter

Bill "An Act to Require a Blood Test for Drugs for Drivers Involved in a Motor Vehicle Accident That Results in Serious Bodily Injury or Death"

(S.P. 703) (L.D. 1815)

Majority (7) **OUGHT NOT TO PASS** Report of the Committee on **CRIMINAL JUSTICE AND PUBLIC SAFETY** **READ** and **ACCEPTED** in the House on June 13, 2025.

Came from the Senate with that Body having **INSISTED** on its former action whereby the Minority (6) **OUGHT TO PASS AS AMENDED** Report of the Committee on **CRIMINAL JUSTICE AND PUBLIC SAFETY** was **READ** and **ACCEPTED** and the Bill **PASSED TO BE ENGROSSED AS AMENDED BY COMMITTEE AMENDMENT "A" (S-371)** in **NON-CONCURRENCE**.

Speaker Pro Tem MOONEN of Portland moved that the House **INSIST**.

Representative NUTTING of Oakland moved that the House **RECEDE AND CONCUR**.

Representative GRAMLICH of Old Orchard Beach **REQUESTED** a roll call on the motion to **RECEDE AND CONCUR**.

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

The **SPEAKER PRO TEM**: A roll call has been ordered. The pending question before the House is to Recede and Concur. All those in favor will vote yes, those opposed will vote no.

ROLL CALL NO. 535

YEA - Adams, Albert, Arata, Ardell, Babin, Bagshaw, Bishop, Blier, Campbell, Carlow, Caruso, Chapman, Cimino, Collamore, Collins, Cooper, Cray, Daigle, Dill, Drinkwater, Ducharme, Faulkingham, Flynn, Foley, Foster, Fredette, Gifford, Greenwood, Guerrette, Haggan, Hall, Henderson, Hymes, Jackson, Javner, Lance, Lavigne, Libby, Lyman, Mason, McIntyre, Mingo, Morris, Nutting, Olsen, Parry, Paul, Poirier, Pomerleau, Rudnicki, Schmiersal-Burgess, Simmons, Smith, Soboleski, Strout, Swallow, Thorne, Tuell, Wadsworth, Walker, White J, White R, Wood P, Wood S, Woodsome.

NAY - Abdi, Ankeles, Archer, Arford, Beck, Bell, Boyer D, Boyer M, Brennan, Bridgeo, Bunker, Cloutier, Cluchey, Copeland, Crafts, Crockett, DeBrito, Dhalac, Dodge, Doudera, Eder, Faircloth, Farrin, Friedmann, Frost, Gattine, Geiger, Gere, Golek, Graham, Gramlich, Hasenfus, Hepler, Julia, Kessler, Kuhn, Lajoie, Lee, Lemelin, Lookner, Macias, Malon, Mastraccio, Mathieson, Matlack, McCabe, Meyer, Milliken, Mitchell, Montell, Moonen, Murphy, O'Halloran, Osher, Pluecker, Pugh, Quint, Rana, Ray, Rielly, Roberts, Roeder, Rollins, Runte, Sachs, Salisbury, Sargent, Sato, Sayre, Shagoury, Sinclair, Skold, Stover, Supica, Terry, Warren, Webb, Yusuf, Zager, Mr. Speaker.

ABSENT - Fredericks, Lanigan, Perkins, Underwood.

Yes, 65; No, 80; Absent, 4; Vacant, 0; Excused, 2.

65 having voted in the affirmative and 80 voted in the negative, with 4 being absent and 2 excused, and accordingly the motion to **RECEDE AND CONCUR FAILED**.

Subsequently, the House voted to **INSIST**.

By unanimous consent, all matters having been acted upon were **ORDERED SENT FORTHWITH**.

Non-Concurrent Matter

Bill "An Act to Require Age Verification for Online Obscene Matter"

(H.P. 1244) (L.D. 1873)

Majority (8) **OUGHT NOT TO PASS** Report of the Committee on **JUDICIARY READ** and **ACCEPTED** in the House on June 16, 2025.

Came from the Senate with the Bill and accompanying papers **COMMITTED** to the Committee on **JUDICIARY** in **NON-CONCURRENCE**.

The House voted to **INSIST**.

ENACTORS

Acts

An Act to Promote Equity in the Forest Products Industry by Allowing Commercial Wood Haulers to Be Eligible for Certain Sales Tax Exemptions and Refunds

(S.P. 543) (L.D. 1313)

(C. "A" S-410)

An Act to Amend the Laws Regarding Legislative Reimbursement

(H.P. 1312) (L.D. 1968)

(S. "A" S-404 to C. "A" H-559)

Were reported by the Committee on **Engrossed Bills** as truly and strictly engrossed, **PASSED TO BE ENACTED**, signed by the Speaker Pro Tem and sent to the Senate.

By unanimous consent, all matters having been acted upon were **ORDERED SENT FORTHWITH**.

The **SPEAKER PRO TEM**: The Chair recognizes the Representative from Chester, Representative Javner.

Representative **JAVNER**: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I request unanimous consent to address the House on the record.

The **SPEAKER PRO TEM**: The Representative from Chester, Representative Javner, has requested unanimous consent to address the House on the record. Hearing no objection, the Member may proceed.

Representative **JAVNER**: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I rise today to honor the courageous and compassionate efforts of the Baxter State Park Rangers and all those who took part in the search for Tim Keiderling and his daughter at the beginning of the climbing season.

Although the outcome was not what any of us had hoped for, their recovery brought a measure of peace and closure to their loved ones and that would not have been possible without the tireless work of those who searched the rugged terrain of Katahdin, often in harsh conditions, driven by duty and compassion. This tragedy reminds us that climbing Katahdin is no small task. It demands preparation, respect for nature and awareness of the risks. Yet even in moments of loss, we saw the best of Maine: the selfless service, the unwavering resolve and the care extended to a grieving family. A special thanks must be given to Park Director Kevin Adam, whose steady leadership and deep commitment to the mission helped guide the search with professionalism and grace.

To all involved and to the Keiderling family, we extend our deepest sympathies and our heartfelt thanks. Thank you.

On motion of Representative FECTEAU of Biddeford, the House adjourned at 7:30 p.m., until 10:00 a.m., Tuesday, June 17, 2025.