MAINE STATE LEGISLATURE

The following document is provided by the

LAW AND LEGISLATIVE DIGITAL LIBRARY

at the Maine State Law and Legislative Reference Library

http://legislature.maine.gov/lawlib



Reproduced from electronic originals

(may include minor formatting differences from printed original)

Legislative Record

House of Representatives

One Hundred and Thirty-First Legislature

State of Maine

Daily Edition

First Special Session

Beginning April 5, 2023

Beginning with Page H-277

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

Representative **MALON**: Thank you, Madam Speaker, Members of the House. I rise in support of the pending motion to override the Chief Executive's veto on LD 398. I won't get as much into the policy matter at hand, my good friend from Bangor did that admirably earlier. The bill is modest in scope but still represents a positive step forward for fairness for farm workers in our State. It is all too easy for folks to take for granted the food we find at the grocery store or at farmers markets and, in fact, I believe we should all take more time to reflect on how that food gets to market and eventually into our homes and onto our plates. Unfortunately, I was not able to attend the tour that my good friend from Milford mentioned earlier. I had too many family commitments to enable me to travel up there for that but I have no doubt, and I don't think any Member of this Legislature has any doubt that nearly every farm owner is someone who lives in our State, who farms our land directly and that these people are some of the hardest-working people on earth, who operate at thin margins, at best. The people who work on our farms as well are among the hardest-working workers in the world. And I believe those who testified at our public hearing, and I am a Member of the Labor Committee, about how well they claim to treat those workers. However, when it comes to the rights and dignity of workers, it has long been the policy of our State and country to not rely on peoples' intentions, no matter how good they might be, but rather to be a nation of laws and to have labor laws which provide a basic framework to ensure that minimum workplace standards are met. Even still, LD 398 recognizes the unique nature of this sector and this type of work and thus makes significant exceptions, as has been discussed. What should not be an exception, however, is the codification of basic standards such as wages into law. These workers deserve nothing less.

In her letter, the Chief Executive indicated her support for applying the minimum wage to farm workers and if this effort at overriding the veto is unsuccessful, I look forward to working with her and my colleagues to make sure that this happens. However, we do have this bill before us right now and I believe it is reasonable and positive and I urge my colleagues to vote to override the veto.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the Representative from Presque Isle, Representative Underwood.

Representative **UNDERWOOD**: Thank you, Madam Speaker. There are eight Representatives in this Body that are from the County or have pieces of the territory assigned to them from the County and I can't speak for any of them other than myself, to which I say I appreciate that the Chief Executive did veto this and it's for the benefit of our county, Aroostook County, and the State of Maine. Thank you, Madam Speaker.

After reconsideration, the House proceeded to vote on the question, 'Shall this Bill become a law notwithstanding the objections of the Governor?' A roll call was taken.

The SPEAKER: The pending question before the House is 'Shall this Bill become a law notwithstanding the objections of the Governor?' All those in favor will vote yes, those opposed will vote no.

ROLL CALL NO. 355V

YEA - Abdi, Ankeles, Arford, Bell, Boyle, Brennan, Cloutier, Cluchey, Collings, Copeland, Crafts, Craven, Dhalac, Dodge, Doudera, Eaton, Fay, Gattine, Geiger, Gere, Golek, Graham, Hasenfus, Hobbs, Jauch, Kuhn, LaRochelle, Lee, Lookner, Madigan, Malon, Matlack, Meyer, Millett R, Milliken, Montell, Moriarty, Murphy, O'Connell, Rana, Reckitt, Riseman, Roeder, Runte, Russell, Sachs, Salisbury, Sargent, Sayre, Shagoury, Shaw, Sheehan, Stover, Supica, Terry, Warren, White B, Williams, Zager, Zeigler, Madam Speaker.

NAY - Albert, Arata, Ardell, Bagshaw, Blier, Boyer, Bridgeo, Campbell, Carlow, Carmichael, Costain, Cyrway, Davis, Dill, Drinkwater, Ducharme, Dunphy, Faulkingham, Foster, Fredericks, Greenwood, Griffin, Guerrette, Haggan, Hall, Henderson, Hymes, Jackson, Javner, Lajoie, Landry, Lanigan, Libby, Lyman, Mason, Mastraccio, Millett H, Ness, Newman, Nutting, Parry, Perry A, Pluecker, Poirier, Polewarczyk, Pomerleau, Quint, Rudnicki, Sampson, Schmersal-Burgess, Simmons, Soboleski, Strout, Swallow, Theriault, Thorne, Underwood, Walker, White J, Wood, Woodsome.

ABSENT - Adams, Andrews, Babin, Bradstreet, Collamore, Cray, Crockett, Galletta, Gifford, Gramlich, Hepler, Kessler, Lavigne, Lemelin, Mathieson, Moonen, Morris, O'Neil, Osher, Paul, Perkins, Perry J, Pringle, Rielly, Roberts, Skold, Smith, Worth.

Yes, 61; No, 61; Absent, 28; Vacant, 1; Excused, 0.

61 having voted in the affirmative and 61 voted in the negative, 1 vacancy with 28 being absent, and accordingly the Veto was **SUSTAINED**.

The Following Communication: (H.C. 231)

STATE OF MAINE
OFFICE OF THE GOVERNOR
1 STATE HOUSE STATION
AUGUSTA, MAINE 04333-0001

July 19, 2023

The 131st Legislature of the State of Maine
State House
Augusta, Maine

Dear Honorable Members of the 131st Legislature:

By the authority vested in me by Article IV, Part Third, Section 2 of the Constitution of the State of Maine, I am hereby vetoing L.D. 1610, *An Act To Prohibit Campaign Spending by Foreign Governments and Promote An Anti-Corruption Amendment to the United States Constitution*.

L.D. 1610 attempts to prohibit businesses and other entities with foreign government "influence" – a term that is poorly defined in the bill – from participating in both candidate elections and the citizen-initiated referendum process through monetary expenditures. On this point, the bill is similar to L.D. 194, *An Act to Prohibit Contributions, Expenditures, and Participation by Foreign Government-owned Entities to Influence Referenda* (130th Legis. 2021), a bill I vetoed last session due to potential Constitutional issues.

My concerns about the Constitutionality of the bill remain. But more broadly, while I strongly support and share the desire to find ways to prevent foreign influence in our elections, the language of the bill is too broad and would likely result in the unintended consequence of effectively silencing legitimate voices, including Maine-based businesses, in debates that would impact their interests.

On top of this concern, L.D. 1610 also attempts to regulate the activities of the press and other media outlets, which I believe runs afoul of the First Amendment and is counter to the longstanding tradition and cornerstone of a free press in America.

L.D. 1610's Regulation of Political Speech

The core of the bill restricts who may participate in political debate, but the First Amendment provides its strongest protections to such political speech (*Eu v. San Francisco County Democratic Central Comm.*, 489 U.S. 214, 223 (1989)), with the Supreme Court generally rejecting restrictions on speech in

political campaigns other than to prevent *quid pro quo* style corruption (*Fed. Election Comm'n v. Cruz*, 132 S. Ct. 1638, 1652 (2022)).

L.D. 1610's proponents point to a Federal District Court decision in *Blumen v. FEC*, 800 F. Supp. 281 (D.D.C. 2012), as support for the constitutionality of the bill's prohibition on expenditures by foreign government-influenced entities. But *Blumen* involved the review of a very different law. At issue in that case was a prohibition only on contributions by *foreign nationals,* whereas this bill would also apply to Maine-based businesses that have, for example, investment from a public pension fund of a foreign city or province that has no interest in influencing a referendum. And importantly, *Blumen* only addressed a prohibition on contributions to candidates, political action committees, and political parties, all of which create the potential for *quid pro quo* corruption. This bill, however, also prohibits expenditures on citizen referenda; but the Supreme Court has explained that the risk of *quid pro quo* corruption "simply is not present in a popular vote on a public issue." *First Nat'l. Bank of Boston v. Bellotti*, 98 S. Ct. 1407, 1423 (1978).

While some states have restrictions on foreign nationals and foreign corporations from participating in ballot initiatives, L.D. 1610 is different from those statutes in ways that are problematic:

1. L.D. 1610 does nothing to prohibit a foreign national from contributing to or making expenditures in a ballot initiative campaign;
2. The definition of a foreign entity as one that has 5 percent investment by a foreign government is so broad that it could theoretically incorporate businesses that are 95 percent owned and operated by citizens of Maine. Moreover, most states that bar foreign entities from contributing to a ballot initiative focus on where the business is incorporated or has its principal place of business. If the entity is a domestic subsidiary of a foreign business, they require United States citizens to determine how to make campaign donations. Here, however, the definition of a "foreign-influenced entity" requires one to know the level of foreign government investment in a privately held or publicly traded business – a much more in depth and difficult question to answer.
3. Under L.D. 1610, the same business that is barred from influencing the electorate as they consider a statute at referendum may retain a paid lobbyist to influence legislators as they consider enacting a statute – an odd and somewhat contradictory distinction to make that, in essence, says lawmakers are due certain information from certain messengers but not the people of Maine.

L.D. 1610's Regulation of the Press and Media Outlets

Most troubling, however, is that L.D. 1610 attempts to regulate the activities of the press in two primary ways.

First, it requires internet platforms to "immediately remove" communications paid for by a foreign government-influenced entity, which is likely in violation of the First Amendment, and penalizes media outlets if they do not do so. But the Supreme Court has consistently protected the right of the press to carry truthful information of public concern, even when a third party violated the law in providing that information. *Bartnicki v. Voper*, 532 U.S. 514, 535 (2001). And paid advertising is entitled to the same First Amendment protection as editorial content. *New York Times v. Sullivan,* 376 U.S. 254, 265-66 (1964).

Second, L.D. 1610 also contains a "due diligence" provision that would require media outlets to ensure they do not publish communications "directly or indirectly" paid for – something that is, again, very difficult to discern – by a "foreign government-influenced entity," under threat of significant financial penalties. The Maine Association of Broadcasters, in urging me to veto this bill, wrote that this provision will "essentially require broadcast outlets to become detective agencies, tasked with investigating the source of funding for any and all campaigns." Similarly, the Maine Press Association wrote that the provision "would restrict and burden speech about public issues in Maine by forcing news outlets to create an oppressive, time-consuming, and costly self-censorship regime." I share these concerns and have enclosed their letters for the Legislature's review and consideration.

Conclusion

While L.D. 1610 is flawed, I agree that we should, and we can, take a stand against dark money in our elections by reaffirming the Legislature's support for an amendment to the U.S. Constitution, as described in Section 2 of L.D. 1610. And we can find a way to prevent foreign influence in our elections by enacting a more narrowly tailored and easily understood statute. Foreign actors have, and will, attempt to influence elections in America, but in attempting to protect our citizens from such nefarious actors, we should not create a bureaucratic morass that will entrap and silence otherwise legitimate voices and undermine the fundamental American cornerstones of free speech and free press. For the reasons set forth above, I return L.D. 1610 unsigned and vetoed, and I urge the Legislature to sustain this veto.

Sincerely,

S/Janet T. Mills

Governor

READ and with accompanying papers **ORDERED PLACED ON FILE**.

The accompanying item An Act to Prohibit Campaign Spending by Foreign Governments and Promote an Anticorruption Amendment to the United States Constitution

(I.B. 1) (L.D. 1610)

(C. "A" H-688)

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

Representative **CARLOW**: Thank you, Madam Speaker. I want to apologize in advance for the length of my remarks. I didn't have time to prepare a short speech this morning.

Madam Speaker, it will not surprise you to learn that I stand in resolute support of the Initiated Bill and, while the Chief Executive is consistent in her opposition to this bipartisan common-sense measure, I am persistent in my bewilderment and confusion by those objections. A bipartisan and commanding coalition in both Chambers sent this Initiated Bill to the Chief Executive. We obeyed the will of 80,000 Maine people who worked hard to get this question on the ballot and the Chief Executive sent the bill back to us with a veto message that left me flabbergasted and, it might surprise many of you to learn, lost for words.

The central pillar of the Chief Executive's veto is the supposition that foreign governments like Russia, China and Iran and the foreign corporations under their control are guaranteed constitutional rights and protections to free speech in this country. Madam Speaker, if I am to be charitable, that assertion is absurd on its face. In deciding the *Blumen v. FEC* case, Justice Kavanaugh wrote, quote; it is fundamental to the definition of our national political community that foreign citizens do not have a constitutional right to participate in and therefore may be excluded from activities of democratic self-government. The former Chairwoman of the Federal Elections Commission, Ellen Weintraub, stated that, quote; it defies logic to allow groups

of foreign nationals or foreign nationals in combination with American citizens to fund political spending through corporations; end-quote.

Versions of this legislation have already been passed in nine other states, including Alaska, California, Colorado, Maryland, Minnesota, Nevada, North Dakota, South Dakota and the State of Washington. The constitutionality of those measures have not been questioned. Meanwhile, the Chief Executive would have us believe that foreign interference in Maine elections is permissible as long as they have legitimate reasons for doing so. I object to this argument as well. For it is when a foreign government sets their scope on the State of Maine that we are most vulnerable to intrusion and most exposed to seemingly limitless reserves of dark money.

I've heard it said that the House should sustain the veto because it impacts Maine-based companies. I want to warn my colleagues this contention is a red herring. The Chief Executive vetoed this effort last year based partially on that very same assertion and the five Maine-based companies she cited in that veto letter last Session or last Legislature later confirmed they would not have been impacted by the legislation at all. Notably, the Chief Executive failed to name any Maine companies that would be impacted by this bill in her latest veto letter.

Madam Speaker, it's also been said that this bill would unfairly move the goalpost for the November referendum, but this claim disregards the action this Legislature took when it unanimously passed LD 764. LD 764 provided that any Initiated Bills enacted by this Legislature would not become law until after the November 2023 referendum. That bill passed as an emergency measure late last month and is now law.

Maine already forbids the interference of foreign governments and corporations in elections to State office. But should the Legislature fail to override this veto, we will permit the continued abuse of the loophole that allows foreign entities that dump tens of millions of dollars into Maine referenda in an attempt to hamper the sovereignty of our State, to splinter its unique culture and character and to reshape our home in their image and for their benefit exclusively. But our constituents know better than to trust these foreign governments. Eighty-two percent of Mainers want to protect Maine elections, 91% of Republicans do.

Thanks to the hard work of the 80,000 Mainers I mentioned earlier, the Legislature now has the justification, the opportunity and the solemnest responsibility to pass this initiative notwithstanding the objections of the Chief Executive or we will surely face ridicule from the voters this November for delaying what is almost certainly the inevitable outcome of this referendum. For these reasons, I strongly urge my colleagues to override the veto. Thank you, Madam Speaker.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the Representative from Scarborough, Representative Warren.

Representative **WARREN**: Thank you, Madam Speaker. I just wanted to rise briefly in bipartisan reflection of support to override this veto. I think it's not a traditionally partisan idea to say that we, in this democracy, should be serving the interests of the people that we represent, the people that vote for us, and that our elections should be free of foreign influence no matter where it comes from. I believe strongly in international cooperation. I believe strongly in being a good global citizen and that there's many issues upon which we can have that out-of-State and out-of-country cooperation. And yet, I think our elections and the decisions we make at the ballot box must be completely sovereign and free of that foreign influence. I think it's at a time when there's so much question and sense of distrust in our political systems, I think that an issue like this is a place where we ought to come together beyond partisanship and maybe seek to override this veto in the aims of a more reflective democracy, a democracy that we can truly trust in. So, I hope you'll follow my light and overturn this veto.

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

Representative **LOOKNER**: Thank you, Madam Speaker. I also rise in support of overriding this veto. Most of us agree that there is too much money in politics coming from all sources. I took some time last night and reviewed the Constitutions of both the United States and the State of Maine and I could find nowhere in either document where it referenced unlimited political spending as protected speech. I could see nowhere where it said that multinational corporations have the same rights to freedom of speech as citizens of our country and our State. I could see nowhere where it said that interests that have an ownership stake by governments of other countries have protected speech in our elections.

Since the disastrous Supreme Court ruling on *Citizens United* over 10 years ago, we have seen record-breaking political spending in year after year. Mainers are sick of it. Mainers new and old. We do not like the constant barrage of attack ads, the toxic and misleading campaigning, and there's seemingly no end to it. Year after year, just one election, one campaign bleeds into the next with so much money that's being spent and it doesn't give our communities any time to heal between elections. So, I'm firmly in support of doing whatever we can to rein in the amount of spending, the just unlimited spending on campaigns. And Mainers are more than capable of making their own decisions, we don't need governments of other countries telling us how to vote. And I believe that this is a solid bill, that Mainers deserve this protection from this misleading campaign advertising and the unlimited money that's infiltrating our politics every year. So, thank you for letting me speak, I'll be voting to override.

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

Representative **FOSTER**: Thank you, Madam Speaker. I did have time enough this morning to put together a brief floor speech here this morning in support of the Chief Executive's veto of LD 1610. LD 1610 would prohibit any company of which a foreign government or foreign government-owned entity holds, controls or owns more than 5% from having a voice in ballot election campaigns. Madam Speaker, I have, through some research of staff, a list of what I count as 147 companies, and there may be more, that are registered to do business in Maine that are owned by a foreign entity. These include, I'll just name a couple; Aroostook Valley Country Club Limited from New Brunswick; Aureus Radiology LLC from New Brunswick; Daaquam Lumber Incorporated, Quebec; IBM Business Services Incorporated, the Philippines; IDEXX Laboratories GmbH, Switzerland; McCain Produce Incorporated, New Brunswick; MetLife Global Operations Support Center Private Limited, India; Viking Cruises USA Limited, Bermuda; just to name a few, Madam Speaker. Now, I have not gone to the length to do the research on how many of those may have 5% or more of their stock ownership or otherwise be owned by the government of the country that they are from but, for example, many government entities, foreign countries and, like the State of Maine, have large pension funds that are invested in certain companies and they could very well be 5% or more of the outstanding stock for that company.

So, Madam Speaker, this veto doesn't kill the bill; it sends it to the voters. It gives them the opportunity to decide. I find it a bit curious that some of those who worked very hard to get

another bill before the voters in November are now opposed to allowing the same to happen with LD 1610. I ask that you follow my light and sustain the veto of LD 1610. Thank you, Madam Speaker.

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

Representative **CYRWAY**: Thank you, Madam Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I just wanted to say that I've struggled with this but I also feel that it's like throwing a big rock in the pond, that there's a ripple effect and when there's that ripple effect, it affects a lot of people. And, for example, in my area, we have Huhtamaki, Sappi, hundreds of workers work there and most of them are from Maine, they're Maine people working here and if they need representation, the owner of that facility would not have any voice so it would be very difficult. It makes it difficult for me to vote for this bill when I think of it could affect so many people. So, I have to agree with the veto and I will support the sustain. Thank you.

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

Representative **POIRIER**: Thank you, Madam Speaker. Madam Speaker, in the last two years, foreign-owned companies have spent over $100 million to influence voters on referendum campaigns. Whether we pass this bill through today or it goes to the voters in November, I strongly believe that this bill will become law. It's something that the people of Maine have stated time and time again that they want. It is a common-sense measure to protect our democracy, our sovereignty and our local interests from foreign meddling. Foreign-owned companies have used their seemingly endless flow of money to flood the airwaves, the internet and the mailboxes with misleading and false information. They have not done this in the interest of Mainers but in the interest of their own governments, their shareholders and their own profit margins.

We need to level the playing field and restore trust and transparency in our electoral process. LD 1610 is a common-sense measure to protect those interests. This law only applies to companies that are owned or controlled by foreign governments. I repeat; foreign governments. As legislators, our constituents expect us to defend our State's independence and autonomy from foreign influence and interference. Maine is known for its motto, Dirigo, which means I lead. Though I know we're not the first State to enact such a law, we should lead the way by standing up for our rights, our values and our future from foreign meddling. I support local business, I support all business here in Maine, but Mainers must come first. Madam Speaker, our constituents have spoken and they want LD 1610 to become law. I urge you to join me and vote to override this veto. Thank you.

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

Representative **LIBBY**: Thank you, Madam Speaker. Madam Speaker, at its core, this bill is an attack on freedom of speech. The Good Representative from Buxton brought up red herrings and it's to that, I have to respond. It is a red herring to claim that this bill is intended to keep foreign governments out of our elections. Every couple of years, Madam Speaker, someone in this Body brings up a bill to tax water in Maine. Everyone here knows that that bill is always meant to target one business; Poland Springs. This bill is very similar. It's intended to target one company; CMP. But its shotgun approach which sprays scattershot across Maine businesses, infringing on their right to free speech.

I would highlight page five in the House Calendar today, points one and two from the Chief Executive's veto letter, and I'll read it for us all. LD 1610 does nothing to prohibit a foreign national from contributing to or making expenditures in a ballot initiative campaign. Number two, the definition of a foreign entity as one that has 5% investment by a foreign government is so broad that it could theoretically incorporate businesses that are 95% owned and operated by citizens of Maine. Moreover, most states that bar foreign entities from contributing to a ballot initiative focus on where the business is incorporated or has its principal place of business. If the entity is a domestic subsidiary of a foreign business, they require U.S. citizens to determine how to make --

The SPEAKER: The Member will defer. The Chair will again remind its Members if they'd like to have a conversation, please do so outside of this Chamber or behind the glass. Out of respect for the person who is speaking, please limit your conversations in this Chamber. The Member may proceed.

Representative **LIBBY**: Thank you, Madam Speaker. I appreciate your courtesy. If the entity is a domestic subsidiary of a foreign business, they require United States citizens to determine how to make campaign donations. Here, however, the definition of a foreign-influenced entity requires one to know the level of foreign government investment in a privately held or publicly traded business; a much more in depth and difficult question to answer. Let's not pretend that this is a noble bill, Madam Speaker. This bill is intended to hit one business and one business only. It's interesting to see who rises to speak to this bill on both sides of the aisle and I think it makes it clear what this bill is intended to do. I will support the Chief Executive's veto and I urge my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to follow my light and support the Constitution. Thank you.

After reconsideration, the House proceeded to vote on the question, 'Shall this Bill become a law notwithstanding the objections of the Governor?' A roll call was taken.

The SPEAKER: The pending question before the House is 'Shall this Bill become a law notwithstanding the objections of the Governor?' All those in favor will vote yes, those opposed will vote no.

ROLL CALL NO. 356V

YEA - Abdi, Ankeles, Arford, Bell, Blier, Brennan, Bridgeo, Carlow, Cloutier, Cluchey, Collings, Copeland, Crafts, Craven, Dhalac, Dodge, Doudera, Eaton, Faulkingham, Fay, Fredericks, Gattine, Geiger, Gere, Golek, Gramlich, Hasenfus, Henderson, Hobbs, Jauch, Kuhn, Lanigan, LaRochelle, Lee, Lookner, Madigan, Malon, Mastraccio, Matlack, Meyer, Millett H, Millett R, Milliken, Montell, Moriarty, Murphy, O'Connell, Perry A, Pluecker, Poirier, Polewarczyk, Rana, Reckitt, Riseman, Roeder, Runte, Russell, Sachs, Salisbury, Sargent, Sayre, Shagoury, Shaw, Sheehan, Stover, Supica, Theriault, Warren, White B, Williams, Zager, Zeigler, Madam Speaker.

NAY - Albert, Arata, Ardell, Bagshaw, Boyer, Boyle, Campbell, Carmichael, Costain, Cyrway, Davis, Dill, Drinkwater, Ducharme, Dunphy, Foster, Graham, Greenwood, Griffin, Guerrette, Haggan, Hall, Hymes, Jackson, Javner, Lajoie, Landry, Libby, Lyman, Mason, Ness, Newman, Nutting, Parry, Pomerleau, Quint, Rudnicki, Sampson, Schmersal-Burgess, Simmons, Soboleski, Strout, Swallow, Terry, Thorne, Underwood, Walker, White J, Wood, Woodsome.

ABSENT - Adams, Andrews, Babin, Bradstreet, Collamore, Cray, Crockett, Galletta, Gifford, Hepler, Kessler, Lavigne, Lemelin, Mathieson, Moonen, Morris, O'Neil, Osher, Paul, Perkins, Perry J, Pringle, Rielly, Roberts, Skold, Smith, Worth.

Yes, 73; No, 50; Absent, 27; Vacant, 1; Excused, 0.

73 having voted in the affirmative and 50 voted in the negative, 1 vacancy with 27 being absent, and accordingly the Veto was **SUSTAINED**.

The Following Communication: (H.C. 227)

MAINE SENATE
131ST LEGISLATURE
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY

July 12, 2023
Honorable Robert B. Hunt
Clerk of the House
131st Maine Legislature
Augusta, Maine 04333
Dear Clerk Hunt:
In reference to the action of the Senate on June 6, 2023 whereby it insisted and asked for a Committee of Conference on Bill "An Act to Direct the Maine Criminal Justice Academy to Develop a Nonresidential Law Enforcement Training Program" (H.P. 442) (L.D. 673), ten legislative days having passed without the committee submitting a report as required pursuant to Joint Rule 352, I am hereby placing L.D. 673 in the legislative files.
Sincerely,
S/Darek M. Grant
Secretary of the Senate

READ and **ORDERED PLACED ON FILE**.

The Following Communication: (H.C. 228)

SENATE OF MAINE
131ST LEGISLATURE
OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT

July 12, 2023
The Honorable Robert B. Hunt
Clerk of the House
2 State House Station
Augusta, ME 04333
Dear Clerk Hunt:
Pursuant to my authority under Title 38, Chapter 3, I am pleased to reappoint Brian Beal of Machias to serve on the Clean-up and Response Fund Review Board serving as a member with expertise in marine fisheries interests. With this reappointment, he will be serving a three-year term.
Please let me know if you have any questions regarding this appointment.
Sincerely,
S/Troy D. Jackson
President of the Senate

READ and **ORDERED PLACED ON FILE**.

The Following Communication: (H.C. 229).

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
2 STATE HOUSE STATION
AUGUSTA, MAINE 04333-0002

July 14, 2023
Rachel Talbot Ross
Speaker of the House,
Maine House of Representatives
2 State House Station
Augusta, ME 04333
Dear Madam Speaker,
On July 11th, 2023, I was appointed by Governor Janet Mills to fill the position of the Sagadahoc County Register of Probate due to a recent vacancy.
Unfortunately, in order to take this appointment, I must resign the position of State Representative for District 50 representing the City of Bath, effective immediately.
Sincerely,
S/Sean C. Paulhus

READ and **ORDERED PLACED ON FILE**.

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

ORDERS

On motion of Representative ARFORD of Brunswick, the following Joint Resolution: (H.P. 1301) (Cosponsored by Senator DAUGHTRY of Cumberland and Representatives: ANKELES of Brunswick, GOLEK of Harpswell)

JOINT RESOLUTION RECOGNIZING THE 200TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE BRUNSWICK TOWN MALL

WHEREAS, in 1823, John O'Brien, Robert D. Dunning and John A. Dunning, all of Brunswick, conveyed real estate to the Town of Brunswick, including land that became Brunswick's Lower Mall; and

WHEREAS, the deed to the town specified that the land was to be used only as a public walk or mall in perpetuity; and

WHEREAS, the Brunswick Town Mall serves as a gathering place for community residents at music concerts, art and Pride festivals, Civil War reenactments, winter ice skating, holiday tree lighting and many other special events and activities; and

WHEREAS, the Lower Mall is the site of Veterans Plaza, which is dedicated to all veterans and Merchant Marines from the Revolutionary War to the present; and

WHEREAS, the Lower Mall hosts a Farmers' Market twice a week during warm months as well as up to 5 food truck vendors; and

WHEREAS, the extraordinary historical significance of the Brunswick Town Mall has been recognized by the designation of a Spanish-American War Square; inclusion on the National Register of Historic Places in 1976; dedication of a statue of Joshua Chamberlain in 1983; placement of a plaque by the Rotary Club designating the Brunswick Town Mall as a local historic site in 2005; and installation of a monument on the Brunswick Town Mall to commemorate the 2020 Maine bicentennial; and

WHEREAS, 2023 is the 200th anniversary of the deed conveying the first property that became part of the Brunswick Town Mall; now, therefore, be it