

ON	E HUNDRED AND TWELFTH LEGISLA	TURE
Legislative Do	cument	No.
	House of Representative the Committee on Business and Commerce ordered printed.	, ,
	EDWI	N H. PERT,
	STATE OF MAINE	
	STATE OF MAINE IN THE YEAR OF OUR LORD NINETEEN HUNDRED AND EIGHTY-S	IX
AN ACT	IN THE YEAR OF OUR LORD	ction to
AN ACT Sh	IN THE YEAR OF OUR LORD NINETEEN HUNDRED AND EIGHTY-S to Amend the Law Giving Prote	ction to ons.

STATEMENT OF FACT

2 In the matter of purchase and sale of publicly 3 shares of stock, the State should favor no offered 4 party in the transaction. The State's current law fa-5 vors interests of corporate management over share-6 and would-be purchasers. Repeal of the Maine holders 7 Revised Statutes, Title 13-A, section 910, will re-8 store the neutrality of the State in these business 9 transactions.

10 In Edgar v. Mite, the United States Supreme Court 11 determined that an Illinois statute similar to the Maine Takeover Bid Disclosure Act was unconstitution-12 13 an undue burden on interstate commerce. Many al as other similar Acts have subsequently been invalidated 14 15 by other courts. In Edgar v. Mite, the court also 16 questioned whether any state attempt to upset the balance between management and purchasers set by the 17 18 Williams Act might run afoul of the supremacy clause.

19 The Maine Revised Statutes, Title 13-A, section 20 910, of the Maine Business Corporation Act affects 21 interstate commerce in much the same manner as 22 Maine's Takeover Bid Disclosure Act. Moreover, sec-23 tion 910 tilts the balance in prospective corporate takeovers toward entrenched management and against 24 25 would-be purchasers. Thus section 910 of the Maine 26 Business Corporation Act is subject to the same con-27 stitutional challenges which have already been upheld by the United States Supreme Court. This section 28 29 should be repealed for the same reasons requiring the repeal of the Takeover Bid Disclosure Act. 30

4869030386

31

Page 2-L.D. 2164

1