

*Testimony for the Maine State Chamber of Commerce before the Joint Standing
Committee on Veterans and Legal Affairs
March 15, 2021*

**L.D. 194– An Act To Prohibit Contributions, Expenditures and Participation
by Foreign Government-owned Entities To Influence Referenda
(EMERGENCY)**

**L.D. 479 – An Act To Ban Foreign Campaign Contributions and Expenditures
in Maine Elections**

**L.D. 641 – An Act To Prohibit Contributions, Expenditures and Participation
by Foreign Nationals To Influence Referenda (EMERGENCY)**

Senator Luchini, Representative Caiazzo, and members of the Joint Standing Committee on Veterans and Legal Affairs: Thank you for the opportunity to testify on these three bills.

My name is Gerald F. Petrucci, from Petrucci, Martin & Haddow in Portland, and I am here today on behalf of the Maine State Chamber of Commerce. The Chamber is the voice of Maine business, speaking for approximately 5,000 Maine businesses of all sizes throughout the State. Some are owned by individuals or parent companies that are not in Maine or even the United States. Not surprisingly, there is, or once was and we hope will be again, significant cross-border commerce with our Canadian neighbors. Attached is a table that was prepared a year ago showing foreign investment in Maine businesses. It may not be fully current or completely accurate, but it is still a fair illustration of the scope of foreign investment in Maine.

Each of these bills should be rejected for any or all of three basic reasons. Predominately, they present very substantial challenges to settled constitutional limits concerning the permissible governmental regulation of political speech. Second, there is no emergency in any fair sense of the term. Third, enactment of any of this proposed legislation would present serious operational difficulties for Maine businesses and impede their ability to protect and advocate for their legitimate interests. A more detailed analysis of these points follows.

I. Introduction

These bills explicitly intend to prohibit political speech concerning a referendum question. It is the settled constitutional jurisprudence that prohibitions or restrictions on political speech, if constitutional at all, may be justified only under a standard of strict

scrutiny. That well established standard imposes on the drafters and defenders of any such legislation a heavy burden of demonstrating that the legislation is narrowly tailored to protect or advance a compelling State interest. They must not merely assert but show not only a legitimate State interest but a “compelling” one. It is therefore essential to identify with precision the problem intended to be solved by these enactments. And the obligation of the sponsors is to devise a solution that achieves the objective with minimal restrictions on the constitutionally guaranteed liberty to speak and advocate on issues, especially issues that are on the ballot.

Supreme Court decisions and opinions of the Federal Election Commission have wrestled with these kinds of issues under existing federal law. However, none of these bills are content to incorporate the existing federal definitions and to reinforce existing federal prohibitions. Instead, each creates vulnerabilities that leave the State open to significant and costly free-speech challenges, and the Committee should reject them.

These bills are also not addressing any emergency. Failure to enact this legislation would not imperil the public peace, the public health, or the public safety. It would simply leave in place the current and longstanding rules governing initiated referendum elections.

Compliance with any of these bills, if enacted, would not only impermissibly burden or restrict the exercise of political liberty but would also present logistical and operational complexities that cannot be justified by any State interest that meets the standard of “compelling.”

II. Analysis

There is already an abundance of State law governing the referendum election process and, if any additional legislation restricting the participation by foreign owners of Maine businesses is both constitutional and prudent, the legislature would be wise to use the federal definition of foreign national and not expand it. These bills bar local companies that are owned by foreign parent companies or with foreign shareholders from any debate on referendum questions that may affect their ability to conduct business in Maine. Stock markets do not have citizenship requirements, so there is no true way for any publicly traded company to prevent foreign actors from obtaining an ownership interest, for example.

LD 641

Except for its *broader* definition of “foreign national” and its reference to a “foreign national’s” majority control of a legal entity/business, LD 641 tracks the most closely to last session’s LD 2136. We will not reiterate all the reasons we opposed that legislation here, but it is important to note that this bill is even more susceptible to criticism and litigation. Critical for this analysis is that LD 641 substantially expands upon the federal

definition of foreign national, located at 52 U.S.C. § 30121(b), to include anyone who is not a U.S. Citizen. This expanded definition would prohibit contributions from U.S. Nationals (those who owe permanent allegiance to the United States but who are not citizens, such as the residents of American Samoa), and lawful permanent residents, many of whom have lived, worked, and paid taxes in our communities for many years.

There is ample case law that demonstrates that LD 641's restrictions on the free speech rights of lawful permanent residents and U.S. nationals are unconstitutional. *See, e.g., Bridges v. Wixon*, 326 U.S. 135, 161 (1945) (“[O]nce an alien lawfully enters and resides in this country he becomes invested with the rights guaranteed by the Constitution to all people within our borders. Such rights include those protected by the First and the Fifth Amendments and by the due process clause of the Fourteenth Amendment. None of these provisions acknowledges any distinction between citizens and resident aliens. They extend their inalienable privileges to all ‘persons’ and guard against any encroachment on those rights by federal or state authority.”) Some restrictions have since been upheld, such as punishment for foreign nationals openly encouraging rebellion, but there is nothing in this law that is sufficiently narrowly tailored to withstand constitutional scrutiny.

LD 479

LD 479 is the only non-emergency bill of the three being reviewed at this hearing. It lowers the threshold for political-participation-disqualifying foreign ownership to a paltry 5%. One Canadian owner out of twenty owners of a Maine business of any size leaves the nineteen American owners powerless to advocate for any position on any issue. It also deviates from the federal contribution prohibitions listed at 52 U.S.C. § 30121(a), which would cause unnecessary confusion and legal conflicts that would needlessly impede participation in the political process. When the law is not clear, it opens the State to litigation. LD 479's definition of “foreign owner” also conflicts with federal definitions and would create a legal minefield for any company that is or has a subsidiary. Similarly, it would be difficult if not impossible to imagine how section 3 of LD 479 would be enforced. Notwithstanding the critical First Amendment consideration discussed elsewhere, this bill appears to prohibit a foreign national from re-sharing a post on social media and would require every internet platform to monitor the financial ties related to every post or communication made by its users. Both requirements are unrealistic and would necessitate a significant and economically wasteful, not to mention intrusive, increase in monitoring capacity to be uniformly enforced.

Both LD 479 and LD 641 substantially expand the definition of foreign national to sweep within it an American company chartered by an American state doing business only in the United States, if a foreign national is indirectly the beneficial owner of some percentage of the equity interest in the company. As noted above, the mathematical

consequence of this overbroad definition is that the remaining equity ownership in American hands is barred from participating in a referendum election that may substantially adversely affect the company. This is the antithesis of narrow tailoring, even assuming that the bill is in the service of some compelling state interest that has not been clearly stated. The inalienable political rights of the majority American owners cannot constitutionally be abridged in this way.

LD 194

This emergency bill is similar to the others, except that it focuses on what it defines as “government-owned entities” rather than on a definition of “foreign nationals.” It sets an arbitrary threshold of 10% of any kind of ownership, without any explanation of how or when that percentage would be calculated. Where the ownership of publicly traded companies is ever changing, with shares being bought and sold by investment groups or mutual funds, including say public pension trusts, with undisclosed beneficial ownership on a daily if not hourly basis, it could make calculating the foreign-government ownership percentage cumbersome, if not impossible.

Federal election law already addresses the importance of protecting the election process and provides sufficient protection from foreign interference. For example, a foreign entity with a U.S. subsidiary must not interfere with, contribute funds to, or direct the political efforts/speech of its U.S. subsidiary. *See, e.g.*, 22 U.S.C. § 611(c); 11 C.F.R. § 110.4. Subsidiaries that are separately incorporated are considered separate legal entities for purposes of analyzing campaign contributions. So long as the entity establishes a separately segregated fund (SSF) into which no foreign money is contributed and no direction from a foreign entity is received, a local corporation can and should be allowed to participate in the legislative process, including initiated legislative proposals, through issue advocacy.

All three bills define foreign ownership in terms of percentages. However, Federal law does not talk about ownership percentages when determining if an entity is a foreign principal. It looks at where the principal place of business is located and where the organization was created. *See, id. See also*, FEC AO 1985-3 (“Under 22 U.S.C. 611(b), a corporation organized under the law of any state within the United States whose principal place of business is within the United States is not a foreign principal and, accordingly would not be a ‘foreign national’ under 2 U.S.C. 441e.”)

In addition to the new and overbroad characterization that two bills make regarding what constitutes a foreign national, it ought not to go unnoticed that LD 194 and LD 641 depart from the general provisions of 21-A M.R.S.A. § 1004. The maximum fine under § 1004 is \$10,000. The fine in both proposed pieces of legislation is the greater of

\$100,000 or twice the amount of the contribution. Perhaps this sanction is intended to constitute evidence of narrow tailoring but conversely it sends the message that a political contribution by a company doing business in Maine that is 49% owned by Americans is ten times as bad as any other campaign violation covered by § 1004. As yet, there appears to be no evidence in any legislative record to support that legislative judgment.

Additionally, several bills are now pending in Congress to amend the laws prohibiting the participation of foreign entities and individuals in the election process. If the Legislature passes a bill that works in contravention to such changes, the State will again likely face significant litigation to clear up any resulting confusion or conflict of laws.

III. The Constitutional Issues

“Congress shall make no law ... abridging the freedom of speech, [or]... to petition the Government for a redress of grievances.” Amend. I, U.S. Const. *See also* Art. I, § 4, Maine Const.

Freedom of speech is a bedrock principle of our democracy. It is protected by the Supreme Court’s application of a strict scrutiny analysis when reviewing laws that attempt to curtail that speech. That analytical framework requires that the government “prove that the restriction furthers a compelling interest and is narrowly tailored to achieve that interest.” *Sindicato Puertorriqueno de Trabajadores v. Burset*, No. 12-1531 (PG), 2012 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 141024, at *15 (D.P.R. Sep. 27, 2012)(citing *Citizens United v. Federal Election Comm’n*, 558 U.S. 310, 130 S.Ct. 876, 898, 175 L.Ed.2d 753 (2010)). *See also*, *NAACP v. Button*, 371 U.S. 415, 438 (1963)(“[O]nly a compelling state interest in the regulation of a subject within the State’s constitutional power to regulate can justify limiting First Amendment freedoms.”)

Whether a law attempting to limit speech is narrowly tailored enough to survive strict scrutiny has been the subject of significant litigation. For example, the Supreme Court upheld a Tennessee law that prohibited campaigning within 100 feet of a polling place, because voter intimidation and voter fraud are so “difficult to detect” that creating the buffer zone was necessary to protect another fundamental right, “the right to cast a ballot in an election free from the taint of intimidation and fraud.” *Burson v. Freeman*, 504 U.S. 191 (1992). In contrast, the Supreme Court struck down a similar Massachusetts law that created buffer zones around abortion clinics, in part, because “[o]bstruction of abortion clinics and harassment of patients, by contrast, are anything but subtle” and there existed other, less restrictive options for protecting patients. *McCullen v. Coakley*, 573 U.S. 464, 496 (2014).

Similarly, the Supreme Court struck down a North Carolina law that sought to regulate the pay and communications of professional fundraisers for non-profit organizations,

because “even if the State had a valid interest in protecting charities from their own naivete or economic weakness, the Act would not be narrowly tailored to achieve it” because “more benign and narrowly tailored options are available.” *Riley v. Nat'l Fed'n of Blind*, 487 U.S. 781, 792, 800 (1988). In contrast, the Supreme Court upheld a restriction on judges directly soliciting financial donations because it was narrowly tailored to the purpose of ensuring public trust in the judiciary. *Williams-Yulee v. Fla. Bar*, 575 U.S. 433 (2015). The Court held that it was narrowly tailored such that it withstood strict scrutiny because though the law “prevented judges from personally soliciting funds, [but] they were still allowed to discuss any topic publicly and could have their campaign committees solicit funds for them.” The pending LDs show no comparable attention to narrow tailoring. Instead, they all show a determination to sweep as broadly as possible.

And although freedom of speech covers a broad range of activities and courts have found that some restrictions are permissible, “[i]ssue advocacy is the classic heart of First Amendment protection and should be burdened as little as possible.” *Nat'l Org. for Marriage & Am. Principles in Action v. McKee*, 765 F. Supp. 2d 38, 46 (D. Me. 2011). And as regulations grow and additional requirements are added, their proliferation itself makes it easier “to ignore the burdensome effects on the speech of individuals and small organizations.” *Id.* Here, the bills presumably attempt to create a bright line rule, but for dozens of small and mid-size Maine companies who would need to ensure compliance with the rule, the prospect of administrative burdens to track down citizenship information for every shareholder or LLC that is a partial owner of the company would effectively curtail their speech. That deterrent effect in and of itself calls into question the bill’s constitutionality and is particularly offensive to First Amendment freedoms because it is aimed at issue advocacy. For example, when reviewing a California law that sought to limit the size of contributions to a ballot measure committee to ensure only small donations, the Supreme Court struck it down, finding that the law “does not advance a legitimate governmental interest significant enough to justify its infringement of First Amendment rights.” *Citizens Against Rent Control/Coalition for Fair Hous. v. Berkeley*, 454 U.S. 290, 299 (1981). That Court found that whatever the state’s interest in regulating contributions to a candidate, that there was no similar interest in “curtailing debate and discussion of a ballot measure.” *Id.* at 299. These bills are obviously animated by concern that a proposed ballot initiative might be defeated (or passed) if campaign participation is not tightly regulated.

Although *Citizens United* is a controversial Supreme Court decision, we must analyze the proposed legislation within the framework of that case because it is the controlling law. The Supreme Court explained that “because speech is an essential mechanism of democracy--it is the means to hold officials accountable to the people--political speech must prevail against laws that would suppress it by design or inadvertence.” *Citizens United v. FEC*, 558 U.S. 310, 312 (2010). The Supreme Court noted that the weight of

First Amendment protections is strong because it is “[p]remised on mistrust of governmental power,” and therefore it “stands against attempts to disfavor certain subjects or viewpoints or to distinguish among different speakers, which may be a means to control content.” *Id.* at 312.

If this proposed legislation were to be enacted, it would very likely draw Maine into litigation. And Maine would very likely lose the argument because it would be committing “a constitutional wrong” by identifying “certain preferred speakers” and there is “no basis for the proposition that, in the political speech context, the Government may impose restrictions on certain disfavored speakers.” *Id.* In this case, the “disfavored speakers” are Maine-based businesses with foreign parent companies or shareholders.

IV. Impact on Maine Companies

Many of Maine’s companies – from large to small – have shareholders from other countries. Foreign investment is not new, and it is generally not considered to be a problem. All three bills would have a negative impact on many businesses of every size already long in operation within our borders. Additionally, this type of legislation would serve as a significant deterrent to those businesses that the Chamber and others are working so hard to attract, because what company would want to move operations to Maine if they would be silenced on a ballot question that could significantly and detrimentally impact their ability to maintain profitability here?

Apart from the difficulty of determining ownership of publicly traded stocks from one minute to the next, consider the unfairness of denying a business an equal chance to contest referenda inimical to its interests. A foreign owned company that has invested heavily in Maine and operates several retail locations in Maine could be facing a municipal referendum hostile to its business and be unable to campaign at all. Or a small company in northern Maine with Maine owners and Canadian owners (who might even all be cousins) could be barred from participating in a referendum campaign that might put the company out of business. Even if it were not unconstitutional, such legislation would be horrible policy.

The Maine State Chamber of Commerce truly is the voice of Maine business. That is not merely a slogan. The Chamber speaks for approximately 5,000 business enterprises of all sizes and all kinds in every corner of the State on issues important to business generally. The Chamber has also been diligently working to improve Maine’s business climate to make Maine a more attractive place for foreign investors to generate new economic activity for the benefit of all of Maine’s people. Very few things are more harmful to any business development strategy than instability, unpredictability, or uncertainty. If a company can diligently comply with all applicable rules from the inception of a project and then be silenced by this law when others seek to defeat their efforts by an initiated

referendum, a prudent potential investor will be less enthusiastic about the prospect of coming here.

Finally, emergency legislation is rightly limited to “only such measures as are immediately necessary for the preservation of the public peace, health or safety...” Maine Const. Art. IV, Part 3, § 16. We have had both foreign investment and initiated referenda for a long time without identifying whatever problem these bills were written to solve. The exceptions laid out to the normal legislative timeline are narrowly tailored and are intended for issues that are clear cut and can be enacted without the necessity of significant research or input from the public. The two bills marked as ‘emergencies’ (LD 194 and LD 641) do not fall into any of those categories, and they are not appropriate to be considered in an emergency legislation context. There are significant and yet-unexplored unintended consequences of the proposed legislation that should caution the Committee against the current course.

The Committee ‘ought not to pass’ any of the three proposed bills.

Foreign Direct Investment in Maine

Name	City	County	Parent Company	Headquarters	Products/Service
Abilis NE	Portland	Cumberland	Abilis Solutions	Canada	IT/Financial services
Albarrie Environmental Services	Lewiston	Androscoggin	Albarrie Canada Limited	Canada	Dust collection services & supplies
American Steel and Aluminum Corporation	S. Portland	Cumberland	Novamerican Steel Inc.	Canada	Aluminum and metal products
Backyard Farms	Madison	Somerset	Mastronardi Produce Ltd.	Canada	Non-GMO greenhouse produce
Cavendish Agri Services Ltd.	Houlton	Androscoggin	Cavendish Agri Services Ltd.	Canada	Chemical manufactureres and distributors
Cavendish Farms	Presque Isle	Aroostook	Cavendish Farms	Canada	Frozen potato products
Chadwick-BaRoss Inc.	Westbrook	Cumberland	Strongco Corp.	Canada	Heavy equipment distributor
Cherryfield Foods Inc.	Cherryfield	Washington	Oxford Frozen Foods	Canada	Retail food products
Cooke Aquaculture	Machiasport	Washington	Cooke Aquaculture	Canada	Aquaculture
Douglas Brothers Stainless Steel	Portland	Cumberland	Robert Mitchell, Inc.	Canada	Fabricated stainless steel piping
Duvaltex US Inc.	Guilford	Piscataquis	Duvaltex	Canada	Contract textile manufacturer
Emera Maine	Bangor	Penobscot	Emera	Canada	Utility (power distribution)
Federal Marine Terminals	Eastport	Washington	FedNav	Canada	Marine freight handling
Fraser Sawmills (aka Ashland Lumbermills)	Masardis / St. Pamphile	Aroostook	Groupe Lebel	Canada	Wholesale lumber
Heritage Memorials Ltd.	Sanford	York	Heritage Memorials Ltd.	Canada	Monuments and markers
Highland Lumber Company	Dixfield	Oxford	J.D. Irving Ltd.	Canada	Timber
Irving Forest Products	Fort Kent	Aroostook	J.D. Irving Ltd.	Canada	Pulp, tissue, paper
Irving Lumber Company	Strong	Franklin	J.D. Irving, Limited	Canada	Timber
Irving Oil Corporation	Statewide		Irving Oil Limited	Canada	Fuel, oil, gas, heating contractors
Irving Woodlands LLC	Ashland	Aroostook	J.D. Irving Ltd.	Canada	Sawmill
Katahdin Forest Management, LLC	Millinocket	Penobscot	Acadian Timber	Canada	Pulp, paper
Katahdin Timberlands, LLC	Millinocket	Penobscot	Acadian Timber	Canada	Timber
Kruger, Inc.	Augusta	Kennebec	Kruger, Inc.	Canada	Electricity Supplier
McCain Fertilizers Ltd.	Presque Isle	Aroostook	McCain Foods	Canada	Fertilizers
McCain Foods USA Inc.	Easton	Aroostook	McCain Foods	Canada	Potato products, french fries
Nautel Maine Inc.	Bangor	Penobscot	Nautel	Canada	Transmitters
Orion Rope Works	Winslow	Kennebec	Canada Cordage Inc.	Canada	Rope
Pepin Lumber Company	Coburn Gore	Franklin	Maurice Pepin	Canada	Lumber
Portbec D&G Forest Products	Bangor	Penobscot	Portbec Forest Products Ltd.	Canada	Forest products
Solifor of Quebec City	Ste. Aurilie	Somerset	Solifor of Quebec City	Canada	Forest products
St. Croix Courier	Calais	Washington	St. Croix Publishing	Canada	Newspapers
Stantec	Scarborough	Cumberland	Stantec, Inc.	Canada	Consulting civil engineering services
Stratton Lumber Inc.	Stratton	Franklin	Fontaine Inc.	Canada	Lumber
Sun Life Financial US	Scarborough	Cumberland	Sun Life Inc.	Canada	Financial services
T4G Limited Saco	Saco	Cumberland	T4G Limited	Canada	IT services
TD Bank	Statewide		Toronto Dominion	Canada	Financial services
Thomas Equipment Inc. USA	Presque Isle	Aroostook	Thomas Equipment Inc.	Canada	Skid steer loaders, mini excavators, potato handling equipment
Timber Resource Group	Stratton	Franklin	Fontaine Inc.	Canada	Logging services
Wolfden Resources Corp.	Patten	Penobscot	Wolfden Resources Corp.	Canada	Mineral exploration
ND Paper LLC	Oxford Penobscot	Rumford Town	Old Nine Dragons Paper, Ltd.	China	Packaging paperboard, coated duplex, recycled print, writing and specialty paper
PK Floats	Lincoln	Penobscot	SR Aviation	China	Sea planes
Prospect Hill Golf Course	Auburn	Androscoggin	Mingjing Industry Group Co.	China	Golf course

St. Croix Tissue/Woodland Pulp, LLC	Baileyville	Washington	International Grand Investment Corp	China	Tissue/pulp
Ramboll USA	Portland	Cumberland	Ramboll	Denmark	Consulting environmental engineering services
Huhtamaki Food Service	Waterville	Kennebec	Huhtamaki Inc.	Finland	Foodservice packaging, paper products
Metso Paper USA Inc.	Biddeford	York	Metso Corporation	Finland	Paper
Braincube	Kennebunk	York	Braincube	France	Software manufacturer
Eurovia	Hermon Charlotte Presque Isle Hancock Washington Lewiston	Penobscot Washington Aroostook Hancock Androscoggin	VINCI	France	Hot asphalt mix for road construction
Greentech	Yarmouth	Cumberland	Greentech	France	Biotech, research, seaweed
Huttotopia	Sanford	York	Huttotopia	France	Upscale camping resorts
Bachmann Industries Inc.	Auburn	Androscoggin	Clyde Bergemann Power Group	Germany	Industrial bypass and exhaust systems
Evonik CYRO	Sanford	York	Evonik Industries AG	Germany	Industrial plastic sheeting
Käsbohrer All Terrain Vehicles, Inc.	Lewiston	Androscoggin	Käsbohrer Geländefahrzeug AG	Germany	Suppliers snow grooming vehicles
Lohmann Animal Health	Winslow	Kennebec	PHW Group	Germany	Poultry biologics
T-Mobile USA	Oakland	Kennebec	Deutsche Telekom	Germany	Mobile phone service provider (call center)
Tuchenhagen North America LLC	Portland	Cumberland	GEA Group	Germany	Centrifugal pumps
Rheinmetall Defence (Vingtech, LLC)	Biddeford	York	Rheinmetall	Germany	Vehicle systems, air defense, naval systems
Weber Machine USA	Bangor	Penobscot	Weber	Germany	Contractor's equipment
Eimskip	Portland	Cumberland	Eimskip	Iceland	Shipping/Logistics
Pike Industries	Lewiston	Androscoggin	CRH	Ireland	Construction
aizoOn USA	Lewiston	Androscoggin	aizoOn	Italy	Technology consulting
Albatrans, Inc.	Portland	Cumberland	Albatrans SpA	Italy	Freight forwarders
Maine Manufacturing, LLC	Sanford	York	GVS	Italy	Filtration devices
Modula	Lewiston	Androscoggin	System Logistics	Italy	Automated vertical storage
AVX Tantalum Corporation	Biddeford	York	Kyocera Corporation	Japan	Electronic capacitors
Hydro-Photon, Inc.	Blue Hill	Hancock	Asahi Kasei Corporation	Japan	Handheld water purifiers
NTT Data, Inc.	Portland	Cumberland	NTT	Japan	IT consulting services
Plasmine Technology Inc.	Portland	Cumberland	Harima Chemicals Inc.	Japan	Chemicals dealers (rosin)
Reliance Standard Life Insurance	S. Portland	Cumberland	Tokio Marine Group	Japan	Disability insurance
Somic America	Brewer	Penobscot	Somic Ishikawa	Japan	Automotive components
World Harbors	Auburn	Androscoggin	Mizkan Group	Japan	Sauces, marinades, drink mixes
Dalegip America, Inc.	Searsport	Washington	Grupo Industrial del Parque, S.A.	Mexico	Chemicals
Hannaford Brothers	Scarborough	Cumberland	Ahold Delhaize	Netherlands	Food Retail
Ducktrap River Fish Farm	Belfast	Waldo	Fjord Seafood ASA	Norway	Smoked seafood
Jotul North America	Gorham	Cumberland	Jotul ASA	Norway	Cast iron stoves
MariCal	Portland	Cumberland	Teknoinvest Management AS	Norway	Aquaculture
Rubb Inc.	Sanford	York	Rubb Motor A/S	Norway	Tension membrane structures
American RheinMetall	Biddeford	York	RheinMetall	Germany	Mechanical & electro optical engineering
Laserwords	Lewiston	Androscoggin	SPI Global	Philippines	Publishing
Sappi Fine Paper North America	Westbrook	Cumberland	SAPPI Limited	South Africa	Paper
Central Maine Power Co.	Augusta	Kennebec	Iberdrola	Spain	Utility (Power Distribution)
Dragon Products Company Inc.	Thomaston	Knox	Portland Valderrivas (and Cementos Lemona)	Spain	Cement manufacturing
Sprague Energy	S. Portland	Cumberland	Axel Johnson Inc./Axel Johnson AB	Sweden	Materials handling services (oil, gas, etc.)
Rynel	Wiscasset	Lincoln	Molnlycke Health Care AB	Sweden	Medical foam/wound care components
Clariant Corporation	Lewiston	Androscoggin	Clariant International Ltd	Switzerland	Specialty chemicals/ plastics
Eldur Corporation	Bangor	Penobscot	Eldur AG	Switzerland	Leadwire manufacturers

InSphero	Brunswick	Cumberland	InSphero	Switzerland	Organotypic, 3D in vitro mico tissues/cellular spheroids suppliers
Lanco Assembly Systems	Westbrook	Cumberland	Lanco AG	Switzerland	Turnkey automated assembly & test systems
Lindt Chocolate Store	S. Portland	Cumberland	Chocoladefabriken Lidt & Spruengli International AG	Switzerland	Chocolate
Lonza Rockland	Rockland	Knox	Lonza	Switzerland	Agar-molecule biology industry products
Poland Springs Water Corporation	Poland Kingfield Hollis	Androscoggin Franklin York	Nestle	Switzerland	Bottled spring water
Remstar International Inc.	Westbrook	Cumberland	Kardex-Remstar International Group	Switzerland	Automated storage and retrieval systems
Shiumpf Inc.	Windham	Cumberland	Schulmpf AG	Switzerland	Unwinding and winding machinery components
AMEC Foster Wheeler	Portland	Cumberland	John Wood Group	United Kingdom	Engineering consultancy
Citizens Bank	Portland	Cumberland	Royal Bank of Scotland	United Kingdom	Financial services
Fatface	Portland	Cumberland	Fatface Group Limited	United Kingdom	Clothing/Apparel
FishVet	Portland	Cumberland	Benchmark Animal Health	United Kingdom	Veterinary pharmaceuticals
Inchcape Shipping Services (ISS):	Portland	Cumberland	ISS	United Kingdom	Logistics/ Shipping
H I L Technology	Portland	Cumberland	Hydro International	United Kingdom	Waste and storm water treatment technology
Hunting Dearborn, Inc.	Fryeburg	Oxford	Hunting PLC	United Kingdom	Deep hole drilling
Maine Biotechnology Services	Portland	Cumberland	BBi Group	United Kingdom	Antibody development and manufacturing
Putney, Inc.	Portland	Cumberland	Dechra Pharmaceuticals, PLC	United Kingdom	Veterinary pharmaceuticals
LGC Maine Standards	Cumberland	Cumberland	LGC	United Kingdom	Products, services in calibration, measurement and testing for the life sciences industry
Porvair Filtration Group	Caribou	Aroostook	Porvair	United Kingdom	Specialist filtration and separation equipment
Quantrix	Portland	Cumberland	IDBS	United Kingdom	Database/info systems; business analysis
SgurrEnergy	Portland	Cumberland	Wood Group	United Kingdom	Energy Consulting
Tate & Lyle	Houlton	Aroostook	Tate & Lyle	United Kingdom	Potato starch
WahlcoMetroflex	Lewiston	Androscoggin	Senior PLC	United Kingdom	Expansion joints/industrial metal fabricator