Bill as Introduced

HB 1547 – AS INTRODUCED

2006 SESSION

06-2826
08/09

HOUSE BILL ***1547***

AN ACT clarifying what constitutes physical presence for purposes of establishing domicile under the election laws.

SPONSORS: Rep. O'Brien, Hills 4; Rep. O'Neil, Rock 15; Rep. Price, Hills 26; Rep. Mirski, Graf 10; Sen. Roberge, Dist 9; Sen. Clegg, Dist 14

COMMITTEE: Election Law

ANALYSIS

This bill clarifies what constitutes physical presence for purposes of establishing domicile under the election laws.

Explanation: Matter added to current law appears in ***bold italics.***
Matter removed from current law appears [~~in brackets and struckthrough.~~]
Matter which is either (a) all new or (b) repealed and reenacted appears in regular type.

HB 1547 – AS INTRODUCED

06-2826
08/09

STATE OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

In the Year of Our Lord Two Thousand Six

AN ACT clarifying what constitutes physical presence for purposes of establishing domicile under the election laws.

Be it Enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives in General Court convened:

1 Purpose of Domicile. Amend RSA 654:1 to read as follows:

654:1 Voter; Office Holder.

I. Every inhabitant of the state, having a single established domicile for voting purposes, being a citizen of the United States, of the age provided for in Article 11 of Part First of the Constitution of New Hampshire, shall have a right at any meeting or election, to vote in the town, ward, or unincorporated place in which he or she is domiciled. An inhabitant's domicile for voting purposes is that one place where a person, more than any other place, has established a physical presence and manifests an intent to maintain a single continuous presence for domestic, social, and civil purposes relevant to participating in democratic self-government. A person has the right to change domicile at any time, however a mere intention to change domicile in the future does not, of itself, terminate an established domicile before the person actually moves. ***Except as set forth in RSA 654:2 through RSA 654:4 and the occupancy of a nursing home, hospital, or group home, occupancy by a person of any of the places identified in RSA 540-B:1, II shall not constitute that person having established a physical presence in order for such location to be the established domicile for voting purposes of such person.***

2 Effective Date. This act shall take effect 60 days after its passage.

Committee Minutes

ELECTION LAW

HB 1547

RECOMMENDED FOR FUTURE LEGISLATION

October 17, 2006

The consensus in the Election Law Committee was that New Hampshire should move clearly establish that only New Hampshire residents participate in its elections. As this was the intent underlying this legislation the majority believes that it should be the subject of future legislation.

10-4

Rep. William L. O'Brien

INTERIM STUDY
COMMITTEE REPORT

COMMITTEE: Election Law

BILL NUMBER: HB 1547

TITLE: Clarifying what constitutes physical presence for purposes of establishing domicile . . .

DATE: 10/17/06

☒ (who) **RECOMMENDED FOR FUTURE LEGISLATION**

LSR No._____ **(If legislation is already filed, please list LSR no.)**

☒ ~~**NOT RECOMMENDED FOR FUTURE LEGISLATION**~~

STATEMENT OF INTENT: (May be handwritten)

The consensus in the Election Law committee was that ~~~~ New Hampshire should more clearly establish that only ~~its~~ NH residents participate in its elections. As this was the intent underlying this legislation the majority believes that it should be the subject of future legislation

MCW

COMMITTEE VOTE: 10-4 (Attach Committee Voting Sheet)

Rep. _____
For the Committee

Rev. 7/98

Speakers

SIGN UP SHEET

To Register Opinion If Not Speaking

Bill # HB 1547 Date Feb 7, 2006

Committee Election Law

**** Please Print All Information ****

Name	Address	Phone	Representing	(check one) Pro	Con
Sen. R. Clegg	Hudson - Dispenser		Dist. 14	X	
June Armstrong	4 Park St. Concord		LWVNH-President		X

Hearing Minutes

HOUSE COMMITTEE ON ELECTION LAW

PUBLIC HEARING ON HB 1547

BILL TITLE: clarifying what constitutes physical presence for purposes of establishing domicile under the election laws.

DATE: February 7, 2006

LOB ROOM: 308 **Time Public Hearing Called to Order:** 10:00 AM

Time Adjourned: 11:45 AM

(please circle if present)

Committee Members: Reps. Whalley, Orisko, Reeves, Kennedy, J. Allen, Biundo, Boehm, Carew, Forsing, Hirschmann, Langlais, O'Brien, Splaine, Clemons, Weed, C. Chase, Harvey and Coates.

Bill Sponsors: Rep. O'Brien, Hills 4; Rep. O'Neil, Rock 15; Rep. Price, Hills 26; Rep. Mirski, Graf 10; Sen. Roberge, Dist 9; Sen. Clegg, Dist 14

TESTIMONY

* Use asterisk if written testimony and/or amendments are submitted.

Rep. O'Neil, Majority Leader. Sponsor and in favor of this bill. Rep. O'Neil opened the hearing and requested the Chair to recess until Rep. O'Brien can attend. The Majority Office supports this bill and requests that Rep. O'Brien be allowed the explain the details.

Hearing recessed at 10:05 to be re-opened at 10:30.

*Rep. O'Brien, prime sponsor in favor of this bill. Rep. O'Brien gave each member a copy of RSA 540-B:1. This statute refers to residency within a particular domicile for purposes of voting. He told us how the landlord/tenant definitions were arrived at for the statute referred to above. There are two types of transient housing recognized in RSA 540-B:1. Hospitals, hotels, jails, student dormitories ask residents to leave when their time is up. They are not required to ~~because~~ because eviction proceedings. Decisions regarding local elections should be community decisions. You should not be allowed to vote where you are not a resident. You should not be allowed to get a hotel room in order to vote in the town where the hotel is. Even those who are incarcerated should vote where they live, not where they are incarcerated. Rep. O'Brien does not feel that this bill is unconstitutional. All this bill says is that those who do not have a connection to the community should have a vote in the community where they live. Vote where your home is. If you live in a hotel on a permanent basis, then you can vote. Community connections are a permissible basis for establishing domicile.

David Scanlan, Deputy Secretary of State. Opposes this bill and is concerned about unintended consequences. Examples given: a young person with no parents and no home to go to; a military person who has returned to hometown to attend school and has no other home. These people have the right to vote and should be allowed to vote where they are living. We must start with the premise that each person in the U.S. has a right to vote.

*Howard Wilson opposes this bill. Concerned about an older person who is in long term care. Are they residents from where they came or where they are in care? He feels that this bill is flawed.

*Tracy Thompson, City Clerk, Moderator, Keene. She opposes this and has submitted written testimony. Please refer to the written testimony. Her concerns appear to be in relation to college students living in dorms in Keene who would need to vote via absentee ballot rather than at the polls. She feels that this bill would not encourage college students to vote.

*Barbara Lessard, representing NH City and Town Clerks Assoc). She is town clerk in Salem and is opposed to this bill. She does not feel it is fair for students who living on campus to be disenfranchised while students who live off campus would be allowed to vote. She feels that absentee voting is too burdensome due to the planning involved on behalf of the students. The students should not be forced to vote with an absentee ballot, as it will discourage them from voting.

*Joan Ashwell, representing League of Women Voters. She opposes this bill. She has submitted written testimony for each member of the committee signed by Jane Armstrong who is the President of the League of Women Voters of NH. Please refer to the written testimony.

Claire Ebel, representing N.H. Civil Liberties Union. She opposes this bill and feels certain it is unconstitutional. Federal law allows students living in dormitories to vote and if we change state law, we will create havoc.

*Bud Fitch, Deputy Attorney General. His is not here in support of opposition. He is giving the committee members information. He feels that the issue of domicile could be clarified through our work. He feels everyone has a right to vote and we need to find a policy approach that will suit our needs while being careful not to disenfranchise students who do not have any other home. The information he has submitted to this committee is too large to fit into the bill folder.

Rep. O'Brien spoke a second time to clear up some things that previous testifiers said. There are no attempts to exclude boarding houses,. He suggested that we work with the AG's office to do the right thing for our constituents.

Respectfully submitted,

Janet F. Allen

Rep. Janet F. Allen, Clerk

Testimony

Good Morning + thank you for the opportunity to speak in opposition to HB 1547 on behalf of NHCTC Alson. My name is Barbara Blessard

HB 1547. An act clarifying what constitutes physical presence for purposes of establishing domicile under the election laws.

This legislation removes student dormitories from the list of "shared facilities" that would qualify as a domicile for voter registration purposes. For those town and city clerks whose communities have higher education facilities, this legislation would disenfranchise one class of students who would not qualify for registration purposes – because they live in a dormitory - and allow another class – those students who live off campus – to register.

We expect that the focus of this legislation is actually out of state students who are going to college in New Hampshire. We expect there is a fear that these students are voting in New Hampshire and then voting in their home states as well. We don't believe there is any evidence of that fact, but we would suggest that with the implementation of the centralized voter checklist and the eventual interoperability of the databases between states, there will be an opportunity to determine if this is happening and prosecute as necessary.

As written, HB 1547 goes beyond out of state students and negatively impacts our own children who have remained in New Hampshire for their higher education. HB 1547 would say that a Keene resident who is going to UNH in Durham would not be allowed to register in Durham and vote in person at the polls. HB 1547 would require that that student from Keene apply for an absentee ballot from Keene. Although voting absentee is less cumbersome in New Hampshire than other States it still requires advance planning and follow-through. It requires either returning to the Clerk's office in their home community and completing an application for the ballot or sending a written request – which cannot be an email. Upon receiving the ballot – either in person because the student happens to be at home during a school break and goes into the Clerk's office – or by mail – the student needs to mark the ballot, complete the affidavit, purchase a stamp (which for optical ballots is typically 79 cents) and mail the ballot back to the local clerk. All of this needs to be completed and returned by 5:00 PM the day before the election. Today, when most of what a student needs is a just "a click away" this practice to obtain an absentee ballot – though it might seem reasonable enough for us adults – is going to be a hurdle that will undoubtedly disenfranchise young, first-time voters.

Another consideration that should be taken in account when considering legislation that increases the need to vote absentee is the fact that absentee voting is the most vulnerable activity in terms of undue influence and potential voter fraud. With all of the focus by the Election Law Committee on voter fraud, we would encourage you to recognize the vulnerability of the absentee voting process and not adopt legislation, which expands the need to vote absentee *unnecessarily*.

Legislation which sets up different registration requirements for different types of voters is very difficult to administer at the local level. It generates significant negative public relations for local officials and discourages voter participation for first time voters, which might continue through their adulthood. As officials who administer the election process at the local level it is important to us that any legislation that is adopted not disenfranchise voters, but rather facilitate and encourage participation in the voting process.

One of the adopted legislative policies of the New Hampshire City and Town Clerks Association is to oppose any measures that would potentially disenfranchise one class of voters and would serve to institute differing registration requirements for different types of voters. HB 1547 does exactly that and therefore the New Hampshire City and Town Clerks Association does not support its passage.

Testimony of Tracy L. Thompson
Ward 3 Checklist Supervisor
Room 308 Legislative Office Building

HB 1547

Good morning and thank you for the opportunity to speak in opposition to HB 1547 today. My name is Tracy Thompson and I am a resident of Keene, NH, a veteran of the US Navy, a single mother of 3 future voters, a graduate of the Yale Law School and the Executive Director of the New England Law Library Consortium. But I am here today in my official capacity as the very newly elected Supervisor of the Checklist for Ward 3 in Keene. I am here at the request of Patricia Little, the City Clerk of Keene, who regrets that she was unable to appear before you today. I am sure her depth of knowledge and experience with elections and the voter registration process in Keene and in the state would add much to the dialogue. I hope you will excuse my lack of expertise and recognize that my comments come from someone looking at the issue with a fresh eye.

I would like to lodge 3 main objections to HB 1547. First, HB 1547 creates an arbitrary distinction among college students based solely on one criterion that has no actual bearing on a student's intention to participate in the civic and political life of the community. Second, it acts as an obstacle to first-time voters, a population whose participation we should seek to encourage rather than discourage. And finally, HB 1547 ~~runs the risk of a constitutional challenge which it would be unlikely to survive in the end~~. I will address each of these concerns in turn.

All related to the dormitory provision for domicile.

is unconstitutional

In Keene, as in other college and university communities, the effect of HB 1547 would be significant. In a report submitted by all five Ward Moderators to the Mayor and City Council of Keene, dated Sept. 1, 2005, the Moderators requested that City Council "support efforts in the legislature to simplify voting by college students and oppose efforts to make voting more difficult for the first-time voters." The Moderators also called upon City Council NOT to support any expansion of absentee balloting." City Council adopted the report and the recommendations of the Moderators, and would therefore oppose HB 1547 for these reasons.

According to that same report the total number of students at Keene State College is about 4300. 19% of Keene's eligible voters are Keene State College students. Keene reaps the benefits of all of those students. They contribute to our economy, on both the local and state levels, and they count in our census figures. Keene's representation here in Concord is based on their residency in our community. Of the 4300 students at Keene State, 2500 live in dormitories on campus and would be absolutely prohibited by HB 1547 from claiming a Keene domicile for voting purposes. An additional

1000 students live off campus but within Keene, and would be permitted to register and vote in their wards. The arbitrary distinction of a dormitory address as an indicator of non-domicile has discriminatory effects. Those who will be eligible to claim domicile will be students living off-campus, perhaps students of greater means than those living in dorms, or perhaps simply students living in university-owned housing that happens to be off-campus. Additionally, HB1547 would potentially disenfranchise students living in married housing, Resident Assistants who live in dormitories as a requirement of their employment, students in towns where off-campus housing is limited, and students who are subject to mandatory residency requirements such as those at New England College in Henniker. Any of these students who have a true intent to claim residency in the town where their institution is located, and a desire to participate in and contribute to the democratic process in that town, would be effectively barred from doing so solely on the basis of their address.

Colleges and Universities typically encourage students to live on campus; to participate in the fullness of the college experience and engage in the collegial community. HB 1547 would require students to choose between on-campus living and political participation. If HB 1547 passes and students begin to understand the implications of dormitory life on one's right to register and vote locally, especially during presidential election years, we may see a trend away from on-campus living in an effort to protect that right.

HB 1547 will act as an obstacle to first-time voters. The Census Bureau figures for the 2004 presidential election show that voters in the 18-24 age group, many of whom are first-time voters, had the lowest registration rate and the lowest voter turnout rate. Our goal as election officials is to encourage all eligible voters to participate in the democratic process, to make the process as accessible and transparent as possible, and to facilitate, not obfuscate. We want to contribute to the development of a lifelong habit for the newly-enfranchised voter. College students are just finding their political voices, yet they have a long tradition of political passion and activism in this country. They bring new energy and fresh perspectives to the communities that they adopt. It is our responsibility to harness that energy to the benefit of our citizens and our communities. Just last month in California, PA, a 20-year old college student was elected mayor. In Nov. of 2005 in Hillsdale, MI an 18 year old high school senior was elected to lead that town. Students with a political conscience should be encouraged to

participate in local politics. It is to the greater benefit of all of us when those aspirations are nurtured rather than thwarted.

Finally, HB1547 is unconstitutional. Under the equal protection guarantee of the Fourteenth Amendment the state is required to provide equal treatment to all persons similarly situated. HB1547 sets up a system of unequal treatment for students who are otherwise similarly situated. While states have been given greater leeway to pass legislation that may appear to treat similarly situated groups in a dissimilar fashion that leeway is not extended when the law in question creates a suspect class or impinges upon a fundamental right. The right of the individual to vote is a fundamental right protected by the constitution. By creating the arbitrary distinction between college students who live in dorms and those who live elsewhere HB1547 has the effect of burdening the exercise of a fundamental constitutional right. When a law has that effect it becomes subject to the strict scrutiny standard of review. That standard requires that the state show that the law in question is narrowly tailored to serve a compelling government interest. While the state's interest here may or may not be compelling, it is clear that HB1547 is NOT narrowly tailored and casts too wide a net.

I appreciate your time this morning and I will be happy to try to answer any questions you may have. Thank you.

file copy

TITLE LV
PROCEEDINGS IN SPECIAL CASES

CHAPTER 540-B
RENTAL OF SHARED FACILITIES

Section 540-B:1

540-B:1 Definition; Shared Facility. –

I. A "shared facility" means real property rented for residential purposes which has separate sleeping areas for each occupant and in which each occupant has access to and shares with the owner of the facility one or more significant portions of the facility in common, such as kitchen, dining area, bathroom, or bathing area, for which the occupant has no rented right of sole personal use.

II. A shared facility shall not include:

(a) Facilities rented to transient guests intended for use of less than 90 days.

(b) Rooms in hotels, motels, inns, tourist homes, and other dwellings rented for recreational or vacationing use.

(c) Rooms provided ancillary to other primary purposes such as jails, student dormitories, nursing homes, hospitals, group homes, and emergency shelters.

Source. 2001, 277:3, eff. Jan. 1, 2002.

Rep. Wm. O'Brien
Submitted during testimony
Re: HB 1547

File Copy

February 6, 2006

House Election Law Committee
Legislative Office Building, Room 308
Concord, NH 03301

Dear Committee Members:

The League of Women Voters of New Hampshire believes that voting is a fundamental citizen right that must be guaranteed.

The New Hampshire Constitution and the Constitution of the United States establish that every citizen, eighteen or over, has a right to vote somewhere. We restrict the right to vote in only the most limited circumstances. In this state, a citizen convicted of a willful election law violation or serving time for a felony can be disqualified.

Under our constitution and the Constitution of the United States, a citizen cannot be disqualified from voting on the basis of lifestyle, including what kind of accommodation a citizen calls home.

Current law in New Hampshire defines a residence for voting purposes as the place where a citizen intends to stay for domestic, social and civil purposes. Examples include:

- The place where a citizen sleeps more than any other place during the year
- The town where a citizen conducts business with government, sends children to school, registers a motor vehicle or registers a dog
- The residence listed on a driver's license or the place where a citizen's mail is delivered
- The place where a citizen keeps personal property

HB 1547 would radically redefine the right to vote in New Hampshire by excluding citizens who live in "***any*** of the places identified in RSA 540-B:I & II." HB 1547 would deny the right to vote to:

- A mother or mother-in-law who lives in a son or daughter's home and contributes money each month to help with expenses
- Anyone in a family that is living in an apartment or motel for a few weeks or months while their new home is being completed
- Anyone in a family that rents a vacation home for the nine or ten months that the owner lives in Florida
- A citizen who lives in a residential hotel for ten, twenty or fifty years
- Citizens who attend colleges or vocational schools
- Mothers who live with their children in safe houses to escape abusive partners

HB 1547 would seem to limit voting to those who live in a very narrow range of what might be called traditional homes. The proposed bill seems to target new residents, the working poor, those who are starting new jobs, and those who have lost their homes to fire or flood. It is hard to think of a proposal that could go further towards denying the fundamental Constitutional right of every citizen to vote.

The League of Women Voters of New Hampshire urges the House Election Law Committee to reject HB 1547.

Thank you for considering our position,

Jane Armstrong

Jane Armstrong, President
League of Women Voters of New Hampshire
4 Park Street, Suite 200
Concord, NH 03301

file copy

Howard L. Wilson
POBox 91
Andover, NH 03216
735-5427 stoneanarch@tds.net

Election Law Committee
308 LOB February 7, 2006 10AM

Re: HB 1547

The inclusion of the new section, added to RSA 654:1, destroys the intent of RSA 654:1.

It matters not to me, that those now resident in a long-term care facility, hospital, nursing home, could be considered to have moved, for purpose of voting. They are not being forbidden to vote, just that they are now required to vote amongst people they may not know (or like).

Law, in a Republic, is supposed to apply to every individual. Amended RSA 654:1, defines Privilege, and exclusion from law, for a selected few, based solely on age, debility or injury and possibly, separation from family. And, if it becomes law, will set in place condition for damn-fools to file for political office, even if not resident in the district, when resident in strange climes (New York, comes to mind).

Leave this law alone, and find RSA 654:1, as it was. Very sensible, with sponsors desire to benefit someone, of family, most like, being the urge to separate fools from their Liberty.

HB 1547 should be found Inexpedient to Legislate.

For Liberty,

Howard L. Wilson

Howard L. Wilson
Member: Libertarian Party
ACLU-NH
Candidate for US House, 2006

Voting Sheets

HOUSE COMMITTEE ON ELECTION LAW

EXECUTIVE SESSION on HB 1547

BILL TITLE: **clarifying what constitutes physical presence for purposes of establishing domicile under the election laws.**

DATE: February 22, 2006

LOB ROOM: 308

Amendments:

Sponsor: Rep. OLS Document #:

Sponsor: Rep. OLS Document #:

Sponsor: Rep. OLS Document #:

Motions: OTP, OTP/A, ITL, Interim Study (Please circle one.)

Moved by Rep. Clemons

Seconded by Rep. Chase

Vote: 15-1 (Please attach record of roll call vote.)

Motions: OTP, OTP/A, ITL, Interim Study (Please circle one.)

Moved by Rep.

Seconded by Rep.

Vote: (Please attach record of roll call vote.)

CONSENT CALENDAR VOTE: 16-0

(Vote to place on Consent Calendar must be unanimous.)

Statement of Intent: Refer to Committee Report

Respectfully submitted,

Rep. Janet F. Allen, Clerk

ELECTION LAW

Bill #: HB 1547 **Title:** clarifying what constitutes physical presence establishment

PH Date: 2/7/06 Exec Session Date: 2/22/06

Motion: interim study Amendment #:

MEMBER	YEAS	NAYS
Whalley, Michael D, Chairman	✓	
Drisko, Richard B, V Chairman	✓	
Reeves, Sandra J	✓	
Kennedy, Richard E	✓	
Allen, Janet F, Clerk	✓	
Biundo, Michael G	✓	
Boehm, Ralph G	✓	
Carew, James M	✓	
Forsing, Robert W	✓	
Hirschmann, Keith D absent		
Langlais, Thomas J	✓	
O'Brien, William L	✓	
Splaine, James R	✓	
Clemons, Jane A	✓	
Weed, Charles F		✓
Chase, Claudia A	✓	
Harvey, Suzanne absent		
Coates, Christopher C	✓	
TOTAL VOTE:	15	1

Printed: 12/19/2005

HOUSE COMMITTEE ON ELECTION LAW

EXECUTIVE SESSION on HB 1547

BILL TITLE: **clarifying what constitutes physical presence for purposes of establishing domicile under the election laws.**

DATE: October 17, 2006

LOB ROOM: 308

Amendments:

Sponsor: Rep. OLS Document #:

Sponsor: Rep. OLS Document #:

Sponsor: Rep. OLS Document #:

Motions: OTP, OTP/A, ITL, Interim Study (Please circle one.) **RECOMMENDED FOR FUTURE LEGISLATION**

Moved by Rep. O'Brien

Seconded by Rep. Hirschman

Vote: 10-4 (Please attach record of roll call vote.)

Motions: OTP, OTP/A, ITL, Interim Study (Please circle one.)

Moved by Rep.

Seconded by Rep.

Vote: (Please attach record of roll call vote.)

CONSENT CALENDAR VOTE:

(Vote to place on Consent Calendar must be unanimous.)

Statement of Intent: Refer to Committee Report

Respectfully submitted,

Rep. Janet F. Allen, Clerk

HOUSE COMMITTEE ON ELECTION LAW

EXECUTIVE SESSION on HB 1547

BILL TITLE: **clarifying what constitutes physical presence for purposes of establishing domicile under the election laws.**

DATE: October 17, 2006

LOB ROOM: 308

Amendments:

Sponsor: Rep. OLS Document #:

Sponsor: Rep. OLS Document #:

Sponsor: Rep. OLS Document #:

Motions: OTP, OTP/A, ITL, Interim Study (Please circle one.)

Moved by Rep.

Seconded by Rep.

Vote: (Please attach record of roll call vote.)

Motions: OTP, OTP/A, ITL, Interim Study (Please circle one.) Rec. for future legislation

Moved by Rep. O'Brien

Seconded by Rep. Hirschman

Vote: 10-4 (Please attach record of roll call vote.)

CONSENT CALENDAR VOTE:

(Vote to place on Consent Calendar must be unanimous.)

Statement of Intent: Refer to Committee Report

Respectfully submitted,

Rep. Janet F. Allen, Clerk

OFFICE OF THE HOUSE CLERK 2006 SESSION

ELECTION LAW

Bill #: HB - 1547 Title: Clarifying what constitutes physical presence

PH Date: 2 / 7 / 06 Exec Session Date: 10 / 17 / 06

Motion: Rec. for future legislation Amendment #:

MEMBER	YEAS	NAYS
Whalley, Michael D, Chairman	✓	
Drisko, Richard B, V Chairman	✓	
Reeves, Sandra J	✓	
Kennedy, Richard E		✓
Allen, Janet F, Clerk	✓	
Biundo, Michael G absent		
Boehm, Ralph G	✓	
Carew, James M	✓	
Forsing, Robert W	✓	
Hirschmann, Keith D	✓	
Langlais, Thomas J	✓	
O'Brien, William L	✓	
Splaine, James R		✓
Weed, Charles F		✓
Chase, Claudia A absent		
Harvey, Suzanne		✓
Coates, Christopher C absent		
Merrick, Scott A absent		
	10	4

TOTAL VOTE:

Printed: 9/6/2006

Committee Report

COMMITTEE REPORT

COMMITTEE: **Election Law**

BILL NUMBER: **HB 1547**

TITLE: clarifying what constitutes physical presence for purposes of establishing domicile under the election laws.

DATE: February 22, 2006 CONSENT CALENDAR YES ☒ NO ☐

☐ OUGHT TO PASS

☐ OUGHT TO PASS WITH AMENDMENT

☐ INEXPEDIENT TO LEGISLATE

☒ REFER TO COMMITTEE FOR INTERIM STUDY
(Available only in second year of biennium.)

STATEMENT OF INTENT
(Include Committee Vote)

This bill was put in interim study because the committee feels we need time to look closely at what constitutes "physical presence" and domicile. The committee agrees we need to be careful as not to disenfranchise legitimate voters and further study is appropriate.

Vote 15-1.

Rep. Jane A. Clemons
FOR THE COMMITTEE

Original: House Clerk
cc: Committee Bill file

USE ANOTHER REPORT FOR MINORITY REPORT

CONSENT CALENDAR

Election Law

HB 1547, clarifying what constitutes physical presence for purposes of establishing domicile under the election laws. **REFER TO COMMITTEE FOR INTERIM STUDY**

Rep. Jane A. Clemons for Election Law: This bill was put in interim study because the committee feels we need time to look closely at what constitutes "physical presence" and domicile. The committee agrees we need to be careful as not to disenfranchise legitimate voters and further study is appropriate. **Vote 15-1.**

COMMITTEE REPORT

COMMITTEE: Election Law

BILL NUMBER: HB 1547

TITLE: ~~Establishing~~ Clarifying what constitutes physical presence for purposes of establishing domicile under election laws

DATE: ~~3/21/06~~ CONSENT CALENDAR: YES ☑ NO ☐

☐ OUGHT TO PASS

☐ OUGHT TO PASS W/ AMENDMENT

☐ INEXPEDIENT TO LEGISLATE

☐ RE-REFER

☑ INTERIM STUDY (Available only 2nd year of biennium)

Amendment No.

STATEMENT OF INTENT:

This bill was put in interim study because the committee feels we need time to look closely at what constitutes "physical presence" and domicile. The committee agrees we need to be careful as not to disenfranchise legitimate voters AND FURTHER STUDY IS APPROPRIATE

MD

COMMITTEE VOTE: _____

- Copy to Committee Bill File
- Use Another Report for Minority Report

RESPECTFULLY SUBMITTED,

Rep. Jane Cooper
For the Committee

Rev. 07/30/99