

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 scanned originals with text recognition applied
(searchable text may contain some errors and/or omissions)

STATE OF MAINE

REPORT

OF THE

ATTORNEY GENERAL

for the calendar years

1947 - 1948

In reply I will say that it would not be a spot light, if it was not equipped with bulb and wire connecting same; it would be an ornament. Therefore it would not be a violation of the law to have an extra spot light on the car, if it was disconnected and the bulb taken out.

The question of whether it is a spot light should be determined by the inspectors or members of your department.

It would not be fair to construe the law so as to require the owner of a car delivered equipped with two spot lights to dismantle one entirely. I think your men should be advised to check on cars that are equipped with two spot lights and see that only one is in operation and connected by wire and bulb.

RALPH W. FARRIS
Attorney General

November 5, 1948

To A. D. Nutting, Forest Commissioner

I have your letter of November 4th, relating to land owners in the Maine Forestry District who wish advice on legal procedure in adjusting the Forestry District tax. You raise the two following questions:

"1. Is it possible to set the tax on a supposed permanent basis, plus a sum of money for equipment for the next two years?"

"2. How should the tax be set up to take care of the present deficit?"

Following out the suggestions which we made yesterday during our conference, I will say in answer to Question 1 that it would not be possible to set the tax on a supposed permanent basis plus a sum of money for equipment for the next two years. The tax should be definite in your bill.

In answer to Question 2 I suggest that Section 74, which provides for an annual tax of $2\frac{1}{4}$ mills, be amended with an increase for a period of, say, two years, to take care of the equipment and deficit, and then have the tax fall back to, say, 5 mills on a permanent basis after January 1, 1951, or June 30, 1951, whichever would be more convenient. This would give the District sufficient tax for the next two years to take care of the deficit and the equipment, and then it would fall back upon a permanent basis after a certain date, either $4\frac{1}{4}$ mills or 5 mills, whichever can be agreed upon when the bill is drafted.

RALPH W. FARRIS
Attorney General

November 22, 1948

To A. D. Nutting, Forest Commissioner

I have your letter of November 18th, enclosing a copy of a letter which you received from Frederick D. Farnsworth, City Manager of Rockland. The question is,

"Can municipalities qualify for reimbursement of one-half their forest fire suppression costs up to 1% of their tax valuation which went to the aid of others, but which were not paid by the towns they aided?"