

# 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)

**This document is from the files of the Office of  
the Maine Attorney General as transferred to  
the Maine State Law and Legislative Reference  
Library on January 19, 2022**

109, 1951-54 Report Yes  
December 18, 1951

To Honorable Frederick G. Payne, Governor of Maine  
Re: Licensing of State Agencies under Milk Control Law

Reference: Milk Commission memo to you, dated October 19, 1951. .

The Commission's memo of October 19, 1951, refers to a memo which you presumably addressed to the Commission, inquiring as to the possibility of licensing the Department of Institutional Service as a "Dealer" under the provisions of the Maine Milk Commission Law.

We assume that your memo was prompted by the fact that the Commission has licensed the University of Maine as a dealer. That institution having been licensed, it is reasonable to inquire as to the status of institutions within the jurisdiction of the Department of Institutional Service.

So far as the Attorney General's office is concerned, to my knowledge, there is nothing in writing as to the licensing of the University of Maine. We recall that in the spring of 1951 Mr. Fessenden, Deputy Attorney General, was asked by Mr. Chenevert as to whether the Commission could issue a dealer's license to the University. It was pointed out that the University produced milk in the agricultural department, but that the production was insufficient to meet demands. Therefore a considerable amount of milk had to be purchased for the cafeterias and the campus store. It was also pointed out that the milk used in the University outlets was on a sale basis in that the students bought their meals and bought at the campus store whatever they consumed.

As we remember it, it was stated to Mr. Chenevert that this office was not interested in the problem of licensing the University because as a pure proposition of law we had advised them in 1949 that the State itself, meaning the governmental instrumentalities thereof, were not subject to control under the terms of the Milk Commission Law. It is a fundamental principle of law that the State itself is not bound by regulatory legislation unless specifically included in the terms of the legislation.

The Milk Commission Law defines a dealer as a person. . . A person in the same law is defined:

"'Person' means any person, firm, corporation, association or other unit."

The State is not mentioned. For a clear illustration of the principle involved, see the definition of 'employer' in Chapter 26, R.S. 1944, Section 2, subsection I:

"'Employer' shall include corporations, partnerships, natural persons, the state, counties, etc."  
(Underscoring supplied.)

In view of this pronounced opinion as to the law which, when given, created considerable furor in the industry, it was stated to Mr. Chenevert that this office did not believe the University needed any license to buy milk at the best price it could get. We believe that the issuance of a license to the University altered in no way its legal status, as it had a legal right to buy competitively anyway. In other words, the whole transaction amounts to doing under the color of a licence that which can be done anyway.

We are not familiar with the operations of the various institutions and therefore wonder if there may not be a difference between them and the University of Maine as to milk consumption, in that at the University it is actually dispensed through the cafeterias and the campus store, which may not be the case in the institutions.

We should like to suggest as a matter for practical consideration that the licensing of the Department of Institutional Service might create as much furor in the industry as did our original opinion referred to above.

So far as any question of law is concerned, we still hold that the institutions don't need licenses to buy competitively. If they do purchase or receive milk for sale, and the Commission chooses to issue a license, it would be of no concern to the Attorney General's office, since such license neither adds to or alters the legal status of the institution.

Alexander A. LaFleur  
Attorney General

f/la/c