

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
1951 - 1954

Thus, the statutes of the State of Maine provide who may practise optometry and require an applicant for a license to pass an examination and to meet certain additional requirements. This would necessarily exclude all but natural persons from the right to obtain licenses. For these reasons a corporation may not engage in the practice of optometry. We would therefore deem it our duty not to approve any corporation whose certificate is submitted to this office, where the avowed purpose would be to engage in the practice of optometry.

JAMES G. FROST
Assistant Attorney General

February 21, 1952

To Harland A. Ladd, Commissioner of Education
Re: Contracts between the Maine School Building Authority and Community School Districts

We have your memo of February 12, 1952, relative to community school districts and the Maine School Building Authority, the provisions pertaining to both of which are contained in Chapter 37 of the Revised Statutes and Chapter 127 of the Resolves of 1951.

You ask the following question: Can the Maine School Building Authority contract with community school districts in excess of the combined valuation of the participating towns?

A community school district may be accepted by the voters of towns and cities as provided by the Enabling Act in the Revised Statutes of 1944, Chapter 37, sections 92-A to K, inclusive. Under the provisions of Section 92-D the limit of indebtedness of the district may be established as a certain amount, but may not exceed 5% of the total of the last preceding valuation of all the participating towns, whichever is the lesser. This 5% limitation is the express mandate of the legislature.

If we are to say that the Authority may contract with a community school district for a sum over this express limitation, then we feel that it must be clearly shown that the 5% limit has been removed. We find no express provision of any statute eliminating the 5% limit.

The importance of the Maine School Building Authority and of the security to which a purchaser of its bonds must look for payment compels us to conclude that the limitation cannot be impliedly removed. If it were the intent of the legislature that the Building Authority could contract with a community school district in an amount in excess of the 5% limitation in the Enabling Act, it is well hidden.

This statutory debt limitation not being expressly removed by the legislature and it not being possible to infer its elimination our conclusion is that the Maine School Building Authority may not contract with community school districts in excess of the combined valuation of the participating towns.

JAMES G. FROST
Assistant Attorney General