

# 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**

that the law provides that the Kennebec Journal "shall be the state paper," and ask if from a legal point of view you should keep the original printed editions of the state paper when you have microfilmed reproductions.

We can find no express provisions authorizing the destruction of such paper, it not being classified as a record of your department. We are of the opinion that before such paper is destroyed there should be legislative approval.

We draw your attention to Chapter 91 of the Public Laws of 1951, relating to the old records of any State department, which authorizes the destruction of such records, if they are valuable, provided they have been photographed or microfilmed. We feel that similar authority should be granted with respect to the "state paper".

JAMES G. FROST  
Deputy Attorney General

June 18, 1952

To Honorable George D. Varney  
Re: Turnpike Employees -- Retirement

This will acknowledge receipt of your letter of June 17, 1952, in which you inquire as to the eligibility of the Maine Turnpike to join the Maine Retirement System.

In response to your question, please be advised that we are of the opinion that the Maine Turnpike has all the attributes of a "quasi-municipal corporation" and may join the Maine Retirement System.

This opinion is based upon a complete reading of Chapter 69 of the Private and Special Laws of 1941, particularly sections 4 and 18.

ALEXANDER A. LaFLEUR  
Attorney General

June 20, 1952

To Robert L. Dow, Commissioner of Sea and Shore Fisheries  
Re: Alewife Fishery in Newcastle

This office is in receipt of your memo of June 6, 1952. You state that presently the towns of Newcastle and Nobleboro share exclusive rights to the alewife fishery at Damariscotta Mills on the Damariscotta River. You also state that the Town of Newcastle wishes to construct a fishway at Sherman Lake, which is a part of the Sheepscot River watershed and wholly within the Town of Newcastle, and that the Town of Newcastle wishes to keep to itself the exclusive alewife fishery rights with respect to this new development. The question has been asked if the law with respect to the Damariscotta River is broad enough to permit this proposed development at Sherman Lake.

The answer to this is, No.

So far as this office can ascertain, the Damariscotta River and the Sheepscot River are distinct bodies, and legislation with respect to the Damariscotta