

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

I do believe, however, as I have stated above, that it is perfectly correct and proper that this right of the City of Waterville, which now is not set forth in the insurance policy, should be set forth specifically.

I would suggest that you keep in touch with Mr. Mahoney, and he will be able, undoubtedly, to advise you when the endorsement has been effected, which will bring about the precise words which the City of Waterville is interested in having incorporated into the policy. . . .

DAVID B. SOULE
Assistant Attorney General

November 12, 1952

To Hon. Harold I. Goss, Secretary of State
Re: Meaning of "Member" and "Another Corporation".

You ask for an interpretation of the meaning of section 31 of the general corporation law, which provides:

"Directors must be and remain stockholders, except that a member of another corporation, which owns stock and has a right to vote thereon, may be a director."

The inquiry is, "Does 'member' mean director or stockholder?"

The case of *Curtis v. Harlow*, 53 Mass. 6, is in point, showing that "member" in such case means stockholder, and of course in such case a holder of common stock or a holder of stock permitting him to vote in the corporation which holds the stock to be voted in this corporation.

Then you inquire, "Does 'another corporation' mean another Maine corporation or any duly organized corporation?"

It would appear that section 21 of Chapter 49, R. S., is in point here and that "another corporation" is not restricted in its meaning to "another Maine corporation".

NEAL A. DONAHUE
Assistant Attorney General

November 12, 1952

To Joseph M. Trefethen, State Geologist
Re: Mining Claims

. . . Chapter 36 of the Revised Statutes of Maine, as amended by Chapter 298 of the Public Laws of 1951, is pertinent to the questions you have propounded.

You ask, "Is there any point in the law that governs the orientation of claim boundary lines in staking mineral claims on state lands?"

The answer to this question is, No.

You ask, "Are the dimensions fixed for a single claim, or can a claim of equivalent area with different dimensions be staked?"

The statute provides that a claim may not be more than 600' wide or 1500' long, the point of strike to be somewhere within that area. We interpret