

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

March 23, 1953

To Earle R. Hayes, Secretary, Maine State Retirement System
Re: Park Employees — Participating Local Districts

We have your memo stating that a committee elected by the Town of Pittsfield annually receive under the provisions of a will certain moneys to be expended in the care of a public park, in that town, and that the question is raised as to whether or not the employee or employees involved should be considered as town employees for purposes of Social Security coverage.

Section 3 of Chapter 84, R. S., provides that a town may accept such a gift, and the purpose fulfilled by town employees in taking care of the property is a valid municipal purpose.

It is therefore our opinion that the employees would be employees of the town for the purpose of Social Security coverage.

JAMES G. FROST
Deputy Attorney General

March 27, 1953

To Honorable Emery S. Dickey, House of Representatives
Re: Validation Act in Jackson

This decision is based upon the following facts and it should be understood that any material deviation therefrom may change this opinion.

Facts: A certain gentleman was challenged as to his ability to read our Constitution or to write his name, during their last town meeting, all in accordance with Article XXIX of the Constitution of Maine. Failing to comply with the request of the moderator to prove his ability in this respect, he was refused the right to vote at said town meeting and withdrew. There is now some feeling that because this gentleman cast votes in all town proceedings since 1946, all actions taken at those meetings and more especially at the referendum on the school district, are invalid, because an illegal vote was accepted. I am assuming that all decisions registered were by more than a bare majority of one vote. I have attempted to ascertain the vote on the school district from the Secretary of State, but he has no record of the result, which the town clerk should have forwarded to him some time ago; so once again I will assume that it was accepted by more than a majority of one vote.

On the foregoing facts, it is my opinion that no validation act is necessary. It is generally held that the reception of illegal votes at an election does not affect the validity unless it is shown that their reception affected the result. 18 Am. Jur. 351 §260, Reception of Illegal Votes. The decisions of our courts are in accord with this rule. *Prince v. Skillin*, 73 Me. 361, and I quote therefrom:

"The mere circumstance that improper votes were received, will not vitiate an election."