

# 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**

be required thereunder for the A. C. Lawrence Leather Company for the proposed discharge in the presently existing general location at South Paris on the property now owned by the Milo Tanning Company, if the same business heretofore operated is continued.

ALEXANDER A. LaFLEUR

Attorney General

September 30, 1953

To Norman U. Greenlaw, Commissioner of Institutional Service

Re: Transportation Costs to State Hospital

We have your memo of September 16, 1953, and attached memo from Dr. Harold A. Pooler, Superintendent of the Bangor State Hospital, in which he cites a case where a town charged a patient \$180 for the cost of committing the patient and transporting him from the town of his residence to the Bangor State Hospital.

The question is asked if the municipalities should charge for the transportation of patients to and from the hospital.

We quote from Section 139 of Chapter 23, R. S. 1944:

“A town chargeable for expenses of examination and commitment and paying for the examination of the insane and his commitment to the hospital may recover the amount paid, from the insane.”

It does not seem unreasonable to us that the cost of transportation should be a proper charge recoverable from the patient.

JAMES G. FROST

Deputy Attorney General

September 30, 1953

To G. Raymond Nichols, Veterans Affairs

Re: Re-employment Rights – Municipalities

In answer to your memo of September 21, 1953, in which you ask if a former Chief of Police of the Town of Lincoln would have re-employment rights under Chapter 59, Section 23, of the Revised Statutes, we must advise that this office may not give an opinion relative to such a matter. It is, of course, our duty to interpret the statute in question with respect to State employees, but we may not give such opinions when employees of municipalities are concerned.

The presence of the statute would indicate a possibility of re-employment rights in such an instance, and we would suggest that you advise Mr. Brinson to contact one of the attorneys who have accepted assignments by the VA to render assistance to veterans in their particular localities.

JAMES G. FROST

Deputy Attorney General