

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

the Public Laws of 1949 and was then known as the Maine Milk Advisory Committee. The title was changed by the provisions of Section 6 of Chapter 64 of the Public Laws of 1951 to the Maine Dairy Council Committee.

The Committee would, in my opinion, be an agency of the State of Maine, its purpose being to advise as to the expenditure of certain money accruing to a separate and distinct account from the assessment of a tax on the amount per hundredweight sold by dealers within the State. It works in conjunction with another State agency, the Maine Development Commission.

The Committee, carrying on an essential governmental function, is therefore not subject to Federal income tax exemption procedures or anything of that nature . . . It is an agency of the State of Maine, carrying on a governmental purpose. . . .

ROGER A. PUTNAM
Assistant Attorney General

August 2, 1954

To Col. Robert Marx
Re: Salaries for State Police Officers

Your question relative to the jurisdiction of the Personnel Board over the salary range of officers of the Maine State Police has been received this day.

The answer is found in Chapter 372 of the Public Laws of 1953. Section 1 of said Chapter provides as follows:

“The governor and council shall determine the salary of the chief and deputy chief. The compensation of the other members of the state police shall be determined under the provisions of the personnel law.”

This is a clear expression of the legislature’s desire to cast the jurisdiction relative to the setting of pay scales for the members of the State Police, other than the Chief and Deputy Chief, upon the Personnel Board. If any doubt be entertained, it can be clearly resolved by comparing L. D. 1546, 1953, a redraft, with L. D. 829, its predecessor. The redraft incorporated Section 1, *supra*, and dropped the grade scales which L. D. 829 enumerated in detail.

ROGER A. PUTNAM
Assistant Attorney General

August 12, 1954

To Norman U. Greenlaw, Commissioner of Institutional Service
Re: Contract Bond.

. . . Subscribing witnesses should be disinterested parties to the contract, at the very least not persons subscribing the contract. . .

JAMES GLYNN FROST
Deputy Attorney General