

# 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)

**This document is from the files of the Office of  
the Maine Attorney General as transferred to  
the Maine State Law and Legislative Reference  
Library on January 19, 2022**

November 22, 1955

To Dr. Arthur A. Hauck, President of the University of Maine  
Re: "Addition" to Chemical Engineering Building, Chapter 178,  
Resolves of 1955.

Chapter 178, Resolves, 1955, reads as follows:

"Resolved" That there be, and hereby is, appropriated from the unappropriated surplus of the general fund the sum of \$370,000 in favor of the University of Maine to construct and equip an addition to the chemical engineering building (Aubert Hall); and be it further

"Resolved: That this appropriation shall not lapse but shall remain a continuing carrying account until the purposes of this resolve have been completed."

In its Legislative Document form a statement of facts was included in the following tenor:

"These wings were included in the original plans of a Chemical Engineering Building, the central portion of which was constructed in 1940. They are now urgently needed to provide more space for undergraduate instruction in chemistry and chemical engineering, and particularly to provide for adequate facilities for teaching and research in pulp and paper technology. With these additions to the Chemical Engineering Building, the University can maintain its recognized high standing in the pulp and paper field and continue effectively to serve Maine's largest industry."

You ask, concerning this Act, whether or not it would permit the construction of a building separate from the Chemical Engineering Building (Aubert Hall). The question is raised because it has been ascertained that such a building, as compared with a building connected to, or adjoining the original building, would be more practicable.

We must answer your question in the negative.

The statement of facts contained in L. D. 375, required by House rule, shows the legislative intent to appropriate money to construct and equip a wing to Aubert Hall. The statement amplifies the meaning of the word "addition" as seen in the enacted bill, and shows that the intent was to build a wing, or addition, that would be connected to the main building.

Reading the Legislative Document in its entirety compels the conclusion that construction of a building separate from the main building would not be proper.

James Glynn Frost  
Deputy Attorney General

JGF:of