

Office of the Vermont Secretary of State
Vermont State Archives

Veto Message: Governor Weeks
1927 (H.21)

An act to regulate outdoor advertising and to repeal No. 44 of the Acts of 1921 and No. 32 of the Acts of 1925 an section 6949 of the General Laws.

STATE OF VERMONT
Executive Department.
Montpelier, Vt., March 12, 1927

Was taken up, and the Speaker laid before the House the following communication from His Excellency, the Governor:

To the House of Representatives:

I have the honor to return without my approval House bill entitled,

"H. 21. An act to regulate outdoor advertising and to repeal No. 44 of the Acts of 1921 and No. 32 of the Acts of 1925 and section 6949 of the General Laws."

My reasons for this action result more from a consideration of the manner in which this proposed bill came into being rather than from a consideration of the bill itself or the facts disclosed by the record showing its journey through the two Houses.

Investigation of the matter discloses that there is now due the State of Vermont as fees under the present law approximately \$4,000.00 from one of the larger billboard advertising companies of the country. Suit has been brought by the State of Vermont and is now pending in Washington County Court to collect these unpaid fees. The billboard company refuses to pay upon the ground that the present law is unconstitutional in that it is confiscatory and makes the further claim that the law is unconstitutional in that it is an attempt to regulate a matter of interstate commerce. As to the latter claim this bill is no improvement over the present law. As to the former claim this

company expresses a willingness to waive same and pay up their back indebtedness provided a law is passed giving them the relief to which they claim to be entitled. Our courts are the proper tribunals to pass upon these questions and it appears to me to be a dangerous policy to collect what is now due the State under the present law at the price of accepting for the future their interpretation of what the law ought to be instead of having the law passed upon by a court of competent jurisdiction. This proposed policy is contrary to our traditions and is a course to which I cannot conscientiously lend my approval. We should adhere to, and not recede from, these traditions.

JOHN E. WEEKS,
Governor."

**Governor's Veto Sustained.
H.21 1927**

The Governor's veto was sustained in the House:
Yeas 11 Nays 178

Sources: *Journal of the House*, March 12, 1927 (pages 402-403)