

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)

ACTS AND RESOLVES

AS PASSED BY THE

Eighty-fourth Legislature

OF THE

STATE OF MAINE

1929

Published by the Secretary of State, in accordance with the Resolves of the Legislature approved June 28, 1820, March 18, 1840, and March 16, 1842.

KENNEBEC JOURNAL COMPANY
AUGUSTA, MAINE

1929

VETO MESSAGES

VETO MESSAGES

CHARLES H. CUTTER COAL CO.

STATE OF MAINE

Office of the Governor

AUGUSTA

April 3, 1929.

To the Honorable Senate and House of Representatives:

There is returned herewith without approval

RESOLVE, in Favor of the Charles H. Cutter Coal Co. of Boston.

No new facts have developed since this claim was rejected by the 83rd Legislature.

There is admittedly no legal claim against the State and it would seem that the passage of this resolve might set a dangerous precedent in reimbursing those who suffer business losses in their dealings with the State.

Respectfully submitted,
(Signed) WM. TUDOR GARDINER.

APPROPRIATING MONEY TO PAY CLAIMS

STATE OF MAINE

Office of the Governor

AUGUSTA

April 10, 1929.

To the Honorable Senate and House of Representatives:

I return without approval

“RESOLVE, Appropriating Money to Pay Claims Allowed by the Committee on Claims.”

This is a “blanket resolve” composed of sixty-one items. About forty of these are pauper claims that might properly be grouped and passed on together. The rest are claims of a miscellaneous nature that have no relation to pauper matters, and should be considered on their respective

merits. The executive has no power to consider any separate item in this resolve, the only course is to approve the whole or veto the whole. It is one of the gravest responsibilities of the executive office to affix approval to acts and resolves. It would seem to be the spirit of the constitutional provision that matters be submitted to a governor in such shape that he may give them proper consideration and have an opportunity to perform his duties in accordance with his oath of office.

Some of these miscellaneous claims I do not approve and I have no alternative but to return the whole resolve.

In 1923 a "blanket" claim resolve was vetoed but passed over the veto. In 1925 a "blanket" claim resolve was again presented and the executive adopted the effective method of a "pocket veto." This latter course might be open to me in the event of your early adjournment. But I prefer to state to you my objections to a practice that seems contrary to the interest of the taxpayers of the State and contrary to orderly procedure under the constitution that gives us our respective duties.

Respectfully submitted,
(Signed) WM. TUDOR GARDINER.

RESOLVE IN FAVOR OF H. E. HOUDLETTE

STATE OF MAINE

Office of the Governor

AUGUSTA

April 12, 1929.

To the Honorable Senate and House of Representatives:

I return without approval

"RESOLVE, in Favor of H. E. Houdlette, Administrator of the Estate of Benjamin Owen Emmons, Late of Richmond, County of Sagadahoc, State of Maine, deceased."

There is no obligation on the part of the State to reimburse a ferryman or his estate for such judgments as were recovered in Court against Mr. Emmons personally. There are in the State many appealing instances of families in distress, but it seems unwise to adopt this extraordinary form of relief for a particular case.

Respectfully submitted,
(Signed) WM. TUDOR GARDINER.

**AN ACT TO PROVIDE FOR RELIEF OF NEEDY DEPENDENTS
OF DISABLED VETERANS OF THE WORLD WAR**

STATE OF MAINE

Office of the Governor

AUGUSTA

April 12, 1929.

To the Honorable Senate and House of Representatives:

I return without approval

**AN ACT to Provide for Relief of Needy Dependents of Disabled
Veterans of the World War.**

Under existing law, provision is made for the relief of dependents of veterans of the World War, by municipalities in the first instance, reimbursement being made by the State. A requisite to this form of relief is that there be disability caused by the war service of the veteran. Ample funds are available on the part of the State to reimburse the municipalities administering these relief payments. No one can question the correctness of the State's expending money for the relief of those still suffering the burden of war.

But this bill would remove the requisite that the disability be the result of the casualties of war. The State's expenditures for charity, health, welfare and pensions call for about 30 per cent of our appropriations. It may be that some of the cases of relatives of veterans who are in necessitous circumstances may be entitled to some existing form of relief. I do not feel that I can approve the creation of a new Board to administer a new form of relief, where the distress is admittedly not the result of military service. There would seem to be an unwarranted distinction in thus placing the relatives of veterans in a specially favored class.

As a practical matter, this measure would not afford a material increase in the amount of relief that, according to present expectations, will be very shortly administered under existing law.

It is with hesitation that a plea for relief of dependents of war veterans is denied, but it must be realized that the effect of this bill would be to grant relief where necessitous circumstances exist without any casual connection with war service.

Respectfully submitted,
(Signed) WM. TUDOR GARDINER.