

4. It is untimely; the measure is directed against organized labor and the very labor representatives opposing it are the men who have responded to the call of the Nation and of the State, the members of the Advisory Committee of the War Manpower Commission, of the State Labor Victory Board, of War Bond Committees and other patriotic undertakings.

5. In the recent war session it was thought undesirable to project either a labor program or a farm program. Rather it was deemed advisable to hold in abeyance such programs for the emergency. I believe it would be departing from that policy to approve this measure which is backed by one group in opposition to the other, as I am convinced that it would make for disunity instead of unity.

The only regret that I have is that the measure did not come to me until after the adjournment of the General Assembly. Otherwise, I would have taken action with full statement of my reasons in time to have the Legislators act again on the matter if they so desired.

If physical violence is practiced then prosecutions can be had for assault. If equipment and machines are damaged then prosecution can be had for malicious destruction of property. If groups assemble illegally and threatenly then prosecutions can be had for unlawful assembly. If a group undertake to do anything by unlawful means, or to the prejudice of the public then prosecutions can be had under criminal conspiracy.

Two years ago at the very time I vetoed this measure, I gave approval to the Sabotage Act. At that time, a number of public expressions were heard including additional comment to the effect that the measure would impose restrictions as should be enforced. I concurred in that view then and signed the Sabotage Bill despite certain opposition.

The experience of the last two years has convinced me that this action was correct. Apparently, there has been no general objection to the Sabotage Law because not a single effort was made during the last session of the Legislature to repeal it.

In view of all the above and including the reasons set forth in the attached statement I feel it my duty to veto Senate Bill No. 165.

Veto Statement on House Bill No. 550, 1941  
Session of Legislature.

Chapter 909 (House Bill 550). A different situation exists in regard to the measure which would cover interference with transportation, delivery or distribution of perishable food products in intra-State commerce. I am inclined to the belief that this measure is directed against labor. Certain occurrences in other States, where perishable food products have