

STATE OF MINNESOTA,
 EXECUTIVE DEPARTMENT,
 SAINT PAUL, March 3, 1869. }

Hon. C. D. Davison, Speaker of the House of Representatives:

SIR—I have approved and signed—

H. F. No. 139, A bill for an act to authorize the county commissioners of Jackson county to issue bonds for the purpose of bridging the DesMoines River.

H. F. No. 96, A bill for an act to define the boundary line of Lyon county and attach the same to Redwood county for judicial purposes.

H. F. No. 57, A bill for an act to amend section fifty-six of chapter eleven of the general statutes, in relation to the duties of county auditors.

H. F. No. 172, A bill for an act to change the name of the town of Dover to Havana.

H. F. No. 149, A bill for an act to legalize the town plat of Jackson.

H. F. No. 189, A bill for an act to amend section three of chapter thirty of special laws of 1865.

H. F. No. 202, A bill for an act to authorize the county commissioners of the county of Watonwan to issue bonds for the purpose of bridging the Watonwan River.

H. F. No. 159, A memorial relative to arrears of pensions of minor children and bounties of Minnesota soldiers in the late civil war.

H. F. No. 219, A bill for an act to authorize the trustees of the German M. E. Church to sell and convey real estate therein named.

H. F. No. 180, A bill for an act to change that portion of the State road running from Minneapolis, in Hennepin county, to Fort Ridgely, lying between Faxon and Highland Creek, in the county of Sibley.

H. F. No. 179, A bill for an act to authorize the county commissioners of Sibley county to cause a re-survey of the roads in said county, the records of the laying out of which have been destroyed by fire.

Very respectfully,

Your obedient servant,

WM. R. MARSHALL.

STATE OF MINNESOTA,
 EXECUTIVE DEPARTMENT,
 SAINT PAUL, March 4, 1869. }

Hon. C. D. Davison, Speaker of the House of Representatives:

SIR—I herewith return to the House of Representatives in which it originated,

H. F. No. 134, A bill for an act to re-locate the seat of government, and provide for the erection of public buildings thereat,

Without my approval.

In the absence of any public sentiment throughout the State demanding the change of the seat of government, which this bill pro-

poses; in the absence of any agitation or canvassing of this question before the people prior to the election; in the absence of anything that would indicate the preference or wishes of the whole people, or any considerable portion of the people whose interests and convenience will be so greatly and permanently affected, it seems to me wholly unwise and inexpedient to take this step.

I am informed by competent and reliable engineers, who have made a careful estimate, that the geographical centre of the State is within a radius of five miles of the junction of the Crow Wing and Mississippi rivers. The present seat of government of the State is one hundred and ten miles south east of this geographical centre. The proposed location in ninety miles south west, being only twenty miles nearer the true geographical centre, than the present temporary seat of government.

In view of these facts, and of the undeveloped condition of the northern section, its looked for development under the influence of the Northern Pacific Railroad, and of the general expectation that a large commercial city is yet to arise at the head of Lake Superior, in Minnesota, and of the prospective development of the mineral resources of Northeastern Minnesota, leaving undetermined for many years yet, the centre of population in the State, it seems to me altogether premature to definitely and finally locate the seat of government, so far from the geographical centre of the State.

Confessedly, no evil can result from postponing a decision of this grave question, until the people can be heard from in the next or subsequent election.

Their decision of the question ought not to be forestalled, by the precipitate action of a legislature chosen without reference to this matter, and without any intimation that the question would be sprung upon them, and decided without opportunity of reversal by the people.

The western treeless districts of the State have been as slow in being populated and developed as the heavily timbered regions of the northeast. So far as the consideration of promoting settlement and development, by removing the capital to the frontier, is concerned, it might apply with equal force to the northern section of the State, with the additional consideration of getting near the geographical centre.

These general considerations are in my judgment, sufficient objections to the bill. I hardly think it necessary to inquire into the details of the scheme. The presence or absence of suitable building materials, of wood and of water-power to facilitate development, and to ensure the ultimate dense population of the country about this location, which would be necessary to render the capital so located, convenient and desirable, and to ensure the sale of the lands at such prices as would pay for the erection of suitable public buildings there, are questions that certainly demand time and careful consideration to determine.

And however attractive the location as a site, and the scheme for realizing a fund for the erection of buildings from the ten sections of State lands, there would be risk and danger—as we know from past State experience—that failure would result and heavy liabilities be entailed, and heavy expenditures rendered necessary in order to realize

completed buildings, and the benefits of the permanent location of the seat of government.

Our people have not forgotten the disastrous experiment of the five million loan bill, which looked to them so attractive and so safe, at its inception.

It is no time, now, in a period of financial embarrassment, and of a depreciated currency, and high prices of almost every thing *except the agricultural products of our people*, to enter upon the work of building a State Capitol to cost a million dollars. We should be warned by the disappointments and mistakes of the past, to look carefully before we leap.

Very respectfully,

WM. R. MARSHALL.

The question being, shall the bill pass notwithstanding the Governor's veto.

Mr. Clarke moved a call of the House.

The roll being called, the following members were found to be absent :

Messrs. Armstrong and McGrew.

Mr. Clarke moved that further proceedings under the call of the House be dispensed with.

Which motion prevailed.

The question being taken, shall the bill pass notwithstanding the Governor's objections, there were yeas 24, and nays 21, as follows :

Those who voted in the affirmative were—

Messrs. Baxter, Bohn, Bryant, Clarke, Easton, Everett, Folsom, Hall, Hicks, Hobart, Hunt, Hunter, Hyde, Lathrop, Meighan, McDonald, Patterson, Pitcher, Pile, Robbers, W. Smith, Tibbetts, Vale and Mr. Speaker.

Those who voted in the negative were—

Messrs. Aaker, Chewning, Egan, Faber, Fridley, Gilman, Grover, Hammer, Haskell, Hathaway, Hollister, Johnson, Larson, Proper, Rhodes, Rudolph, Sibbison, L. Smith, Stoever, Thompson and Webster.

So the bill was lost.

The following communication was received from the Attorney General of the State :

OFFICE ATTORNEY GENERAL,
ST. PAUL, March 4, 1869. }

Hon. C. D. Davison, Speaker of the House of Representatives :

SIR :—My written opinion is requested by the honorable body over which you preside, as to the time when its present session must expire by constitutional limitation. Section one, Article four of the Constitution provides that the Legislature shall meet at such times as shall be prescribed by law, but no session shall exceed the term of sixty days. The law passed in pursuance to this provision has fixed the first Tuesday after the first Monday in January, as the time for the annual meeting of the Legislature, which happened this year on the 5th day of January. If the days referred to in this constitutional provision