7	25,	19	79
r	ved, etar 82,	y (of
30	r		
2	25, 1	197	9

illed Acts received he Office the State

Fii 979 1y 25 1y 25 1y 25 1y 25 1y 25 1y 25

у 25 у 25 у 25 у 25 у 25 у 25 у 25

y 25

у 25 у 25 у 25 у 25 у 25 у 25 у 25

y 25 y 25 y 25 y 25 y 25 y 25

S. F. No.	H. F. No.	Session Laws Chapter No.	Date Approved 1979	Date Filed 1979
	521	214	May 25	May 25
	546	215	May 25	May 25
	747	216	May 25	May 25
	749	$\overline{217}$	May 25	May 25
	912	218	May 25	May 25
	936	219	May 25	May 25
	988	220	May 25	May 25
	1018	221	May 25	May 25
	1029	222	May 25	May 25
	1037	$\frac{223}{223}$	May 25	May 25
	1062	$\frac{224}{224}$	May 25	May 25
	1101	225	May 25	May 25
	1324	226	May 25	May 25
	1353	227	May 25	May 25
	1364	228	May 25	May 25
	1377	229	May 25	May 25
	1444	230	May 25	May 25
		Sincerely,		

Joan Anderson Growe, Secretary of State

May 25, 1979

The Honorable Edward J. Gearty President of the Senate

Dear Sir:

I am returning to you Senate File 498 unsigned for the purpose of vetoing that measure.

I do so reluctantly since Section 1 of the bill, which constitutes the original bill introduced by Senator Setzepfandt and Representative Patton, is clearly a worthwhile and noncontroversial provision. However, Section 2 of the bill which was amended on to it in the Transportation Committee of the House of Representatives is a special interest provision which runs contrary to the clearly enunciated regulatory practices for motor vehicle carriers as established by the Public Service Commission.

Section 2 of the bill would allow a large carrier which presently possesses local cartage, contract and certificated authorities to acquire irregular route authority without giving up its other authorities as would be required under the present regulatory scheme.

Irregular route authority would give the concern which seeks to acquire that authority a substantial competitive advantage over other motor carriers in the State without giving them an opportunity to appear and present their objections to the Public Service Commission in a customary regulatory proceeding.

For the foregoing reasons, I cannot allow this bill to become law.

Sincerely,

Albert H. Quie, Governor

May 29, 1979

The Honorable Edward J. Gearty President of the Senate Dear Sir:

I am vetoing S.F. 607 which establishes in Sections 2 and 3 a research program on the therapeutic use of marijuana. S.F. 607 does not provide any funds for research and in my judgment does not establish sufficient research guidelines or clarify investigational procedures to merit status as a research program.

The Federal Government has established procedures for the scientific experimental use of drugs, with protective research criteria clearly defined for experimentation. These current Federal programs investigating the use of marijuana permit physician participation without the need of enabling state legislation.

In addition it is my view that the "qualifications review board" which this bill establishes to certify patients, practitioners, and pharmacies for participation in the program will be administratively cumbersome and expensive and of questionable usefulness for either the individual patient or for research purposes.

Finally, not only are there no appropriations for research but no appropriation is included to address the costs of promulgating rules, administering the program, funding per diem and travel for the qualifications review board and writing contracts with the National Institute on Drug Abuse. If the State were to participate in such a research effort, an appropriation would be needed.

The negative effects of therapeutic research program contained in Sections 2 and 3 warrant a veto. I anticipate that Section 1 which prescribes increased penalties for the possession of controlled substances on school premises will be able to stand on its own merit next year.

Sincerely, Albert H. Quie, Governor Dear S.

I he proved State \$1026.11

and 75

The Ha

The Faster

President of the from the of the

Con S. F. No.