

By the original terms of the Bill, the inoculation against *diphtheria* of school pupils was made mandatory. However, just before the adjournment of the Legislature, an entire new Bill was substituted and passed which provides that novel methods might be undertaken by health officers of the State and its subdivisions against typhoid carriers.

The Director of the State Department of Health—Dr. R. H. Riley—in opposing this Bill states that under the prevailing regulations the carriers of typhoid can be controlled, as for the most part these carriers are amenable to Health Department instructions.

Dr. Huntington Williams, Commissioner of Health for Baltimore City, not only has written in opposition to this measure but appeared personally at a public hearing which I held on the measure and voiced his emphatic protest. He states that “the best results in handling typhoid fever carriers is by persuasion and education and not by compulsory misdemeanor penalty impositions.”

It seems apparent that if this Bill were enacted it would appreciably affect the present methods of the health authorities in the handling of typhoid carriers.

Representatives of the Christian Science Committee on Publications for the State of Maryland declare that the measure is an infringement on religious principles. This criticism of the enactment is supported by expressions of large numbers of citizens in every section of the State. These protests have come to me by telegraph, letters and personal expressions.

In view of the representations which have been made, I feel compelled to veto the measure.

WORKMEN'S COMPENSATION.

Chapter 970 (House Bill 335). This measure would exempt certain employers of cutters of pulp wood from the Workmen's Compensation Act.

Two formidable objections have been raised to this enactment.

The State Industrial Accident Commission, through its able Chairman, Charles E. Moylan, gives it as his opinion that this change would be unwise and would be a backward step. Under the present law, the salutary provisions of the Workmen's Compensation Act cover industrial workers irrespective of the number of such employees who are engaged by an employer in extra hazardous work.

The second objection is raised by the Attorney-General who describes the language of this enactment as ambiguous. In fact, it is stated in the legal opinion that it would be difficult to determine how the particular section would read if this Chapter would become law.

Under the circumstances I feel compelled to veto the measure.