

Boston, Mass., Feb. 18, 1924.

To the Committee on Legal Affairs,
State House,
Boston, Mass.

Re: Senate 143 ~~and~~ ^{now} House ~~194~~ ¹⁸⁷⁸.

Gentlemen:

The undersigned original petitioners and sponsors for the legislation of Section 1 of Senate No. 143, representing also many others unable to appear at the adjourned hearing, respectfully remind you of a few of the reasons why this bill ought to pass this year; also of a necessary amendment to Section 2 thereof, and to House No. 194.

First, Senate 143 does not, as has been represented by some of its opponents, take away the regulatory powers of the State Division of Highways over billboard advertising. It leaves the power to make general rules of state-wide application in the hands of the Division exactly as at present, retaining also the original provision of the law of 1920 that cities and towns may make further local regulations not inconsistent with the general law or with the regulations of the State Highway Division. It does strike out the words "subject to the approval of the Division", referring to local ordinances, and thus removes an anomaly in the law of 1920, which not only requires that local by-laws on this subject shall comply with all conditions of other local laws, subject to the constitution and to the state laws and regulations, but prevents a town from making any local regulation unless it shall also meet with the approval of the State Commission.

We respectfully submit that this innovation in the law of 1920 is an unnecessary infringement of the fundamental principle of local self-government in Massachusetts. The amendment