

2. That State employees must be convinced that any proposed change is made for the sole purpose of strengthening the Merit System and not to weaken it, thus jeopardizing their positions.

3. That any proposed change ought not to be in conflict with other Civil Service law provisions such as the Salary Standards Board set-up but should harmonize with existing Merit System regulations with the efficient administration of which I am in hearty accord.

Under all the circumstances, I shall veto House Bill 240.

Chapter 506 (House Bill 494). This bill would permit an appeal to Court from the action of the Employment Commissioner after hearings of classified employees in accordance with the Merit System law. It is thought that this innovation if provided for would seriously interfere with the functioning of the Merit System and would unduly delay the execution of orders from the Employment Commissioner. Until the need for such a drastic step has been proven, I think it inadvisable to make such a radical change in the present system and, accordingly, will follow the urgent suggestion of the Employment Commissioner and other Merit System proponents that this bill be vetoed.

MONTGOMERY COUNTY.

Chapter 241 (House Bill 499). This bill provides for the payment of compensation to banking institutions in Montgomery County for services in the collection of taxes. While the apparent purpose of the enactment is to have the measure apply to County taxes, the language employed would give wider coverage and would also apply to State taxes. Inasmuch as there is no provision for the payment by the State for collection of its taxes, this measure will be vetoed.

MOTOR VEHICLES.

Chapter 740 (House Bill 439). In view of the circumstances surrounding the passage of the bill, I am convinced that all of its essential features were not thoroughly understood by the majority of the members of the General Assembly.

Inasmuch as automobile owners of the State would be required to pay, in the aggregate, such a large amount under the terms of the bill, I could not conscientiously give approval to the measure when it appears to me that the provisions were not fully discussed before the two branches of the Legislature.

It is to be recalled that such considerable opposition was raised to that part of the Tax Revenue Bill requiring an addi-