

be deprived of the much-needed services of an attorney to advise on the issues involved. It would be analogous to a case where by law a person would be prevented from availing of the services of the most competent physician or surgeon, in a critical illness, simply because he did not live in a certain county or town.

The County Commissioners of Garrett County have, in writing, unanimously opposed the signing of the Bill.

Proponents of the measure point out that extraordinary conditions call for this restriction upon the powers of the County Commissioners. An individual instance has been referred to as proof of the need for this limitation. However, I think it would be unfortunate to have this restriction written into the statute law of the State merely because one instance may justify it. It would seem that the remedy is in the selection of the county officials who, when elected must be vested with certain discretionary powers which they are supposed to exercise for the best interest of the local government.

No such provision exists in any other County of the State and I feel compelled to veto the measure.

HAGERSTOWN.

Chapter 396 (House Bill 745). This Act seeks to direct the Mayor and Council of Hagerstown to provide for the codification and publication of ordinances of the City and to include the cost in the next annual levy. The Mayor of Hagerstown urges the veto of this measure and states that certain changes are expected in the near future and that needless expense would be incurred if the codification were to take place at this time.

In fact, the Mayor states, it would be a waste of money.

It is to be noted that in passing a somewhat similar measure affecting the entire county, the Legislature merely "authorized" the County Commissioners to provide for the codification, whereas in this Bill, they "directed" the Mayor and Council to follow their mandate. In view of the attitude of the City officials, I feel that I must veto the measure.

JAI-ALAI

Chapter 845 (House Bill 903). I am vetoing House Bill 903 legalizing the conduct of games of Jai-Alai in Montgomery County in conjunction with pari-mutual wagering.

While this game has been recognized in other jurisdictions, the suggestion as to legalizing it in Maryland was not brought forward for general discussion until two days before the adjournment of the recent 90-day session. In broaching the subject, members of the Montgomery County Delegation very