VETOED BY THE GOVERNOR, APRIL 4, 1958

House Bill No. 151—By the Carroll County Delegation:

A Bill entitled "An Act to add new Section 8A to Article 23A of the Annotated Code of Maryland (1957 Edition), title 'Corporations—Municipal', to follow immediately after Section 8 thereof, and to be under the new sub-title 'Facilities outside corporate limits', relating to the establishment or location by a municipal corporation or Baltimore City of penal institutions or other places outside the corporate limits thereof and relating generally to municipal corporations in this State".

The Speaker put the question: Shall the bill pass notwithstanding the objections of the Executive?

AFFIRMATIVE—NONE

NEGATIVE

Messrs.—
Speaker, Combs, Raley, Harris (R. B.), Joiner, Kirkland, Melvin, Ridout, Tawney, Wade, Whitmore, Dowell, Hance, Jenkins, Parran, Boone, Brewster, Culver, Jackson, Maguire, Staten, Harrison, Latham, Lowe, Quinn, Riggin, Simpkins, Adams, Bennett, Brinsfield, Corkran, Burkley, Mackie, McCool, Loveless, Machen, Nichols, Sasscer, Sickles, Wilkinson, Eaton, Risley, Hickman, Polk, Stevens, Derr, Harris (S. F.), Payne, Smelser, Virts, Utterback, Hatem, Hess, Moore, Tydings, Blades, Hughes (H.), Dabrowski, Milanicz, Mrozinski, Nowakowski, Silk, Walters, Antonelli, Bartos, Behounek, Hedrick, Mach, Urban, Acker, Brooks, Buffington, Kenney, McNeal, Abramson, Cole, Friedman, Hatchett, Pollack, Robinson, Bacharach,Cardin, Fitzgerald, Mandel, Silver, Baynes, Corrigan, Hodges, Meyers (W. W.), Myers (W. J.), Berkson, Bloom, Brewer, Huyett, Porter, Browning, Gude, Lee, Schweinhaut, Wheeler, Woodward, Cook, Driscoll, Hughes (G. R.), Williams, Reed, Barnes, Hahn, Six, Smith, Brown, Murray, Hanna, Larmore, White, Ashby, Edwards, Glotfelty. Total—118

The Speaker announced the veto was sustained.

EXECUTIVE DEPARTMENT

ANNAPOLIS, MD., April 3, 1958.

Honorable John C. Luber

Speaker of the House of Delegates

State House

Annapolis, Maryland

Dear Mr. Speaker:

House Bill 176 excludes employees of the Department of Maryland State Police from Social Security coverage. The intent of the Bill was to exclude uniformed personnel, and compensate for the exclusion by increasing certain benefits under the State Police Retirement System. Unfortunately, the word "employee" is broad enough to include civilian employees of the Department. These civilians are members of the regular State Employees Retirement System, and their exclusion from social security benefits would be an uncompensated loss, discriminatory in nature.

The Attorney General and the Board of Trustees of the State Police Retirement System have recommended veto of this Bill, which is requested by the civilian employees.