350 Vetoes

their obligations, and approval of Senate Bill 48 now would benefit very few school teachers but would be merely the granting of an additional State subsidy to the city and county treasuries. I am opposed to increasing such subsidies because I believe they are based on deception of the taxpayers and tend toward the weakening of local government.

Finally, with your cooperation and that of the Speaker of the House of Delegates, I intend to comply at an early date with the request of the Legislature, as set forth in Senate Joint Resolution No. 1, for the appointment of a commission to study the problems of the schools, particularly in regard to the fiscal relationships of the State Government and those of its political subdivisions. Since we should have a report by that commission, to approve at this time a bill which might or might not be in accord with the commission's recommendations.

With highest regards, I am

Sincerely,

THEODORE R. MCKELDIN,

TRMcK:Q/js

Governor

TIDEWATER FISHERIES COMMISSION

March 27, 1952

Honorable John C. Luber Speaker of the House of Delegates State House Annapolis, Maryland

Dear Mr. Speaker:

House Bill No. 98 is herewith returned without my approval.

This Bill provides that at least one member of the Commission of Tidewater Fisheries shall be or shall have been within five years of his appointment actively engaged in the taking of seafood within Maryland waters.

By requiring that one of a three member commission be the representative of a particular phase of the seafood industry I believe the State would give special representation to those engaged in the taking of seafood and denying others of special representation on the Commission. If it is necessary that the watermen have a representative on the Commission in order to have their interests duly considered then it is only logical that each branch of the seafood industry