

and perhaps an even larger percentage of those having occasion to visit State departments is located in and around Baltimore City.

As a practical matter, a great part of the State's establishment must be housed in Baltimore City, and if moved to Annapolis, these facilities would, to a considerable extent, have to be duplicated in Baltimore.

As a resident of Annapolis, having daily contact with my Annapolis neighbors, it is not pleasant for me to have to veto a measure that is favored so generally by them. I share their pride in their city, and would like to help in its growth and development, but I cannot assent to the expenditure of \$5,000,000 for a building in Annapolis at this time.

My decision to veto the bill, of course, is influenced by the fact that defense preparations and scarcity of manpower and materials rules out any immediate construction.

The effect of this veto, therefore, is to postpone legislation at a time when it cannot in any event become immediately effective. It will, however, give us an opportunity to review the matter and make a wiser decision.

Respectfully,

THEODORE R. MCKELDIN,
Governor

SUNDAY OBSERVANCE

May 7, 1951

Hon. George W. Della
President of the Senate
State House
Annapolis, Maryland

Dear Mr. President:

Senate Bill No. 189 amends Sections 564 and 565 of Article 27 of the Annotated Code of Maryland (1947 Supplement), and purports by its title to authorize the operation of bathing beaches and the playing of games in Cecil County on Sunday. However, the effect of the amendment of the law is to authorize the operation of bathing beaches not only in Cecil County, but also in Kent, Caroline and Montgomery Counties, although no reference to these last mentioned counties is made in the title of the Bill. In view of the foregoing the title of the Bill is probably defective and the Bill invalid.

I am therefore, returning the Bill herewith without my approval.

Respectfully,

THEODORE R. MCKELDIN,
Governor