

AN ACT TO ADD A NEW SECTION 132 (A-1) TO ARTICLE 66C OF THE ANNOTATED CODE OF MARYLAND (1957 EDITION AND 1960 SUPPLEMENT), TITLE "NATURAL RESOURCES", SUB-TITLE "BIRDS, GAME AND INLAND WATER FISH", SUB-HEADING "UPLAND AND MIGRATORY GAME BIRDS AND GAME ANIMALS", TO FOLLOW IMMEDIATELY AFTER SECTION 132 (A) THEREOF, PROVIDING THAT IN DORCHESTER COUNTY, ST. MARY'S, SOMERSET, WICOMICO AND WORCESTER COUNTIES THERE SHALL BE A THREE-DAY OPEN SEASON FOR THE HUNTING OF ANTLERLESS DEER, AND RELATING GENERALLY TO THE TIME FOR AND THE CONDITIONS OF THIS OPEN SEASON IN DORCHESTER COUNTY, ST. MARY'S, SOMERSET, WICOMICO AND WORCESTER COUNTIES.

The President put the question, Shall the bill pass notwithstanding the objection of the Executive?

The President announced the veto was sustained by roll call as follows:

AFFIRMATIVE—NONE

NEGATIVE

Senators:

President, Barrick, Buffington, Dean, Dorf, Dorsey, Gonder, Hall, Hepbron, Hughes, James, Johnson, Jones, Mach, Malkus, Mrs. Nock, North, Northrop, Parran, Phipps, Phoebus, Pine, Sanford, See, Shipley, Snyder, Weant, Wheatley. Total—28

EXECUTIVE DEPARTMENT

May 8, 1961.

Hon. George W. Della  
403 Warren Avenue  
Baltimore 30, Maryland

Dear Mr. President:

In accordance with Article II, Section 17 of the Maryland Constitution, I am returning to you herewith Senate Bill No. 278 which has been vetoed by me.

This Bill would increase the corporate surety bond required of licensed real estate brokers from \$5,000 to \$10,000.

The Real Estate Commission of Maryland has advised me that their records indicate that out of a total of approximately 3400 brokers in Maryland less than \$1500 was paid out by bonding companies in behalf of licensed brokers for the 1960 license year and that this sum represented only three cases. From this evidence before me, it would appear that there is no compelling reason for doubling the amount of the surety bond required under existing law, and there is ample evidence that such an increase would work a definite hardship on a substantial number of licensed real estate brokers.

Accordingly, I have vetoed Senate Bill No. 278.