

The President announced the veto was sustained by yeas and nays as follows:

Negative

Senators—

President, Clark, Dean, Derr, Graham, Gude, Hall, Hepbron, Hughes, (G.), Hughes, (H.), Mach, Malkus, Nock, North, O'Farrell, Phoebus, Pine, Raley, Roney, Sanford, Snyder, Steffey, Welcome, Wineland. Total 24.

### Senate Bill No. 34—Redeposit in Retirement Systems

AN ACT to repeal and re-enact, with amendments, Section 3 (6) of Article 73B of the Annotated Code of Maryland (1964 Supplement), title "Pensions," subtitle "In General," and to repeal and re-enact, with amendments, Section 110 (7) of Article 77 of said Code, title "Public Education," subtitle "Teachers' Certificates, Salaries and Pensions," subheading "Teachers Retirement System," amending the laws concerning the employees' and the teachers' retirement systems of this State with particular reference to the redeposit by certain former members of either system of accumulated contributions that have been withdrawn, such redeposit being in either the teachers' or the employees' retirement system.

### EXECUTIVE'S MESSAGE

May 4, 1965.

Honorable William S. James  
President of the Senate  
State House  
Annapolis, Maryland

Dear Mr. President:

In accordance with Article II, Section 17 of the Maryland Constitution, I have today vetoed Senate Bill 34, 1965 session, and I am returning this bill along with my veto message.

This bill amends Section 3 (6) of Article 73B of the Annotated Code of Maryland, and Section 110 (7) of Article 77 of said Code with particular reference to the redeposit by certain former members of either system of accumulated contributions that have been withdrawn, such redeposit being in either the teachers' or the employees' retirement system.

The Board of Trustees for the Employees Retirement System has advised me that they strongly disapprove of Senate Bill No. 34 because it removes the discretionary power of the Board in allowing past service credit to certain members of the retirement systems. The Board points out that had this bill been in effect last year it would have increased the cost to the taxpayers in an amount in excess of \$100,000. The Board feel that members who leave State service, and later return, should not automatically be permitted to regain past service credit.

This bill and a number of others that were introduced at the past session of the General Assembly would have altered the present retirement systems. It was my feeling that it was not possible financially to provide across-the-board increases for State employees and to finance the proposed changes in the retirement systems. It was the overwhelming consensus of all concerned that we should move ahead with the salary increases and defer costly alteration of the retirement systems.