

The roll was called resulting as follows:

Affirmative

Delegates—

Athey, Lipin, Thomason, Burkhead, Connell, Helms, Anderson, Fornos, Benner, Arata, Coolahan, Malone, Deitrich, Hinkel, Jensen, Hutchinson, Jones, Kardash, Schirano, Einschutz, Evans, Rush, Arnick, D'Anna, Minnick, Donovan, Hickman (R.), Dypski, Krysiak, Burns, Curran, Kent, Kircher, McQuade, O'Brien, Murphy, Rutkowski, Weisengoff, Hoffman, Becker, Cook (E. P.), Burgess, Warfield, Long, White, Aiken.

Total—46

Negative

Delegates—

Mr. Speaker, Briscoe, Fowler, Boyer, Allen, Compton, Nimmerrichter, Alpert, Rynd, Hopkins, Price, Lowe, Dize, Matthews (R. M.), Burkheimer, Mackie, Dorman, Menes, Mothershead, Banning, Goodman, King, Santangelo, Weile, Bagley, McDonough, Rummage, Hickman (C. M.), Houck, Remsberg, Virts, Greer, Hess, Scarff, Walters, Adams (F. B.), Antonelli, Cassady, Holub, McCarty, Orlinsky, Sarbanes, Hergenroeder, Mooney, Abramson, Brailey, Dixon, Douglass, Lee, Cardin, Friedman, Resnick, Spector, Waxter, Avara, Freeberger, Donaldson, Grumbacher, Wright, Clarke, Cronin, Lady, McInerney, Scott, Whalen, Whitney, Bell, Docter, Zander, Aitken, Beall, Cook (N. S.), Evans, Reed, Matthews (R. C.), Yingling.

Total—76

The Speaker announced the veto was sustained.

May 4, 1967.

Honorable Marvin Mandel
Speaker of the House of Delegates
State House
Annapolis, Maryland

Dear Mr. Speaker:

In accordance with Section 17 of Article II of the Maryland Constitution, I have vetoed today House Bill 623 and am returning it to you.

This bill would authorize the trustees of the State retirement systems to make agreements with the State Roads Commission to lend money for the advance acquisition of rights of way for improvements of the roads system.

The Boards of Trustees of the retirement systems have unanimously and strongly urged me to veto this measure. They point out that its implementation would create "many complicated and insolvable problems"; that it entails an improper approach for the investment of retirement funds; and that present investments of the systems provide a greater return than that allowable under the bill.

The objectives of the bill are meritorious and reflect a condition for which some relief should be provided—the need for funds for advance right of way acquisitions on the basis of long-range needs planning in a period of rising land costs.

Nevertheless, this bill at best would amount to nothing more than a temporary and inadequate answer to a vital problem deserving of more attention and a more complete solution. I hope that a reasonably early proposal designed to provide a satisfactory and permanent