

Courts, since an adverse decision could cause serious financial confusion and difficulty in all of the Counties. Moreover, this is a matter which can be considered at the next session of the Legislature, and should meanwhile receive careful study from the Legislative Council as to whether we are to revert to an assessing system which perpetuates inequality or whether the present law should remain despite any real or fancied burdens of local administrations.

In view of the foregoing, I am vetoing the Bill in its present form.

Respectfully,

(s) THEODORE R. MCKELDIN,

Governor

TRMcK/tk

HOUSE BILL NO. 192

May 5, 1953

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

Dear Mr. Speaker:

On the written recommendation of the Police Commissioner of Baltimore City, concurred in by Mayor D'Alesandro, I am returning House Bill No. 192 herewith as vetoed. The bill would require payment of a pension to Mr. Howard J. Langley on the same basis as if he had been injured in the performance of his duty as a police officer of Baltimore City. Officer Langley was dismissed from the force as a disciplinary measure. Medical reports subsequently submitted indicate that his actions resulted from a serious mental condition, which has required continued hospitalization. However, there are two objections to the proposed legislative action, as follows:

1. In order for a permanently incapacitated police officer to receive the pension which this bill provides, he would, under the terms of the Charter and Public Local Laws of Baltimore City, be required to have 20 years service or show that the disability is service connected. Mr. Langley's case meets neither alternative. He had served approximately 10 years at the time of his dismissal, and no contention is made that his disability is service connected. The only possible relief to which he may have been entitled is the