

in the Police Department and in the Police Pension Fund. The body of the bill is merely permissive. Whether mandatory or permissive, this is another instance of ill advised special legislation to serve the interest of a single person, in preference to others who may be similarly situated.

The bill correctly recites the resignation of Mr. Hochberg, but no reason is cited for this legislative interference with the exercise of sound administrative discretion in the operation of the Baltimore Police Department. The case was thoroughly reviewed in a letter to me from the late Commissioner Ober, which fully explained the circumstances surrounding the resignation. The facts there recited are distinctly uncomplimentary to Mr. Hochberg, and serve not only to show good cause for withdrawal from the Department, but also for refusal of reinstatement.

I am further advised that prior to the past legislative session, a mandamus suit was instituted to compel this reinstatement, which suit is still pending in the courts. This is the proper forum for orderly review of the Commissioner's action and redress for any proper grievances of Hochberg. I express no opinion as to the merits of this claim, except to note that I do not believe it is a matter properly falling within the legislative or executive province. Accordingly, I have vetoed House Bill 843.

Respectfully,

(s) THEODORE R. MCKELDIN,

Governor

TRMcK:TK

House Bill No. 871—Alcoholic Beverages Licenses

AN ACT to add a new section to Article 2B of the Annotated Code of Maryland (1954 Supplement), title "Alcoholic Beverages," subtitle "General Provisions on Issue of Licenses," said new section to be known as Section 45A and to follow immediately after Section 45, relating to the number of licenses that a person, partnership, firm or corporation may have an interest in, in Baltimore County.

May 18, 1955

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

Dear Mr. Speaker:

The codification of the Alcoholic Beverage laws to be found in Article 2B of the Annotated Code of Maryland (1951 Edition) is one of the most confusing articles of the Code because of its county to county variance, often in matters of insignificant detail. Uniformity is the exception rather than the rule.

Section 39 of Article 2B prohibits issuance of more than one license to any person or for the use of any partnership, corporation or unincorporated association in any political subdivision of the State. The language is clear and unambiguous. House Bill 871 attempts to restate this general prohibition in more elaborate language, to be applicable only in Baltimore County. This would be