

Chapter 763 (Senate Bill 370). This measure relating to Washington County is similar in its provisions to the preceding act and for the same reasons will be vetoed.

Chapter 779 (Senate Bill 473). This measure relating to Dorchester County is similar in its provisions to the preceding act and for the same reasons will be vetoed.

#### ATTORNEYS AT LAW.

Chapter 316 (Senate Bill 290). Despite many assertions which I have heard to the effect that the Bill was simply an advisory enactment that a disbarred lawyer's conduct after his pardon ought to be considered by the Court on his plea for re-instatement, the draftsmen, perhaps unintentionally, wrote into the measure a mandate that a lawyer could *force* his reinstatement, despite the gravity of the offense for which he was convicted, solely upon a basis of a subsequent pardon by the Governor and good conduct *following* the conviction of crime. The duration of the period of subsequent good conduct was not provided for in the Bill and lawyers in various parts of the State were shocked at the prospect that an attorney convicted possibly of grave misdeeds, against the interest of his clients, could thus force his re-instatement against the wishes of the judicial branch of the government while attorneys disbarred for unethical practices not constituting a crime would have no such right or privilege.

I might add that many attorneys considered the enactment an improper usurpation of the rights of the Judiciary by the Legislative branch of the government and, for this reason, felt it would be invalid under any circumstances. It may be that the framers of the bill did not intend it to go so far. But the construction which was placed on it by the Attorney General's Office and the Bar Association officials would have given the act the most far-reaching effect.

Under the circumstances I must veto this measure.

#### BRIDGE.

Chapter 315 (Senate Bill 288). This bill purports to legalize the game of "Bridge" in Montgomery and Prince George's Counties.

Well-informed persons throughout the State are not agreed that it is unlawful to play "Bridge." If it is not unlawful, then there is no necessity for this measure. Furthermore, if it is unlawful, then it would seem the better practice to have a State-wide measure legalizing the game.

Until it is more definitely determined that the game of "Bridge" is illegal, I think it would be unwise to have this measure approved.