

troller explained that although the bill was designed as a local bill, his office was of the opinion that it is not a local bill, but of such a nature that it would disturb the entire State setup with respect to State wholesale beer licenses.

Because of the doubt expressed by the Attorney General, and the views expressed by Mr. Roger V. Laynor, Chief of the Alcoholic Beverages Division of the Comptroller's office, I am forced to veto this particular bill and am returning the same to your body.

Sincerely yours,

(s) J. MILLARD TAWES,

Governor.

JMT/S/db

House Bill No. 690—Baltimore, Worcester, Harford and Kent Counties; Testamentary Law

AN ACT to add new Section 47A to Article 93 of the Annotated Code of Maryland (1957 Edition), title "Testamentary Law", sub-title "Administration by an Executor", to follow immediately after Section 47 thereof, relating to and prohibiting certain actions of banks and trust companies with respect to administration of testamentary estates in Harford County, BALTIMORE, WORCESTER AND KENT COUNTIES.

Honorable Perry O. Wilkinson
Speaker of the House of Delegates
State House
Annapolis, Maryland

Dear Mr. Speaker:

After serious consideration, I have concluded that I should veto House Bill No. 289 and House Bill No. 690, which were enacted at the recent session of the General Assembly. In accordance with Article II, Section 17 of the Constitution of Maryland, I herewith return these two bills to the House of Delegates, in which they originated, and will set forth my objections to them herein.

These similar (but not identical) bills relate to and would prohibit certain acts of banks and trust companies with respect to administration of testamentary estates in Talbot, Harford, Baltimore, Worcester and Kent Counties. I am advised that were these bills to become law, Maryland would be the first State in the nation with such legislation on its statute books. In view of the long and honorable history of the banks and trust companies of this State in the administration of estates as fiduciaries, it seems to me that compelling reasons for legislation of this sort ought to exist before these bills are allowed to become law. With due deference to the General Assembly, it is my belief that such compelling reasons do not exist. To the contrary, I believe that there are many cogent reasons why these bills should not become law.

Essentially, these bills have to do with the relationship between lawyers and corporate fiduciaries. Historically, this relationship in the State of Maryland has been harmonious. In Baltimore City, where a number of our large banks and trust companies have their principal offices, there has for many years been in existence an Agreement between these corporate fiduciaries and the Bar Association of that