

violation to fish in designated rivers, creeks, etc., with a net of any kind, except fyke and gill nets.

In the interest of conservation, it is considered advisable to prevent netting in the spawning season. Officials of the Conservation Commission suggest that for the protection of fish during the particular season involved, the bill should be vetoed.

FORESTRY.

Chapter 737 (House Bill 360). This measure would require the State Forester to develop a recreational area at a specified location in Prince George's County. It vests no discretion in this official, but makes it mandatory that the area be provided.

The State Forester thinks it would be a waste of money to have the recreational area located as provided in the bill. It would seem to be contrary to public policy to have such a State official forced to locate such areas in places where his expert knowledge and experience force him to the conclusion that it would be improper and unwise.

Under the circumstances, I am required to veto the bill.

FREDERICK CITY.

Chapter 339 (Senate Bill 407). This bill provides for a City Manager form of government in Frederick City. The Attorney General rules that this bill is "clearly unconstitutional" because it contains no express charter powers and is an improper delegation of legislative power.

GARRETT COUNTY.

Chapter 271 (Senate Bill 78). The Attorney General advises that while this bill purports to be a local measure relating to Garrett County, it changes the date on which interest is due on State as well as County taxes. Inasmuch as there would result a situation where taxpayers in Garrett County would be afforded a period of grace not given to taxpayers in other counties, the Attorney General advises that the bill is contrary to State law. The State Law Department also advises that it is inconsistent with Chapter 387, which allows counties to fix discounts by resolution. It was suggested that the bill be vetoed.

Chapter 590 (House Bill 782). This bill relates to classes of delinquent taxes in Garret County and is to be considered in connection with the preceding measure (Senate Bill 78) and according to the opinion given by the Attorney General also should be vetoed for the reasons applying to the foregoing measure.