

straightforwardly admitted that the proposal had been made to them at the eleventh hour and that they decided to take advantage of the opportunity for revenue-producing purposes if subsequent investigation would indicate that their constituents favored it. The Delegates added that they would request my veto in the event that general sentiment seemed opposed to the Bill.

Since the adjournment of the Legislature, considerable opposition has been expressed and citizens of the County have protested vigorously against the enactment becoming law. So definite has been this expression of disapproval that the sponsors of the measure publicly announced their desire that I veto it. The County Commissioners of Montgomery County have also signified their desire that this Bill be disapproved.

I consider that I am acting in accordance with the wishes of the great majority of the people in the County, and also in fulfillment of the expressed wishes of the Delegates sponsoring the Bill when I veto the measure, which action is not to be construed as reflecting upon the motives of the Delegates in question.

If the proposal is a meritorious one, it should be brought to public attention in ample time, before legislative action, to afford citizens the opportunity to voice their sentiments. Inasmuch as circumstances combined to make careful consideration impossible in the recent Legislature, I feel that the measure should be vetoed because it represents hastily-enacted legislation which the Constitution specifically guards against by vesting in the Governor the power of veto.

JUSTICES OF THE PEACE.

Chapter 797 (House Bill 718). This measure undertakes to add a new section to Article 52 of the Code of the Public General Laws, despite the fact that it relates exclusively to Committing Magistrates in Prince George's County. The measure provides that certain of the Justices of the Peace (other than Trial Magistrates) shall perform the duties of their office at such sections of the County as the County Commissioners may designate.

The troublesome point is that the Bill provides that they may function either within or without the election district for which they were appointed. The State Law Department states that it always has been the rule in this State that Justices appointed for any particular district may not exercise their powers in another district (see Volume 23 of Attorney General, page 296. Also Volume 22, page 366).

As the State Law Department points out, further objection is noted in that the Bill states that the Justices may also, in the discretion of the County Commissioners, be appointed as