

tor from Western Maryland or Central Maryland who wanted to persuade laborers on the lower Eastern Shore to move to the coal mines of Garrett County or the wheat fields of Frederick would be undisturbed, while a truck farmer in Delaware could not make the solicitation. It is difficult under these circumstances to see a valid basis for classification between interstate and intrastate solicitation.

A third and similar ground for possible unconstitutionality is interference with the privileges and immunities of the farm laborer to move freely from one part of the country to the other.

Fourth, the Bill would grant an administrative body or agent an uncontrolled delegation of legislative power without any standards or guides. In effect, the Bill would give the agency or the agent absolute control over the economy of the County as far as farm labor is concerned.

All of these grounds would seem to add up to a conclusion that sound legislation and fairness do not combine in the present Bill.

Very truly yours,

(s) HALL HAMMOND,

Attorney General

HH:MH

FEES OF OFFICERS

May 7, 1951

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

Dear Mr. Speaker:

House Bill No. 333, which increases certain fees of the equity courts of Baltimore City is in violation of the constitutional provision of Section 45 of Article 3, which provides:

“The General Assembly shall provide a simple and uniform system of charges in the offices of clerks of courts and registers of wills in the counties of this State and the City of Baltimore.”

Therefore, I am returning House Bill No. 333 without my approval.

Respectfully,

THEODORE R. MCKELDIN,

Governor