

(a) would have to be tried in the county adjacent to the waters where the violation occurred, whereas offense (b), being a common law misdemeanor, would have to be tried, under the provisions of Section 675 of Article 27, in the county where the violator was arrested or into which he was first brought. This split jurisdiction would undoubtedly result in delay, inconvenience and additional expense to the State and the defendant.

"On the whole, this Act is so contradictory, ambiguous and ineptly drawn as to leave serious doubt of the real intention of the General Assembly. It is my opinion the Act is inoperative and of doubtful constitutionality."

Respectfully,

(s) THEODORE R. MCKELDIN,

Governor

TRMcK/A

Senate Bill No. 110—Dogs Engaged in Fox Hunting

AN ACT to repeal and re-enact, with amendments, Section 195 (c) of Article 66C of the Annotated Code of Maryland (1951 Edition), title "Natural Resources", sub-title "Deer", ~~excepting Talbot County from the prohibition against hunting deer with dogs, and correcting certain wording therein.~~ EXEMPTING DOGS USED IN FOX HUNTING IN CERTAIN COUNTIES FROM THE PROVISIONS ALLOWING THE KILLING OF DOGS PURSUING DEER.

May 18, 1955

Honorable Louis L. Goldstein  
President of the Senate  
State House  
Annapolis, Maryland

Dear Mr. President:

Senate Bill 110, as originally introduced, purported to exempt Talbot County from the provisions of Section 195 (c) of Article 66C of the Annotated Code of Maryland (1951 Edition), making it unlawful to use dogs in hunting deer. The bill was amended to include some eleven counties, including Talbot. In final form, it does not in direct language, legalize the use of dogs to hunt deer in those counties, but prohibits killing of dogs which are engaged in fox hunting and have broken away therefrom.

In 1953, I vetoed (page 1867, Acts of 1953) a bill which would have wholly exempted a number of counties from the provisions of Section 195 (c). The widespread opposition to that change is insignificant in comparison to the present opposition to this bill. I have received letters from all parts of the state from owners of farms, large and small, state game authorities, sportsmen, wild life and hunting associations, as well as strongly worded petitions from hundreds of people unanimously expressing disapproval of this bill. Their arguments are obviously sincere and well intentioned, and