

As a result of the advice given me by the Attorney General's office, I am returning House Bill No. 733 to your body with the hope that you will uphold my veto action.

Sincerely yours,

(s) J. MILLARD TAWES,

JMT/LS/db

Governor.

House Bill No. 809—Worcester County; Bingo

AN ACT to add a new Section 251A to Article 27 of the Annotated Code of Maryland (1957 Edition), title "Crimes and Punishments", sub-title "Gaming", to follow immediately after Section 251 thereof, authorizing the conduct and operation of games of bingo in Worcester County, providing for the appointment of a Board to administer this law, specifying the powers and duties of this Board and relating generally to the playing of bingo in Worcester County; making this Act effective on June 1, 1959, but providing that its continued effectiveness and applicability shall be contingent upon the results of a referendum election in Worcester County to be held in conjunction with the regular Congressional election therein in the month of November, 1960.

May 5, 1959.

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

Dear Mr. Speaker:

House Bill No. 809 has been vetoed by me today. Article II, Section 17 of the Maryland Constitution requires me to return all vetoed bills to the House of origin; consequently, I am herewith returning the same to you along with my reasons for vetoing this legislation.

In a letter received from the Attorney General dated April 29, 1959, he states:

"I have reviewed House Bill No. 809 and find, in my opinion, that the title to the bill is misleading, and therefore violates Article III, Section 29 of the Maryland Constitution.

"The title to House Bill No. 809 indicates that the playing of bingo in Worcester County is to become effective June 1, 1959 and that its continued effectiveness is to be contingent upon the results of a referendum election in Worcester County in the month of November 1960, whereas, in fact, the body of the bill provides the playing of bingo in Worcester County is to become effective only if approved by the voters at the referendum election to be held in Worcester County in the month of November 1960."

The Maryland Court of Appeals has held in several cases, among them being *Ridgely vs. Baltimore*, (119 Md. 567) and *Lewin vs. Hewes* (118 Md. 624), that the title to an Act must not be misleading or divert attention from the actual matters contained in the Act.

It is my feeling that the title to this bill is misleading and is not consistent with the language in the body of the bill. For this reason,