

and place on *probation before conviction* any person accused of a crime over which jurisdiction is obtained [emphasis added].” However, the body of the bill, which is an amendment to Article 52, Section 19 (1) of the Annotated Code of Maryland (1964 Replacement Volume and 1965 Supplement), confers the power to “place such person on *probation before commitment* [emphasis added].”

There is a clear distinction between “probation before conviction” and “probation before commitment.” See *State v. Jacobs*, 234 Md. 452. Therefore, the bill does not appear to us to be sufficiently described in its title; and it is our opinion that it is invalid under the terms of Article III, Section 29, of the Constitution of Maryland.

Very truly yours,

(s) THOMAS B. FINAN,

Attorney General.

House Bill No. 314—Baltimore City—Municipal Court

AN ACT to repeal and re-enact, with amendments, Section 112 of Article 26 of the Annotated Code of Maryland (1965 Supplement), title “Courts,” subtitle “Municipal Court of Baltimore City,” to provide for a right of removal within the same division of the Municipal Court of Baltimore City upon suggestion in writing under affidavit rather than suggestion, the granting of which is within the discretion of the judge.

May 6, 1966.

Honorable Marvin Mandel
Speaker of the House of Delegates
State House
Annapolis, Maryland

Dear Mr. Speaker:

In accordance with the provisions of Article 2, Section 17 of the Maryland Constitution, I have today vetoed House Bill 314.

This Bill authorizes the removal for trial from one Judge to another Judge of the Municipal Court of Baltimore City merely upon the suggestion in writing under affidavit that a person cannot obtain a fair and impartial trial. It eliminates the present provision which has a requirement that it must satisfactorily appear to the Judge that such suggestion that a fair trial cannot be obtained is true or that there are reasonable grounds for the same.

The Chairman of the Permanent Commission on Municipal Courts and an overwhelming majority of the Judges of the Municipal Court of Baltimore City have recommended that this Bill be vetoed. They point out that the Bill, if enacted into law, would seriously impede the expeditious dispatch of the Courts' work and cause