

1956

VETOES

the weight allowed refuse trucks. The bill also exempts such trucks from axle weight limitations.

The Attorney General has advised me that House Bill 263 has a defective title, and therefore it is in violation of Article III, Section 29, of the Maryland Constitution. For the reasons given in the attached copy of the Attorney General's Opinion, which is to be considered a part of this message, I believe that this bill must be vetoed.

Sincerely,

/s/ MARVIN MANDEL,

Governor.

---

Letter from the Attorney General on House Bill 263

May 22, 1972.

The Honorable Marvin Mandel  
Governor of Maryland  
State House  
Annapolis, Maryland 21404

Re: House Bill 263

Dear Governor Mandel:

At your request we have reviewed House Bill 263, which amends Section 14-111(c) of Article 66½ of the Annotated Code of Maryland (1970 Replacement Volume), to provide, according to the title of the Bill, for a five per cent (5%) tolerance on weight allowed refuse trucks under the "Size, Weight and Load" subtitle of the Article.

While the title of the Bill indicates that its purpose is to allow refuse trucks a five per cent (5%) margin on applicable weight limits, the body of the Bill exceeds that purpose; Section 1 of the Bill not only amends Section 14-111(c) of Article 66½ to add the five per cent tolerance, but also by proviso adds an exemption from all rear axle weight limitations for garbage and refuse trucks. The title attempts to describe the amendments effectuated by the Bill but fails to mention a complete exemption from certain provisions of law, which exemption would be a significant amendment of Section 14-111(c).

Article III, Section 29 of the Maryland Constitution requires that the subject of every law enacted by the General Assembly shall be described in its title. The purpose of this requirement is so that the General Assembly and the people of the State may be fairly advised of the real nature of pending legislation. *Clark's Brooklyn Park, Inc. v. Hranicka, et al*, 246 Md. 178 (1967); *Kelly v. State*, 139 Md. 204 (1921). It has also been held that one of the essentials of a good title is that it shall not be misleading, *Baltimore v. Deegan*, 163 Md. 234 (1932); and that the title must not apparently limit the enactment to a much narrower scope than the body of the Act embraces, *State v. King*, 124 Md. 471 (1914).

We think that, as to House Bill 263, we must point out that the description of the Bill as contained in its title might not be