

For these reasons I have decided to veto House Bill 560.

Sincerely,  
/s/ Marvin Mandel  
Governor

Letter from State Law Department on House Bill 560

May 8, 1974.

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

Re: House Bill 560  
Re: House Bill 561

Dear Governor Mandel:

House Bill 560 and House Bill 561 are each unconstitutional because of titling problems. The title of the former states that it concerns "Baltimore City — Commercial Rehabilitation Bond Issue" and that the proceeds of the bond issue are to be used to guarantee, insure or make loans to owners of buildings "used or occupied for commercial purposes." However, Section 3(b) of the Bill states that the proceeds shall be used to make loans to owners of buildings "used or occupied for residential purposes." The title of the latter bill states that it concerns "Baltimore City — Home Rehabilitation Bond Issue" and that the proceeds of the bond issue are to be used to guarantee, insure or make loans to owners of buildings "used or occupies for residential purposes." However, Section 3(b) of the Bill states that the proceeds shall be used to guarantee, insure or make loans to owners of buildings "used or occupied for commercial purposes."

The conflict between the title and the substantive provisions of each bill result from the fact that the first page of House Bill 560 was attached to the last two pages of House Bill 561 and the first page of House Bill 561 was attached to the last two pages of House Bill 560. We are advised that the bills passed the legislature in this form. Because in the conflicts between the titles and the substantive provisions of the bills, I am of the opinion that the Bills are each unconstitutional. See Article III, Section 29, Maryland Constitution.

In conclusion, it should be noted that there may be some uncertainty as to the form of the bills as they passed the legislature. Whatever the event, House Bill 560 is identical to Senate Bill 286 which has been signed