

vetoed House Bill 334. House Bill 334 was presented to me on April 2, 1991 and must be acted on by May 2, 1991.

This bill would permit the Attorney General, the State Prosecutor, and any State's Attorney to obtain a court order that would authorize the interception of mobile telephone communications anywhere within the State. Normally, I would have had 50 days in which to consider this legislation. Because of its early presentment, however, I have had only 24 post-session days to evaluate House Bill 334. This period has proven insufficient to weigh the legislation's legal and constitutional sufficiency, the effect of potential conflicting amendments, and comments from agencies and the public regarding policy considerations.

Fortunately, Senate Bill 153 was also passed by the General Assembly and accomplishes the same purpose. Senate Bill 153 was presented at the normal time, giving me the full 50 days to evaluate the legislation. Therefore, I will be able to consider the issue and decide whether to sign or veto Senate Bill 153 before May 28, 1991.

Sincerely,
William Donald Schaefer
Governor

House Bill No. 334

AN ACT concerning

Wiretapping – Mobile Telephones

FOR the purpose of permitting the Attorney General, the State Prosecutor, and any State's Attorney to obtain a court order under certain circumstances that authorizes the interception of certain mobile telephone communications anywhere within the ~~territorial jurisdiction of the State~~ State; and generally relating to wiretapping and mobile telephone.

BY repealing and reenacting, with amendments,
Article – Courts and Judicial Proceedings
Section 10-408(c)
Annotated Code of Maryland
(1989 Replacement Volume and 1990 Supplement)

SECTION 1. BE IT ENACTED BY THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY OF MARYLAND, That the Laws of Maryland read as follows: