

availability of plans and specifications for these projects, emphasize my conviction that the Bill must be vetoed.

Sincerely yours,

(s) J. MILLARD TAWES,

Governor.

JMT/S/els
Encl.

House Bill No. 676—Washington County; Alcoholic Beverages

AN ACT to repeal and re-enact, with amendments, Section 6(b) of Article 2B of the Annotated Code of Maryland (1957 Edition), title "Alcoholic Beverages", sub-title "Manufacturer's and Wholesaler's Licenses", sub-heading "Privileges", and to add new Section 6(f) to said Article of the Code, said new section to follow immediately after Section 6(e) thereof, providing that holders of Class 1, Class 3 and Class 4 Wholesaler's Licenses shall comply with certain requirements in order to sell beer in Washington County.

May 5, 1959.

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

Dear Mr. Speaker:

As required by Article II, Section 17 of the Maryland Constitution, I am today returning to the House of Delegates House Bill No. 676, recently vetoed by me, along with my reasons for vetoing the same.

This bill was introduced by the Washington County delegation, and I understand that it was done to correct a situation now prevailing in that County. The bill requires detailed facilities in Washington County by all persons holding State beer wholesaler's licenses issued by the Comptroller's office before selling beer to retail dealers within the County. The bill as written denies the privileges of those holding State wholesale beer licenses to sell in Washington County unless they first comply with the detailed restrictions set forth in the bill. These restrictions include a warehouse situated within the County containing not less than 900 square feet of area space with two employees assigned thereto, a telephone answering service during regular business hours, and an inventory of not less than 1,000 cases of beer, and one beer delivery truck. These requirements, the bill states, are to be determined by the Comptroller, and upon his endorsement, Washington County will be designated as included within the privileges of the license. The bill further states that these facilities are to be maintained, otherwise the privileges will be cancelled.

I have discussed this bill with the office of the State Comptroller as well as with the office of the Attorney General.

The Attorney General, by letter dated April 8, 1959, advised me that he believed the bill to be constitutional, although he stated there are certain areas of doubt as to whether or not this bill would constitute legislating in favor of a class.

The State Comptroller's office has advised me that in the opinion of that office, the provisions of this bill are not practical. The Comp-