

that shall be described by the title." The Act of 1854, chapter 200, relating to inspections, &c., was passed under this Constitution, (see the Act,) and the numerous matters in it. The Court of Appeals on this Act say, in *Davis vs. State*, 7 Md., 160: The law relates to inspections and to such matters only as are inseparably connected with it, and to none other, and therefore can be said to embrace but a single subject. The Court also say that an Act would not be rendered void by the introduction of a single foreign or irrelevant subject into it, and when such subject was not indicated in the title, in such case the irrelevant matter would be rejected as void, while the principal subject of the law would be supported if properly described in the title.

In *Miller vs. State*, 11 Md., 525, the same provision of the Constitution was before the Court under the Act of 1856, chapter 353, "An Act to raise additional revenue to pay the debts of the State by increasing the rates of licenses to ordinary keepers and traders." It also required venders of lager beer, manufactured by themselves, to take out license. It was held this was but one subject, though the title gave no notice of a new class, manufacturers being taxed on their own products. They were not so taxed in the amended law. (See opinion, page 531.) It affirms *Davis vs. State*.

In *Parkinson vs. State*, 14 Md., 184, the Act of 1858, chapter 55, was before the Court. (See the Act.) The Court, pages 193, 194 and 195, enters fully into this subject. They say the object of the Constitution was to prevent the practice of blending in the same law subjects not connected with each other and often entirely different.

It was to prevent "omnibus bills." Legislation is full of such bills.

The Constitution of 1867, is the same on this point as that of 1851, and will receive the same construction. The subject of the proposed bill to change the name of the "Mutual Coal Company," to that of the "Maryland Coal Company," has but one subject or object, and that a very different one, namely, to change the name of a corporate, being separate and distinct from all others. The subject is that corporation, and that alone, the name of the corporation limits and defines the subject; any legislation relating to that subject, namely, the corporation, might be embraced in one bill under the Constitution. Nobody could mistake it. No multifarious matter could get into it. What related to that corporation would be the subject and a very limited one.

The proposed bill relates only to a small part of that limited subject, namely, to the change of name.

It changes its name for the future, and also for the past, since its organization last July, when the Court decreed a change of its name, it has done business in that name since and for the correctness and certainty of its affairs, and the