

water supply of said city, was void under this section. *Baltimore v. Bond*, 104 Md. 591.

An ordinance of the city of Baltimore providing for the raising of one million dollars by the hypothecation of certain shares of stock and for the investment of said sum, etc., is within the scope and purvue of the portion of this section providing that no debt shall be created, etc., unless it is authorized by the legislature and approved by a majority of the legal voters of said city. Meaning of the word "debt." Intent of this section. *Baltimore v. Gill*, 31 Md. 385.

An ordinance of the city of Baltimore approved June 13, 1910, and passed in pursuance of the act of 1910, chapter 110, held not to violate this section. *Bond v. Baltimore*, 116 Md. 685.

The act of 1876, chapter 220, directing Baltimore City to take possession of Harman's bridge over Gwynn's Falls, held not to violate this section. *Pumphrey v. Baltimore*, 47 Md. 153.

Cited but not construed in *P., B. & W. R. R. Co. v. Baltimore*, 121 Md. 506.

See notes to section 1.

Sec. 8. All Laws and Ordinances now in force applicable to the City of Baltimore, not inconsistent with this Article, shall be, and they are hereby continued until changed in due course of Law.

The ordinance of 1866, providing for the appointment of school commissioners of Baltimore city by the city council was in force when the constitution of 1867 was adopted and was not inconsistent with this article; hence it continued in force "until changed in due course of law." The laws applicable to appointments generally were also continued in force by the constitution; in case of conflict between the above ordinance and the statute authorizing appointments generally, the particular method would be held to be an exception to the general method. Meaning of the phrase "until changed in due course of law." Ordinance of 1866 held not to have been "changed in due course of law;" that provision continued in force, not merely the ordinance of 1866, but the power which that ordinance contained authorizing the municipality to follow the special method of making selections for school commissioners therein prescribed. See notes to article 8, of the Md. constitution. *Hooper v. New*, 85 Md. 578.

This section referred to in construing article 15, section 3, and article 4, section 42—see notes to the former. *Smith v. Thursby*, 28 Md. 270 (dissenting opinion).

See notes to section 1.

Sec. 9. The General Assembly may make such changes in this Article, except in Section 7th thereof, as it may deem best; and this Article shall not be so construed or taken as to make the political corporation of Baltimore independent of, or free from the control which the General Assembly of Maryland has over all such Corporations in this State.

The constitution recognizes Baltimore City as a public corporation, established for public purposes, and in this character it is in no wise distinguished from the several counties; except in so far as the constitution forbids; the city, like the counties, is subject to legislative control—see notes to section 1. *Baltimore v. Gorter*, 93 Md. 5.

While it is not claimed that the legislature has unlimited control over the appellant, it may require the payment by the city of a sum requisite to pay for the maintenance and treatment of habitual drunkards in said city. *Baltimore v. Keeley Insitute*, 81 Md. 115.

This section referred to in upholding the power of the legislature to pass the act of 1876, chapter 220, directing Baltimore City to take possession of Harman's bridge over Gwynn's Falls. *Pumphrey v. Baltimore*, 47 Md. 151.