

The title of the act of 1902, chapter 265, prohibiting the sale and giving away of liquors in Chapel district in Talbot county, held sufficient. *Parker v. State*, 99 Md. 199.

*Acts relating to roads.*

The title of the act of 1910, chapter 110, providing for the construction of a public highway in the city of Baltimore over Jones' Falls, held sufficient. *Bond v. Baltimore*, 116 Md. 684.

The title of the Act of 1904, chapter 225, dealing with public roads, and known as "The Shoemaker Road Law," held sufficient. *Fout v. Frederick County*, 105 Md. 563.

The title of the act of 1908, chapter 654, dealing with public roads in Anne Arundel county, held sufficient. *Anne Arundel County v. United Railways*, 109 Md. 377.

The title of the act of 1902, chapter 300, limiting and controlling the expenditure of money on public roads by the county commissioners of Talbot county, held sufficient. *Queen Anne's County v. Talbot County*, 99 Md. 17.

*Generally.*

Where the title of an act states that it is an act to "Repeal and Re-enact with Amendments" a certain article and section of the code and gives the number thereof, such title is sufficient. *Lankford v. Somerset County*, 73 Md. 107; *Worcester County v. School Commissioners*, 113 Md. 307; *Kingan Assn. v. Lloyd*, 110 Md. 624; *Barron v. Smith*, 108 Md. 326; *Himmel v. Eichengreen*, 107 Md. 613; *Miller v. Wicomico County*, 107 Md. 444; *State v. German Savings Bank*, 103 Md. 201; *Garrison v. Hill*, 81 Md. 555; *Dreunen v. Banks*, 80 Md. 317; *Ruggles v. State*, 120 Md. 564.

Where the title of an act is "To Amend Article 95 of the Code by Adding an Additional Section Thereto," and when the new section is strictly germane to the subject embraced in that article, the title is sufficient. *2nd Ger. Am. Bldg. Assn. v. Newman*, 50 Md. 65. And see *State v. Norris*, 70 Md. 95.

The title of the act of 1898, chapter 206, repealing and re-enacting certain sections of article 99 of the code, title "Wild Fowl, Birds and Game," and adding certain additional sections thereto, held sufficient. *Stevens v. State*, 89 Md. 675.

Where the title of an act calls for the regulation of the employment of children, the fact that the body of the act prohibits the employment of children under a certain age except under certain circumstances, does not render the law invalid; nor is an act invalid because the repeal of another act with a defective title is provided for in its title; nor because the act excepts certain counties while its title indicates that it applies to the whole state. The title of the act of 1902, chapter 566, regulating the employment of children, held sufficient. *Mt. Vernon Co. v. Frankfort Co.*, 111 Md. 561.

Where the title of an act sufficiently describes its subject but concludes with an additional description which correctly applies to only a portion of the act, the title is sufficient. The title of the act of 1908, chapter 635, amending the law relative to "Public Education," held sufficient. *Worcester County v. School Commissioners*, 113 Md. 305.

The title of the act of 1912, chapter 117, providing a new method of condemnation, held sufficient. *Ridgely v. Baltimore*, 119 Md. 572.

The title of the act of 1894, chapter 380, repealing article 72 of the code, title "Oysters," and re-enacting the same with amendments, held sufficient. *State v. Applegarth*, 81 Md. 303.

The title of the act of 1874, chapter 221, repealing and re-enacting a prior act so that oysters sold in the shell at packing establishments should be measured in an iron measure, held sufficient. *McGrath v. State*, 46 Md. 633.

A law requiring vendors of beer manufactured by themselves to take out licenses, may be validly enacted under the title "An Act to Raise Additional Revenue to Pay the Debts of the State by Increasing the Rates of Licenses to Ordinary Keepers and Traders." *Keller v. State*, 11 Md. 531.

The title of the act of 1878, chapter 159, which was in substance as follows: "To Repeal Chapter 220 of the Act of 1876, Entitled An Act to