

When portion only of act void.

Where the provision of an act which is not sufficiently indicated or described by the title of the act, is inseparably connected with the whole scheme of the act, the whole act is void. *Nutwell v. Anne Arundel County*, 110 Md. 667. *Cf. Somerset County v. Pocomoke Bridge Co.*, 109 Md. 8; *Kafka v. Wilkinson*, 99 Md. 240; *Steenken v. State*, 88 Md. 710; *Davis v. State*, 7 Md. 160.

The title of the act of 1898, chapter 505, providing for licenses to stevedores, conceded to be insufficient in so far as the law required a bond to be given; but the remainder of the law dealing with the licensing of stevedores upheld, since it was separate and independent of the portion of the law requiring bonds to be given. *Steenken v. State*. 88 Md. 710.

Section 122B of the act of 1902, chapter 338, held void because the title of the act of 1902, while it called for a repeal and re-enactment of certain sections of article 23 of the code and for an addition to said article to be known as section 122A, did not mention section 122B, which embraced affirmative legislation. The remainder of the act of 1902 upheld. *Kafka v. Wilkinson*, 99 Md. 240.

The title of the act of 1880, chapter 403, merely provided for the repeal of an act; section 2 of the act of 1880 was unconstitutional, since it enacted a new law. *Stiefel v. Md. Institute*, 61 Md. 147. *Cf. Levin v. Hewes*, 118 Md. 633.

Generally.

The title of the act of 1904, chapter 212, purporting to add an additional section to article 81 of the code to follow section 81A and to be designated as section 81B, held insufficient, since at the time of the passage of the act of 1904, there was no section 81A of article 81, and section 81 of article 81 did not relate to the franchise tax on deposits of savings banks (the subject dealt with by the act of 1904). Cases distinguished. *State v. German Savings Bk.*, 103 Md. 200.

Section 2 of the act of 1890, chapter 513, purporting to authorize the agents of certain counties to make examinations of the records in the Land Office without charge, and also to remit the sum due by a certain county for examinations previously made, held void because not sufficiently described or designated in the title of the act. *Scharf v. Tasker*, 73 Md. 383.

The title of the act of 1896, chapter 266, purporting to repeal the act of 1894, chapter 377, both relating to licenses of insurance brokers, being insufficient, the latter act was not repealed by the former. *State v. Benzinger*, 83 Md. 487.

The title of the act of 1906, chapter 804, purporting to repeal and re-enact section 2 of chapter 426 of the acts of 1904 authorizing the board of public works to collect the insurance upon certain state tobacco warehouses and to rebuild a modern warehouse, held insufficient. Cases involving the portion of this section dealing with the title of an act, reviewed and summarized. *Christmas v. Warfield*, 105 Md. 541.

Generally:

The title need not give an abstract of the act, but it must not be misleading nor divert attention from the matters contained in the act. Only the subject of the act need be described in the title; not the instrumentalities, means or procedure by which the subject is to be carried into effect. The title should be sufficiently comprehensive to cover, to a reasonable extent, all its provisions. Subjects of a private or local character must not be engrafted upon a law of a general nature, nor may two or more dissimilar and discordant subjects be embraced in the same law. Purpose of the portion of this section dealing with the title of an act; it will be liberally construed. *State v. Gurry*, 121 Md. 540; *Ridgely v. Balto. City*, 119 Md. 572; *Painter v. Mattfeldt*, 119 Md. 473; *Levin v. Hewes*, 118 Md. 631; *State v. Loden*, 117 Md. 383; *Bond v. Baltimore*, 116 Md. 688; *Curtis v. Mactier*, 115 Md. 393; *Mitchell v. State*, 115 Md. 362; *Worcester County v.*