

A statute requiring a bond to be executed with "sufficient securities," can not be construed under this section to call for only one surety. *Harris v. Register*, 70 Md. 109.

This section applied so as to entitle more than one surety to sue under art. 8, sec. 5. *Fuhrman v. Fuhrman*, 115 Md. 443.

See notes to art. 3, sec. 29, Md. Constitution.

An. Code, sec. 8. 1904, sec. 8. 1888, sec. 8.

9. Wherever an oath is required by this code an affirmation shall be sufficient, if made by a person conscientiously scrupulous of taking an oath.

The affidavit need not show on its face that the party affirming was conscientiously scrupulous of taking an oath. *Loney v. Bailey*, 43 Md. 16.

An. Code, sec. 9. 1904, sec. 9. 1896, ch. 113. 1898, ch. 75.

10. The form of Judicial and all other oaths to be taken or administered in this State, and not prescribed by the Constitution, shall be as follows: "In the presence of Almighty God I do solemnly promise or declare," etc. And it shall not be lawful to add to any oath the words "So help me God," or any imprecatory words whatever.

A mortgage sale will not be set aside because the tax affidavits to the assignments of mortgage state that the affiant "made oath on the Holy Evangely of Almighty God and in due form of law"; surplusage. *Tolson v. Williams*, 136 Md. 616.

An. Code, sec. 10. 1904, sec. 10. 1896, ch. 113. 1898, ch. 75.

11. The manner of administering oaths shall be by requiring the person making the same to hold up his hand in token of his recognition of the solemnity of the act, except in those cases wherein this form is not practicable, or when it shall appear that some other mode is more binding upon the conscience of the swearer.

See notes to sec. 10.

An. Code, sec. 11. 1904, sec. 11. 1888, sec. 9.

12. The boundaries and limits of each of the counties of this State and of the city of Baltimore shall remain as now established.

See art. 75, sec. 160, *et seq.*

An. Code, sec. 12. 1904, sec. 12. 1888, sec. 10.

13. Where the public general law and the public local law of any county, city, town or district are in conflict, the public local law shall prevail.

The general law as to assessment for taxation held to prevail over the general terms of the charter of Hyattsville covering assessments. Hyattsville held to have no power to assess personal property of the C. & P. Telephone Company. See notes to art. 81, secs. 2, 249 and 259. *Hyattsville v. C. & P. Tel. Co.*, 131 Md. 599.

This section does not remove a public local law from ordinary rules of construction; it applies to general and local laws adopted by the Code, but as to subsequent legislation, it does not alter the common law rules of construction. *Alexander v. Baltimore*, 53 Md. 100. See also *State v. Falkenham*, 73 Md. 466.

This section applied. *McCracken v. State*, 71 Md. 150; *Ex Parte Tax Sale*, 42 Md. 200; *Albert v. White*, 33 Md. 304; *Hammond v. Haines*, 25 Md. 558.

For cases in which there was held to be no conflict, see *Cooper v. Holmes*, 71 Md. 20; *Snowden v. State*, 69 Md. 208; *Baltimore County v. Baker*, 44 Md. 9.

Cited but not construed in *Weber v. State*, 116 Md. 410. *State v. Baltimore County*, 29 Md. 520.