117 Md. 383; Bond *v.* Baltimore, 116 Md. 688; Curtis *v.* Mactier, 115 Md. 393; Mitchell *v.* State, 115 Md. 362; Worcester County *v.* School Commissioners, 113 Md. 307; Whiteley *v.* Baltimore, 113 Md. 545; Mt. Vernon Co. *v.* Frankfort Co., 111 Md. 566; Nutwell *v.* Anne Arundel County, 110 Md. 670; Kingan Assn. *v.* Lloyd, 110 Md. 624; Somerset County *v.* Pocomoke Bridge Co., 109 Md. 3; Himmel *v.* Eichengreen, 107 Md. 613; Jeffers *v.* Annapolis, 107 Md. 273; State *v.* Cumberland, etc., R. R. Co., 105 Md. 482; Fout *v.* Frederick County, 105 Md. 563; Christmas *v.* Warfield, 105 Md. 541; Baltimore *v.* Flack, 104 Md. 114; State *v.* German Savings Bank, 103 Md. 200; Queen Anne's County *v.* Talbot County, 99 Md. 17; Kafka *v.* Wilkinson, 99 Md. 240; Price *v.* Liquor License Commissioners, 98 Md. 351; Mealey *v.* Hagerstown, 92 Md. 743; Stevens *v.* State, 89 Md. 675; Phinney *v* Sheppard Hospital, 88 Md. 636; State *v.* Schultz Co., 83 Md. 61; Drennen *v.* Banks, 80 Md. 316; Scharf *v.* Tasker, 73 Md. 383; Catholic Cathedral *v.* Manning, 72 Md. 132; State *v.* Norris, 70 Md. 95; Maryland Agricultural College *v.* Keating, 58 Md. 584; Baltimore *v.* Reitz, 50 Md. 579; Dorchester County *v.* Meekins, 50 Md. 40; Davis *v.* State, 7 Md. 160.

Sec. 8 of the act of 1906, ch. 401, held not to impose upon street railway companies whose charters required them only to repair the streets between their tracks, the obligation to repave such streets between the tracks, since there was no indication in the title of said act that such a provision was contained in the act, or that the companies' charters were to be amended. United Rwys. & Elec. Co. *v.* Baltimore, 121 Md. 557.

The first clause of this section is directory and not mandatory; hence an act, the title of which is "An Act————Telegraph Companies, etc." (describing the subject of the act), and then proceeding, "Be It Enacted by the People of the State of Maryland Represented in the General Assembly," is valid. Postal Telegraph Co. *v.* State, 110 Md. 608; Prince George's County *v.* B. & O. R. Co., 113 Md. 182; McPherson *v.* Leonard, 29 Md. 386 (*cf.* dissenting opinion); Levin *v.* Hewes, 118 Md. 635. And see Maxwell *v.* State, 40 Md. 301 (dissenting opinion); Williams *v.* Broening, Mayor, 135 Md. 232.

The portion of this section providing that an act shall be divided into articles and sections, is directory and not mandatory. Anderson *v.* Baker, 23 Md. 585 and 570; Dorchester County *v.* Meekins, 50 Md. 45.

This section will be liberally construed to effectuate and not to destroy the legislative will. The portion of this section directing public general laws to be enacted in articles and sections in the same manner as the code is arranged, held to have been substantially complied with. Hardesty *v.* Taft, 23 Md. 525.

The portion of this section (as it stood in the Constitution of 1864), providing that "No law, etc., shall be revived, amended or repealed by reference to its title or section only," held not to defeat the repeal of a pre-existing law by the implication resulting from a subsequent inconsistent or contradictory enactment. Purpose of the above portion of this section. Davis *v.* State, 7 Md. 158.

Under this section and the legislative practice, where the repealing law contains a substantial re-enactment of the previous law, the operation of the latter continues uninterrupted. This principle applied to act of 1900, ch. 207, repealing and re-enacting the act of 1888, ch. 395, which in turn repealed and re-enacted the act of 1884, ch. 485, all dealing with the redemption of ground rents. Swan *v.* Kemp, 97 Md. 691.

In the light of art. 1, sec. 8 of the An. Code, the act of 1916, ch. 704, sec. 184, providing for builders' licenses does not violate the portion of this section providing that a law shall embrace but one subject which shall be described in the title. Appellee's contention was based on the fact that the title related to "Construction Firms or Companies," while the section was applicable to any "person, firm or corporation." State *v.* Case, 132 Md. 273.

Title need not contain an abstract of the bill nor give its provisions in detail, but it must not be misleading by apparently limiting the enactment to a much narrower scope than the body of the act; nor ought it to be such as to divert attention from the matter contained in the body of the act. Purpose of this section. See notes to art. 49, sec. 7, of the Code. State *v.* King, 124 Md. 497.

In order to comply with this section, though the title need not give an abstract of the act, yet it must sufficiently describe the subject-matter and must not be misleading by apparently limiting the enactment to a much narrower scope than the body of the act embraces. A section which was attempted to be repealed and re-enacted with amendments by an act neither the title nor enacting clause of which referred to such section, held void. Baltimore *v.* Williams, 124 Md. 510.