

The title of the act of 1910, ch. 180, creating the public service commission, held sufficient under this section; purpose and construction of this section. See notes to art. 23, sec. 349, of the Code. *Thrift v. Laird*, 125 Md. 69.

Title of the act of 1912, ch. 32, restricting the liability of Baltimore city for injuries due to the unsafe condition of the Patapsco River, is not in violation of this section. *Foard Co. v. Maryland*, 219 Fed. 828.

Title of Baltimore city ordinance, No. 332, approved July 25, 1913, prescribing certain regulations of the markets in said city, held sufficient under this section, since it repeals and reordains with amendments, certain sections of art. 23 of the Baltimore City Code. *Baltimore v. Wollman*, 123 Md. 313.

Act of 1914, ch. 250, authorizing the mayor, etc., of Mount Ranier to issue bonds and use the proceeds for constructing a sewer and water system, etc., held invalid, because its title was defective under this section. Cases reviewed. *Weber v. Probey*, 125 Md. 549.

Under a title calling for one bill, a different act may not be validly passed. *Thrift v. Towers*, 127 Md. 60.

This section referred to in stating that where the meaning of an act is doubtful, its title may be referred to. *Maxwell v. State*, 40 Md. 306 (dissenting opinion).

Cited but not construed in *Foote v. Claggett*, 116 Md. 232; *B. & O. R. R. Co. v. Waters*, 105 Md. 416; *Prince George's County v. Laurel*, 70 Md. 445.

See notes to sec. 30 (this article), and to art. 46, sec. 1, and art. 23, sec. 147, An. Code.

Sec. 30. Every bill, when passed by the General Assembly, and sealed with the Great Seal, shall be presented to the Governor, who, if he approves it, shall sign the same in the presence of the presiding officers and chief clerks of the Senate and House of Delegates. Every law shall be recorded in the office of the Court of Appeals, and in due time be printed, published and certified under the Great Seal, to the several courts, in the same manner as has been heretofore usual in this State.

Governor's signature.

Where a bill is passed and sealed as directed, it may be presented to the Governor and signed after the close of the session of the legislature, provided the Governor signs it within six days from the time the bill is presented. *Lankford v. Somerset County*, 73 Md. 105. (See also, concurring and dissenting opinions in this case); *Johnson v. Luers*, 129 Md. 523.

If a bill is not sealed as required by this section, there is no legal presentation of it to the Governor, and hence he may properly refuse to sign it. Sec. 17 of art. 2, is consistent with this article. The scope of arts. 2 and 3 of the Constitution, differentiated. *Hamilton v. State ex rel. Wells*, 61 Md. 28.

Where the Governor signs a bill by inadvertence and under a misapprehension as to what the paper is, and without having gone through the mental operation of approving the bill, he does not approve it as required by this section, and his signature is null and void in so far as it affords evidence of his approval thereof. No one other than the Governor has possession of a bill after it is signed by him until it is sent to the clerk of the court of appeals. *Allegany County v. Warfield*, 100 Md. 518; *Nowell v. Harrington*, 122 Md. 491.

Generally.

Courts are not precluded by an authentication of a statute in the manner prescribed by this section from passing upon the question of whether the bill was constitutionally passed; but an authenticated statute cannot be impeached by the legislative journals alone or by mere parol evidence. Cases reviewed and distinguished. Evidence held insufficient to overcome the due authentication of an act. The bill need be engrossed only in the house in which it originated. *Ridgely v. Baltimore*, 119 Md. 583; *Berry v. Baltimore, etc., R. R. Co.*, 41 Md. 461; *Legg v. Annapolis*, 42 Md. 220; *Jessup v. Baltimore*, 121 Md. 562.

In proving the contents of an act of assembly, the court cannot permit extrinsic evidence so as to go behind the evidence provided for by this section; hence it may not be proved that the provisions of an act are different from those set out in the published volume which is an exact transcript of the copy recorded in the court