

Title of the act of 1906, ch. 218, prohibiting the sale of liquors in Garrett county within five miles of Henry Station, held sufficient. *Clark v. Tower*, 104 Md. 177.

Title of act of 1898, ch. 532, enabling the registered, qualified voters of Cecil county to decide whether liquors should be sold in said county, held sufficient. Cases reviewed. *Price v. Liquor License Commr's*, 98 Md. 351.

Title of the act of 1882, ch. 92, known as the "Local Option Law for Harford County," held sufficient. *Slymer v. State*, 62 Md. 243.

Act of 1916, ch. 594, provides for increasing the liquor license fees in the various localities of the state, and the title, after stating the position of the act in the code and its primary purpose, provided that the additional license fees were to be paid to the state treasurer for general state purposes, whereas the body of the act provides that such fees should be disposed of as other license fees now provided by law, etc.; the act was held not invalid under this section. Cases construing this section, and principles governing such construction, reviewed. *Ruehl v. State*, 130 Md. 189.

Act of 1916, ch. 340, providing for the creation by popular vote of anti-saloon territory in Carroll county, etc., held not to embrace more than one subject, within the meaning of this section. Title of said act, held sufficient. Cases under this section reviewed. *Crouse v. State*, 130 Md. 366; *Poisel v. Cash*, 130 Md. 374.

Sec. 9F of ch. 31 of the act of 1916, regulating the sale and granting of licenses for the sale of liquors in Baltimore county, held germane to the subject of that act, as set forth in its title. Cases under this section reviewed. *Benesch v. State*, 129 Md. 508.

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

Act of 1916, ch. 30, the local option law for several counties and municipalities, does not violate the portion of this section providing that acts shall embrace but one subject which shall be described in its title. Purpose of this provision. *Kelly v. State*, 139 Md. 207.

#### *Acts relating to roads.*

Title of the act of 1910, ch. 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.

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

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

Title of the act of 1902, ch. 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.*

Title Ch. 239, 1937, held sufficient. *Goldsmith v. Mead Johnson & Co.*, Daily Record, July 1, 1939.

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; *Drennen v. Banks*, 80 Md. 317; *Ruggles v. State*, 120 Md. 564; *Todd v. Frostburg*, 141 Md. 694.

Where the title of an act is "To Amend Art. 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.

Title of the act of 1898, ch. 206, repealing and re-enacting certain sections of art. 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, ch. 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, ch. 635, amending the law relative to "Public Education," held sufficient. *Worcester County v. School Commissioners*, 113 Md. 305.

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

Title of the act of 1894, ch. 380, repealing art. 72 of the Code, title "Oysters," and re-enacting the same with amendments, held sufficient. *State v. Applegarth*, 81 Md. 303.

Title of the act of 1874, ch. 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.