

money for such purposes nor for an apportionment of the cost of the building. *Revell v. Annapolis*, 81 Md. 13.

Sec. 19 of act 1870, ch. 260, incorporating the town of Laurel provided that certain labor or money levied or taxed upon the owners of property or residents within said town should be turned over to the commissioners of Laurel and be spent by them for the improvement of roads, etc.; the law was a local and not a special one. *Prince George's County v. Commissioners of Laurel*, 51 Md. 460.

Act of 1868, ch. 411, relating to the public roads of Baltimore county; a local and not a special law. *State v. Baltimore County*, 29 Md. 519.

Act 1906, ch. 566, modifying the park tax payable by the United Railways Company of Baltimore upon certain gross receipts, authorizing the board of estimates to grant a certain franchise to said company in perpetuity, and modifying the powers of the board of estimates, held not to violate this section or art. 15 of the Declaration of Rights. Objects of this section. There is a wide difference between a special act within the meaning of this section, and an act for special purposes. Partial exemption from taxation, held not unreasonable. *Baltimore v. United Rys. & E. Co.*, 126 Md. 45.

Act 1874, ch. 221, providing for the measurement of oysters in the shell at certain designated places and at all packing establishments in the state; such act was not a special law within the meaning of this section, nor was there in existence at the time it was passed a general law on the subject. *McGrath v. State*, 46 Md. 634.

Act 1882, ch. 47, authorizing a street railway company to operate passenger railways upon certain streets in Baltimore—there was no general law covering the same subject. *Hodges v. Baltimore Union P. Ry. Co.*, 58 Md. 621.

Act 1890, ch. 263, incorporating the Fidelity and Deposit Company and authorizing it to become sole surety in cases where two or more sureties are required—there was no general law authorizing said company to become surety on a trustee's bond. The provision of the general law that any trustee for the benefit of creditors should give a bond with sureties, had reference to individual or personal suretyship. *Gans v. Carter*, 77 Md. 8.

Act 1914, ch. 197, exempting mortgages held by domestic fire insurance companies from taxation. See notes to art. 81, sec. 15. *Baltimore v. German American Fire Ins. Co.*, 132 Md. 382.

Act directing the board of police commissioners of Baltimore city to pay pensions to a retired matron and to certain former police officials or their widows. *Police Pension Cases*, 131 Md. 316.

Act 1876, ch. 220, directing Baltimore city to take possession of Harman's bridge over Gwynn's Falls. *Pumphrey v. Baltimore*, 47 Md. 153.

Act 1876, ch. 101, providing for the completion of Wilkens avenue in Baltimore city; the purposes of said act could not have been accomplished under any existing general law. *O'Brian v. Baltimore County*, 51 Md. 21.

Act 1900, ch. 147, regulating the number, jurisdiction, duties and compensation of justices of the peace and constables of Baltimore county; the act of 1900 was a local law as distinguished from a special law. *Herbert v. Baltimore County*, 97 Md. 645.

Act of 1906, ch. 794, providing for the taxation of mortgages in certain counties, since "there is no general law now existing providing for the taxation of mortgages in Wicomico county." *Miller v. Wicomico County*, 107 Md. 438.

Act 1894, ch. 546, providing for the removal of the county seat of Charles county if the voters so determine and for the erection of a court house, etc., since there was no general law on this subject. *Hamilton v. Carroll*, 82 Md. 337-8.

The portion of this section forbidding the passage of a special law where there is an existing general law, has respect to the future passage of a special law in a matter already provided for by a general law. This provision not violated by the section of the Code *re* negro apprentices. *Brown v. State*, 23 Md. 507 (based on the Constitution of 1864).

Though art. 56, sec. 159, only applies in Baltimore, it is not a special law. Distinction between general and local law. See notes to art. 56, sec. 159, of Code. *Grossfield v. Baughman*, 148 Md. 333.

See notes to Code, art. 56, sec. 302.

Art. 65, secs. 59 *et seq.*, relating to Veterans' Guardianship, not in violation of this section.

This section applied in holding invalid ch. 497 of 1931, exempting W., B. & A. Elec. R. Co. from taxation. *Mayor v. Williams*, 61 Fed. (2nd), 374.

Ch. 497, 1931, exempting W., B. & A. Elec. R. Co. not repugnant to this section. *Williams v. Mayor*, 289 U. S. 45.

Ch. 425, 1884, incorporating the Md. Title Insurance and Trust Co. and all amendments thereto, not in violation of this section or sec. 48. *State v. Title Guarantee and Trust Co.*, 168 Md. 376.

Ch. 418 of 1916, making a certain road in Baltimore County a county road, held not to be special Act under this section. *Willis v. Baltimore*, 173 Md. 28.

Ch. 94, Acts of 1937, relating to voting machines in Baltimore City, not special law within meaning of this section; "special law" means special law for a special case. *Norris v. Baltimore*, 172 Md. 682.