

Reitz, 50 Md. 574 (1879)) to the effect that sections of laws which are discordant and dissimilar to each other violate the prohibition against laws containing more than one subject. Beshore v. Town of Bel Air, 237 Md. 398, 412 (1965).

There are only two arguable connections which could be made between the two seemingly unrelated portions of Senate Bill 788. They both do relate to Calvert County and it is true that one portion relates to the County Treasurer and the other relates to the expenditure of public funds. We do not believe that the second "connection" is a sufficient one and we are further of the opinion that the fact that both portions of the bill pertain to the same county will not support a conclusion that the bill relates to a single subject. A conclusion that applicability to a single county would by itself be a sufficient nexus would virtually immunize any public local law from the single subject requirements, and if that had been the intent then the applicable provision of the Constitution would have so provided and would not purport to apply to "[e]very law". See Curtis v. Mactier, 115 Md. 386, 394 (1911), where the Court of Appeals invalidated a law pertaining to the incorporation of the village of Chevy Chase (in Montgomery County) and authorizing the imposition of a tax by the County Commissioners of Montgomery County and the payment of its proceeds to the Chevy Chase Improvement Association as "manifestly [involving] ... two wholly distinct subjects".

Having concluded that Senate Bill 788 is in violation of the single subject requirement, it is necessary to determine if any portion of the bill can be saved. The Court of Appeals has noted that the constitutional provision in question was enacted to prevent the practice of engrafting upon proper legislation matters which members of the General Assembly were induced to sanction, and that its purpose was not to endanger the main subject of the legislation. Madison National Bank v. Newrath, 261 Md. 321 (1971). If foreign and irrelevant, or discordant, matter is found in a statute, it will be rejected if other sections of the law can stand without it. But if the statute is composed of a number of discordant and dissimilar subjects, so that no one could be clearly recognized as the controlling or principal one, the whole law would be void. The Mayor and City Council of Baltimore v. Reitz, 50 Md. 574, 579 (1879).

We see no basis upon which to conclude that one or the other of the two separate subjects covered by Senate Bill 788 is the controlling or principal or dominant subject, and it is our view that the entire bill is unconstitutional.