

in House Bill 1421, none of the amendments are inconsistent with any of the others. The net result will be a new 16(k) (as per House Bill 1421) and a new 16(l) (the former 16(k) with references to Charles, Garrett and Howard Counties deleted. We should also point out that in amending what is presently section 16(k), three stylistic changes are made by the three bills. One is made consistently in all three bills, one is made only in House Bill 1621 and the third is made in House Bills 1421 and 1621 (but not in Senate Bill 1034). It is our view that all three stylistic changes will be given effect. None of the matters discussed above affects the validity of any of the three bills.

A more serious problem, however, is posed by that portion of Section 2 of House Bill 1621 which purports to repeal and re-enact with amendments Section 25(j) of Article 2B. Prior to the intended 1975 amendment, this subsection provided for a special Class D beer license in Charles and St. Mary's Counties. In addition to making several changes of both substantive matters and of clarifying language, House Bill 1621 deletes from the existing law the reference to St. Mary's County (lines 120-121).

House Bill 1621 is entitled:

"AN ACT concerning

Charles County - Alcoholic Beverages

For the purpose of providing that a certain alcoholic beverage license may be issued in Charles County; providing that a certain other class of license may be issued in Charles County for certain conditions and for a certain period of time; including Charles County within certain provisions of the alcoholic beverage laws; relating to appeals from a decision of the Board of License Commissioners; clarifying language; and generally relating to alcoholic beverages in Charles County."

Nothing contained in the title of the Act affords any indication that St. Mary's County was to be affected in any way. Article III, Section 29 of the Constitution of Maryland states in part:

"... and every Law enacted by the General Assembly shall embrace but one subject, and that shall be described in its title."

The Court of Appeals has stated that this constitutional provision requires that a bill's title