

*When portion only of act void.*

Where the provision of an act which is not sufficiently indicated or described by the title of the act, is inseparably connected with the whole scheme of the act, the whole act is void. *Nutwell v. Anne Arundel County*, 110 Md. 667. *Cf. Somerset County v. Pocomoke Bridge Co.*, 109 Md. 8; *Kafka v. Wilkinson*, 99 Md. 240; *Steenken v. State*, 88 Md. 710; *Davis v. State*, 7 Md. 160; *State v. King*, 124 Md. 497.

The title of the act of 1898, ch. 505, providing for licenses to stevedores, conceded to be insufficient in so far as the law required a bond to be given; but the remainder of the law dealing with the licensing of stevedores upheld, since it was separate and independent of the portion of the law requiring bonds to be given. *Steenken v. State*, 88 Md. 710.

Sec. 122B of the act of 1902, ch. 338, held void because the title of the act of 1902, while it called for a repeal and re-enactment of certain sections of art. 23 of the Code and for an addition to said article to be known as sec. 122A, did not mention sec. 122B, which embraced affirmative legislation. The remainder of the act of 1902 upheld. *Kafka v. Wilkinson*, 99 Md. 240.

Title of the act of 1880, ch. 403, merely provided for the repeal of an act; sec. 2 of the act of 1880 was unconstitutional, since it enacted a new law. *Stiefel v. Md. Institute*, 61 Md. 147. *Cf. Levin v. Hewes*, 118 Md. 633.

*Generally.*

Title of the act of 1904, ch. 212, purporting to add an additional section to art. 81 of the Code to follow sec. 81A and to be designated as sec. 81B, held insufficient, since at the time of the passage of the act of 1904, there was no sec. 81A of art. 81, and sec. 81 of art. 81 did not relate to the franchise tax on deposits of savings banks (the subject dealt with by the act of 1904). Cases distinguished. *State v. German Savings Bk.*, 103 Md. 200.

Sec. 2 of the act of 1890, ch. 513, purporting to authorize the agents of certain counties to make examinations of the records in the Land Office without charge, and also to remit the sum due by a certain county for examinations previously made, held void because not sufficiently described or designated in title of the act. *Scharf v. Tasker*, 73 Md. 383.

Title of the act of 1896, ch. 266, purporting to repeal the act of 1894, ch. 377, both relating to licenses of insurance brokers, being insufficient, the latter act was not repealed by the former. *State v. Benzinger*, 83 Md. 487.

Title of the act of 1906, ch. 804, purporting to repeal and re-enact sec. 2 of ch. 426 of the acts of 1904 authorizing the board of public works to collect the insurance upon certain state tobacco warehouses and to rebuild a modern warehouse, held insufficient. Cases involving the portion of this section dealing with the title of an act, reviewed and summarized. *Christmas v. Warfield*, 105 Md. 541.

Title of Ch. 426 of 1927 defective. *Quenstedt v. Wilson*, 173 Md. 22.

**Generally:**

The title need not give an abstract of the act, but it must not be misleading nor divert attention from the matters contained in the act. Only the subject of the act need be described in the title; not the instrumentalities, means or procedure by which the subject is to be carried into effect. The title should be sufficiently comprehensive to cover, to a reasonable extent, all its provisions. Subjects of a private or local character must not be engrafted upon a law of a general nature, nor may two or more dissimilar and discordant subjects be embraced in the same law. Purpose of the portion of this section dealing with the title of an act; it will be liberally construed. *State v. Gurry*, 121 Md. 540; *Ridgely v. Balto. City*, 119 Md. 572; *Painter v. Mattfeldt*, 119 Md. 473; *Levin v. Hewes*, 118 Md. 631; *State v. Loden*, 117 Md. 383; *Bond v. Baltimore*, 116 Md. 688; *Curtis v. Mactier*, 115 Md. 393; *Mitchell v. State*, 115 Md. 362; *Worcester County v. School Commissioners*, 113 Md. 307; *Whiteley v. Baltimore*, 113 Md. 545; *Mt. Vernon Co. v. Frankfort Co.*, 111 Md. 566; *Nutwell v. Anne Arundel County*, 110 Md. 670; *Kingan Assn. v. Lloyd*, 110 Md. 624; *Somerset County v. Pocomoke Bridge Co.*, 109 Md. 3; *Himmel v. Eichengreen*, 107 Md. 613; *Jeffers v. Annapolis*, 107 Md. 273; *State v. Cumberland, etc., R. R. Co.*, 105 Md. 482; *Fout v. Frederick County*, 105 Md. 563; *Christmas v. Warfield*, 105 Md. 541; *Baltimore v. Flack*, 104 Md. 114; *State v. German Savings Bank*, 103 Md. 200; *Queen Anne's County v. Talbot County*, 99 Md. 17; *Kafka v. Wilkinson*, 99 Md. 240; *Price v. Liquor License Commissioners*, 98 Md. 351; *Mealey v. Hagerstown*, 92 Md. 743; *Stevens v. State*, 89 Md. 675; *Phinney v. Sheppard Hospital*, 88 Md. 636; *State v. Schultz Co.*, 83 Md. 61; *Drennen v. Banks*, 80 Md. 316; *Scharf v. Tasker*, 73 Md. 383; *Catholic Cathedral v. Manning*, 72 Md. 132; *State v. Norris*, 70 Md. 95; *Maryland Agricultural College v. Keating*, 58 Md. 584; *Baltimore v. Reitz*, 50 Md. 579; *Dorchester County v. Meekins*, 50 Md. 40; *Davis v. State*, 7 Md. 160.

Sec. 8 of the act of 1906, ch. 401, held not to impose upon street railway companies whose charters required them only to repair the streets between their tracks, the obligation to repave such streets between the tracks, since there was no indication in the title of said act that such a provision was contained in the act, or that the companies' charters were to be amended. *United Rwys. & Elec. Co. v. Baltimore*, 121 Md. 557.