

Title act 1924, ch. 529 (creating Metropolitan District of Baltimore County) held sufficient. *Dinneen v. Rider*, 152 Md. 357.

Art. 56, sec. 265, sufficiently described in title—see notes thereto. *Adding Machine Co. v. State*, 146 Md. 196.

Title act 1927, ch. 691, prohibiting sale of liquor or giving liquor to minors in Howard County, sufficient. *Redmond v. State*, 155 Md. 16.

Title act 1920, ch. 350, regulating sale of liquor in Baltimore County, insufficient; act void. *Shea v. State*, 148 Md. 257.

This section referred to in construing Workmen's Compensation Act—see notes to Code, art. 101, sec. 14.

Cited but not construed in *Havre de Grace v. Bridge Co.*, 145 Md. 493.

Constitutionality of title of Ch. 167, 1927, raised, but as issues were foreclosed by decree in previous case involving same act, therefore decree is *res judicata* as to this case. *Holt v. Moxley*, 157 Md. 620.

The provisions as to amending or reviving laws do not apply to amendments to the Charter of a private corporation so as to require the whole charter or such sections as are revived or amended to be set out in full. *Home for Incurables v. Bruff*, 160 Md. 164.

Title of ch. 229, 1924, authorizing Baltimore City to incur debt for viaduct held sufficient. *Browne v. Baltimore*, 163 Md. 219.

One of the essentials of a good title is that it shall not be misleading. *Baltimore v. Dugan*, 163 Md. 238.

Titles of ch. 401, 1929, and ch. 115, 1931, relating to Mothers' Relief, held sufficient. *Baltimore v. Fuget*, 164 Md. 345.

Titles of ch. 425, 1884, incorporating Md. Title Insurance Co. and of all acts amending same, sufficient. *State v. Title Guarantee and Trust Co.*, 168 Md. 376.

Title of ch. 281, 1933, imposing higher license fees on certain motor vehicles, held sufficient. *Bevard v. Baughman*, 167 Md. 71.

Any default in title of ch. 170, 1878, cured by inclusion in Code of 1888, as the Code was a new enactment. *State v. Coblentz*, 167 Md. 526.

Title of ch. 2 of Special Session of 1933, adding art. 2B, relating to Alcoholic Beverages, held sufficient. *Zukowski v. State*, 167 Md. 554.

Title of ch. 188, 1935, imposing "Emergency Gross Receipts Tax" is sufficient. *Jones v. Gordy*, 169 Md. 178.

Cited in *State v. Christhilf*, 170 Md. 589.

Defective title of local statute (1910, Ch. 96) cured by incorporation of statute in local Code enacted by statute (1912, Ch. 790), the title of which complied with this section. *State v. B. & O. R. R.*, 171 Md. 599.

Titles of Chs. 394 of 1931, 506 of 1933 and 3 of 1935 held sufficient. *Toomey v. Shipley*, 172 Md. 463.

Title of Ch. 124 of 1936 (Sp. Sess.), relating to Inheritance Tax, held sufficient. *Mylander v. Connor*, 172 Md. 329.

Title of Ch. 153, Acts of 1936 (Sp. Sess.), held to be sufficient. *Kimble v. Bender*, 173 Md. 613.

Title of Ch. 368, 1937 (State Office Bond Bill), held sufficient. *Bickel v. Nice*, 173 Md. 1.

See notes to sec. 30 (this article), and to art. 46, sec. 1, and art. 23, sec. 146, An. Code.

Sec. 30. Every bill, when passed by the General Assembly, and sealed with the Great Seal, shall be presented to the Governor, who, if he approves it, shall sign the same in the presence of the presiding officers and chief clerks of the Senate and House of Delegates. Every law shall be recorded in the office of the Court of Appeals, and in due time be printed, published and certified under the Great Seal, to the several courts, in the same manner as has been heretofore usual in this State.

Governor's signature.

Where a bill is passed and sealed as directed, it may be presented to the Governor and signed after the close of the session of the legislature, provided the Governor signs it within six days from the time the bill is presented. *Lankford v. Somerset County*, 73 Md. 105. (See also, concurring and dissenting opinions in this case); *Johnson v. Luers*, 129 Md. 523.

If a bill is not sealed as required by this section, there is no legal presentation of it to the Governor, and hence he may properly refuse to sign it. Sec. 17 of art. 2, is consistent with this article. The scope of arts. 2 and 3 of the Constitution, differentiated. *Hamilton v. State ex rel. Wells*, 61 Md. 28.

Where the Governor signs a bill by inadvertence and under a misapprehension as to what the paper is, and without having gone through the mental operation of approving the bill, he does not approve it as required by this section, and his signature is null and void in so far as it affords evidence of his approval thereof. No one other