

## Sec. 27.

This section is not violated by amending a bill as follows: "Amend by striking out all after the words A. Bill and insert in lieu thereof the following." *Thrift v. Towers*, 127 Md. 58.

## Sec. 29.

**Liquor laws.**

The act of 1916, chapter 594, provides for increasing the liquor license fees in the various localities of the state, and the title, after stating the position of the act in the code and its primary purpose, provided that the additional license fees were to be paid to the state treasurer for general state purposes, whereas the body of the act provides that such fees should be disposed of as other license fees now provided by law, etc.; the act was held not invalid under this section. Cases construing this section, and principles governing such construction, reviewed. *Ruehl v. State*, 130 Md. 189.

The act of 1916, chapter 340, providing for the creation by popular vote of anti-saloon territory in Carroll County, etc., held not to embrace more than one subject, within the meaning of this section. Title of said act, held sufficient. Cases under this section reviewed. *Crouse v. State*, 130 Md. 366; *Poisel v. Cash*, 130 Md. 374.

Section 9F of chapter 31 of the act of 1916, regulating the sale and granting of licenses for the sale of liquors in Baltimore County, held germane to the subject of that act, as set forth in its title. Cases under this section reviewed. *Benesch v. State*, 129 Md. 508.

**Generally.**

The title need not contain an abstract of the bill nor give its provisions in detail, but it must not be misleading by apparently limiting the enactment to a much narrower scope than the body of the act; nor ought it to be such as to divert attention from the matter contained in the body of the act. Purpose of this section. See notes to article 49, section 7 of the code. *State v. King*, 124 Md. 497.

In order to comply with this section, though the title need not give an abstract of the act, yet it must sufficiently describe the subject-matter and must not be misleading by apparently limiting the enactment to a much narrower scope than the body of the act embraces. A section which was attempted to be repealed and re-enacted with amendments by an act neither the title nor enacting clause of which referred to such section, held void. *Baltimore v. Williams*, 124 Md. 510.

The title of the act of 1910, chapter 180, creating the public service commission, held sufficient under this section; purpose and construction of this section. See notes to article 23, section 414 of the Code. *Thrift v. Laird*, 125 Md. 69.

The title of the act of 1912, chapter 32, restricting the liability of Baltimore City for injuries due to the unsafe condition of the Patapsco River, is not in violation of this section. *Foard Co. v. Maryland*, 219 Fed. 828.

The title of Baltimore City ordinance No. 332, approved July 25, 1913, prescribing certain regulations of the markets in said city, held sufficient under this section, since it repeals and reordains with amendments, certain sections of article 23 of the Baltimore City Code. *Baltimore v. Wollman*, 123 Md. 313.

The act of 1914, chapter 250, authorizing the mayor, etc., of Mount Ranier to issue bonds and use the proceeds for constructing a sewer and water system, etc., held invalid, because its title was defective under this section. Cases reviewed. *Weber v. Probey*, 125 Md. 549.

Under a title calling for one bill, a different act may not be validly passed. *Thrift v. Towers*, 127 Md. 60.