

"must not be misleading by apparently limiting the enactment to a much narrower scope than the body of the Act is made to compass...." Painter v. Mattfeldt, 119 Md. 466, 474 (1913). In weighing the adequacy of a title, the courts frequently inquire whether it was sufficient to put legislators and the public "on notice" of its intended provision. Dinneen v. Rider, 152 Md. 343, 358 (1927); Quenstedt v. Wilson, 173 Md. 11, 22 (1937). See generally Everstine, "Titles of Legislative Acts", 9 Maryland Law Review 197 (1948).

A reading of the title to House Bill 1621 indicates that its provisions affect Charles County only. No one reading the title would be put "on notice" that a substantive change affecting St. Mary's County is made. In an early case decided by the Court of Appeals, the title to an Act stated that the Act provided for an election to be held in the town of Cambridge for the purpose of determining whether liquor traffic was to be regulated in Cambridge. In fact, the Act provided that an entire election district of which Cambridge was but a part was to be affected, and that liquor traffic was to be abolished, rather than regulated. The Court of Appeals stated:

"... There is not the faintest suggestion in the title to indicate that the body of the Act contained, under any contingency, a single provisions prohibiting, in the town of Cambridge, the sale of liquor by druggists or the compounding by them of prescriptions whose chief ingredient is alcohol; and much less is there the most remote intimation in the title that such a prohibitory clause, applying to a whole election district beyond the limits of the town, was contained in the body of an Act whose title professed that the Act was one to regulate the sale of liquor merely within the town. This ... section is, therefore, not germane to the subject described in that part of the title which we have been considering; but, on the contrary, it is distinctly foreign to that subject, and must fall ..." (Emphasis in original). Whitman v. State, 80 Md. 410 (1895).

We conclude that, as was the case with the title being considered in Whitman, the title to House Bill 1621 does not afford even "the most remote intimation" that the effect of the Act went beyond Charles County and into St. Mary's. The title is, therefore, defective, and we find that portion of House Bill 1621 which purports to amend Article 2B, Section 25(j) to be unconstitutional. While we can conclude that the amendment to Section 25(j) is severable from the balance of the Act (see infra), we cannot reach the same conclusion as to the various parts of the amendment to Section 25(j) itself. For if we were