

'Without that provision [Art. IV, §9] the Judges would undoubtedly have the power to appoint such officers as are necessary for the proper conduct of the business of their respective Courts....'"

61 Opinions of the Attorney General 195, 197 (1976) .

Accordingly, although such matters are never free from doubt, in view of the increasingly proper reliance of the courts upon automatic data processing as a tool in the performance of the judicial function, we are of the opinion that the appointment of a member to the Data Processing Policy Board is "necessary for the proper conduct of the business" of the Courts.

(b) Legislative Appointment Authority. House Bill 948 further provides that a non-voting member of the Data Processing Policy Board may be designated by the joint action of the President of the Senate and the Speaker of the House of Delegates. Noting the significant reliance of the Legislative Branch upon automatic data processing for the preparation of bills and other services, we are of the opinion that legislation authorizing the President and the Speaker to exercise such authority does not contravene Article 8.

(c) Title Sufficiency. Although the title of House Bill 948 was amended to provide for the exclusion of "certain departments and branches of government from the provisions of the Act" (emphasis supplied, the only exclusions set forth in the body of the bill are from that subtitle which is created by Section 1 of the Act. (See units 135-143 1/2). Consequently, we have considered whether the title of House bill 948, as amended, is constitutionally defective as contravening the requirements of Article III, Sec. 29 of the Constitution. We think not.

In pertinent part, Article III, Sec. 29 requires:

"... every law enacted by the General Assembly shall embrace but one subject, and that shall be described in its title; nor shall any law be construed by reason of its title to grant powers or confer rights which are not expressly contained in the body of the Act."

The purpose of the first part of this provision is to fairly advise the General Assembly and the public of the real nature, and subject matter of the Act. McLaughlin v. Warfield, 180 Md. 75, 78 (1941). Thus, a title must not be misleading by apparently limiting the enactment to a much narrower scope than the body of the Act is made to encompass. Painter v. Mattfeldt, 119 Md. 466, 474 (1913). However, the Court of Appeals has repeated in a number of cases that titles to legislative acts will be declared