

tunity for the consideration of those bills having less priority. The comparatively few controversial bills must consume most of the session-time and the others are shelved for the next session, if ever.

#### CATEGORY "0"

This category represents those cases where no amendments of any type were made to a bill by the second house, and the original bill remained intact to the final punctuation mark.

**Example:** This category is demonstrated by House Bill 302. The bill, introduced by the speaker, concerned certain payments to be made to widows of judges. Referred to the Committee on Finance,<sup>10</sup> the bill had a labored trip through the House. On third reading it had a majority of the votes in the House, 59 to 43,<sup>11</sup> but the Maryland Constitution requires that bills must be passed by a majority of the *whole* number of members elected.<sup>12</sup> In this case the bill required seventy-two "aye" votes. A motion was made to reconsider the vote by which House Bill 302 failed to receive a constitutional majority.<sup>13</sup> The motion was made a special order of the day,<sup>14</sup> and finally carried by a vote of 56 to 41.<sup>15</sup> The bill then passed the House on third reading 94 to 6.<sup>16</sup> In the Senate the bill was referred to the Finance Committee.<sup>17</sup> Favorably reported out of this Committee,<sup>18</sup> it went to the floor of the Senate for third reading. The bill was passed without change by the Senate 28 to 1.<sup>19</sup>

<sup>10</sup> 1 MD. H. DEL. JOUR. 201 (1965).

<sup>11</sup> 2 MD. H. DEL. JOUR. 1307 (1964).

<sup>12</sup> MD. CONST. art. IV, sec. 28.

<sup>13</sup> 2 MD. H. DEL. JOUR. 1499 (1965).

<sup>14</sup> *Id.* at 14.

<sup>15</sup> *Id.* at 1548.

<sup>16</sup> *Id.* at 1565.

<sup>17</sup> 2 MD. S. JOUR. 1085 (1965).

<sup>18</sup> *Id.* at 1552.

<sup>19</sup> *Id.* at 1620.

#### CATEGORY "1"

This category represents those cases where the textual changes which were made by the second house were either a correction of spelling or punctuation,<sup>20</sup> or a semantic difference of opinion.<sup>21</sup>

**Example:** This category is demonstrated by Senate Bill 10. The bill, introduced by the president of the Senate for the Legislative Council concerned home rule for code counties. Referred to the Committee on Judicial Proceedings,<sup>22</sup> the bill came out of the Committee in amended form. It passed the Senate 29 to 2,<sup>23</sup> and was then sent to the House where the Committee on the Judiciary amended the bill<sup>24</sup> by striking the words "already is scheduled to" and inserting the words "at the General Election." The bill then passed the House.<sup>25</sup> This was merely a semantic change and the Senate concurred in it unanimously.<sup>26</sup>

#### CATEGORY "2"

This category represents those cases where the bill was changed moderately by an amendment which constituted a reconstruction of the original bill, rather than the formation of a new bill.

**Example:** See example to category "3."

<sup>20</sup> This only applies where the change in punctuation did not result in a change in meaning. Sometimes the mere addition or deletion of a comma can affect the statutory interpretation.

<sup>21</sup> Note that this involves a substitution of different words describing the same thought. Here the change was one of style, not similitude.

<sup>22</sup> 1 MD. S. JOUR. 12 (1965).

<sup>23</sup> *Id.* at 245.

<sup>24</sup> 1 MD. H. DEL. JOUR. 838 (1965).

<sup>25</sup> *Id.* at 1062.

<sup>26</sup> 1 MD. S. JOUR. 700 (1965).