

Because of the manner in which the phrase "educational programs" was inserted in the unnumbered line following line 104, it is somewhat unclear whether the words "demonstrations" and "exhibits" will now be treated as entirely unmodified, modified only by the word "educational," or still modified by the adjectives "scientific" and "medical." We have brought this question to the attention of the Anatomy Board and we are frankly uncertain as to whether this possible ambiguity will present any significant practical problems.

Of greater importance in considering House Bill 583 is the amendment which is made beginning at line 105. That amendment was obviously designed to exempt from the permissive provisions of the law relative to out-of-state transportation the bodies of persons who are known to have been members of a religious sect or denomination the tenets of which would be violated by any of the provisions of the subsection. The difficulty with the amendment as phrased is that it would exempt the bodies of such persons from the entire subsection, including the general prohibition against selling, buying, sending or transporting bodies beyond the limits of the State. This result was obviously not intended by the proponents of the amendment. Since this change, however inadvertent and unintentional it may be, is adequately described by the general language employed in the title, there is a real likelihood that it would be given effect in accordance with its literal terms. There is, however, authority for the proposition that a statute may be construed in a fashion contrary to its literal wording if a rigid, literal reading of the law would produce a result that is "bizarre or preposterous." Hillyard v. Board of Supervisors, 259 Md. 150 (1970).

While it might be argued that the Anatomy Board could simply refuse permission for the out-of-state transportation of bodies under the circumstances described by the amendment, it is not at all clear that such permission is required under these circumstances since the amendment indicates that the provisions of the subsection in their entirety do not apply.

Finally, we note that there is some ambiguity in connection with the amendment to the Bill which begins at line 111 and purports to authorize a particular medical school "temporarily located in the District of Columbia" to receive, send, and transport bodies under this section as if the school were located in the State. The title of the Bill indicates that the purpose of this amendment bears only on the provisions of Section 160(c) dealing with the transportation, etc., of bodies out of the State. It is not at all clear that the amendment is intended to or would have the effect of including this particular medical school within the medical schools