

Also in subsection (b) of this section, the former reference to "impair" the provisions is deleted as included in the reference to "affect" the provisions.

The second sentence of former Art. 27A, § 12, which declared that the legislative intent of this title would have been adopted if the invalid or unconstitutional provision, sentence, clause, section or part had not been included therein, is deleted as duplicative of this section.

#### GENERAL REVISOR'S NOTE TO SUBTITLE:

Former Art. 27A, § 14, which provided for local exemptions to the provisions of Article 27A, is deleted as obsolete. The Public Defender provides services in all counties within the State, and no county implemented or maintained a separate or different system before September 1, 1971.

#### GENERAL REVISOR'S NOTE TO TITLES 14, 15, AND 16:

This revision contains three revised titles of the Criminal Procedure Article.

The Department of Legislative Services is charged with revising the law in a clear, concise, and organized manner, without changing the effect of the law. One precept of code revision has been that, once something is said, it should be said in the same way every time. To that end, the Criminal Procedure Article Additions Review Committee conformed the language and organization of Titles 14, 15, and 16 to that of the rest of the Criminal Procedure Article and other previously enacted revised articles to the extent possible.

It is the manifest intent both of the General Assembly and the Criminal Procedure Article Additions Review Committee that this bulk revision of the substantive laws regarding the Office of the State Prosecutor, the Office of the State's Attorney, and the Office of the Public Defender render no substantive change. The guiding principle of the preparation of Titles 14, 15, and 16 of the Criminal Procedure Article is that state in *Welch v. Humphrey*, 200 Md. 410, 417 (1952):

[T]he principle function of a Code is to reorganize the statutes and state them in simpler form. Consequently any changes made in them by Code are presumed to be for the purpose of clarity rather than change of meaning. Therefore, even a change in the phraseology of a statute by a codification thereof will not ordinarily modify the law, unless the change is so radical and material that the intention of the Legislature to modify the law appears unmistakably from the language of the Code. (citations omitted).