

551(b) that would be changed by House Bill 618. At least part of the decision, however, implemented the principle that "a specific, well-defined portion of a statute will control a general, uncertain provision of the same statute." 296 Md. at 635. A similar principle prevails when two statutes cover similar subjects:

"It is a fundamental principle that the law does not favor repeals by implication. Waye v. State, 231 Md. 510, 516, 191 A.2d 428, 431 (1963); State v. Clifton, 177 Md. 572, 574, 10 A.2d 703, 704 (1940). A latter statute should not be held to repeal by implication an earlier one 'unless there is some express reference to the previous statute, or there is a manifest inconsistency in the two statutes, or their provisions are so repugnant that they cannot stand together.' Kirkwood v. Provident Savings Bank, 205 Md. 48, 55, 106 A.2d 103, 107 (1954).

"Where two statutory provisions are neither irreconcilable nor mutually repugnant, they should be construed in harmony with their respective objects and tenor. Smith v. Gray Concrete Pipe Co., Inc.; 267 Md. 149, 155, 297 A.2d 721, 725 (1972); Kirkwood v. Provident Savings Bank, *supra*; Public Service Commission v. Maryland Bay Co., 176 Md. 59, 73, 3 A.2d 736, 742 (1939); Loker v. State, 2 Md. App. 1, 9, 233 A.2d 342, 348 (1967), *aff'd*, 250 Md. 677, 245 A.2d 814 (1968), *cert. denied*, 393 U.S. 1082 (1969). This principle is applicable even though the statutes were passed at different times and contain no reference to each other. Board of Fire Commissioners of Balto. v. Potter, 268 Md. 285, 290-91, 300 A.2d 680, 683 (1973); May v. Warnick, 227 Md. 77, 83, 175 A.2d 413, 415-16 (1961).

"Similarly controlling is the premise that '[w]here there is a specific enactment and a general enactment 'which, in its most comprehensive sense, would include what is embraced in the former, the particular enactment must be operative, and the general enactment must be taken to affect only such cases within its general language as are not within the provisions of the particular enactment.'" Criminal Injuries Comp. Board v. Gould, 273 Md. 486, 495, 331 A.2d 55, 61 (1975); Henry v. State, 273 Md. 131, 134 n.1, 328 A.2d 293, 296 n.1 (1974); Maguire v. State, 192 Md. 615, 623, 65 A.2d 299, 302 (1949). See also 73 Am.Jur.2d Statutes § 416 (1974); 82 C.J.S. Statutes § 369 (1953). Dept. of Nat. Resources v. France, 277 Md. 432, 460-62 (1976)."

In light of those principles, § 551 (b) may not apply when other statutes contain specific forfeiture provisions. If construed in that fashion, House Bill 618 will have limited impact.

Forfeiture provisions can be found in a variety of statutes.