

1 Again, I have a problem as a lawyer to say how
2 they could do it and in many of the sections where we have
3 said shall do something and without setting out any
4 standards it makes it pretty impossible of enforcement.

5 I would have to say I would have to vote against
6 it because again the Committee position is that this is a
7 very important right that has been with us since 1805. We
8 do not wish to change that right except to give the Court
9 of Appeals reasonable regulation of it. That is all I can
10 say about it and I would have to oppose it.

11 THE CHAIRMAN: Delegate James.

12 DELEGATE JAMES: What we are doing is we are
13 really broadening the Willomer amendment. It seems to me
14 this says shall provide for the right of removal. That
15 means in all cases equity, condemnation, ejection of
16 land cases -- I can't really see any limitation.

17 The Court, as I interpret this, is limited to
18 procedural matters. There may be some flexibility, but
19 it is much broader than the Willomer amendment.

20 THE CHAIRMAN: Delegate Moser.

21 DELEGATE MOSER: Simplicity is sometimes not