

THE CHAIRMAN: Delegate Bennett.

DELEGATE BENNETT: How much money, Mr. Weidemeyer, do you think bingo games and slot machines take out of Anne Arundel County each year?

DELEGATE WEIDEMEYER: We are happy for it.

THE CHAIRMAN: Does any other delegate desire to speak in opposition?

Delegate Fornos.

DELEGATE FORNOS: Mr. Chairman and fellow delegates: Lest the wrong impression was given of Anne Arundel County, not all the people in Anne Arundel County agree with Delegate Weidemeyer.

THE CHAIRMAN: Delegate Rosenstock.

DELEGATE ROSENSTOCK: Mr. Chairman and fellow delegates: Last night I enjoyed hearing an interview of the Governor of Maryland on television. He spoke about this Convention, and in so doing remarked about the office of attorney general. He stated that in his opinion the office of attorney general came as close to performing the duties of an ombudsman as such an office itself if created could do, and from my experience, the elected attorney general with constitutional status has been most helpful working out problems between the citizen and the various bureaucrats that we have in the State of Maryland. For that reason, I shall vote for the amendment.

THE CHAIRMAN: Does any delegate desire to speak in opposition?

Delegate Ulrich.

DELEGATE ULRICH: I rise for personal privilege. I would like to say Amen to Mr. Fornos' statement.

THE CHAIRMAN: Does any delegate desire to speak in opposition to the amendment?

DELEGATE BOYCE: Yes, Mr. Chairman.

THE CHAIRMAN: Delegate Boyce.

DELEGATE BOYCE: Mr. President and members of this Convention and Committee of the Whole:

I sat by while we rewrote the judicial article, and listened to lawyer after lawyer talk. Only four people spoke who were not lawyers.

What bothers me is the octopus-like attitude of the attorney general's office. What

is important to think about is that all of you who are lawyers and are presently taking fees from the attorney general's office should disqualify yourself from voting on this article as far as the attorney general is concerned, because I feel perfectly certain that the list is being prepared, and as a Convention as a whole we will not look very attractive if we have a conflict of interest on this question.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

THE CHAIRMAN: Delegate Blair.

DELEGATE BLAIR: Mr. Chairman and ladies and gentlemen of the Convention:

Besides the quasi-judicial aspect of this matter, there is an all-important matter that I would like to consider. I would like to make an analogy in this issue between the attorney general's office, which is elective, and the city solicitor's office in Baltimore, which is appointive. I have had some experience in both departments, having served six years as an assistant city solicitor in Baltimore City, and two years as special assistant attorney general.

The attorney general now appoints his deputies, all of his assistants, his special assistants, and they are subject to the hiring and firing of the attorney general. They are not subject to any executive control, and he gets the most competent men of his choosing, not politically mandated assistants.

Now, the city solicitor of Baltimore City is appointed by the administration. All of his assistants are appointed by the attorney general; his deputy is appointed by the administration, and he has what is known as a politically dominated solicitor's office.

To verify that fact I would like to refer you to the article appearing in the Morning Sun of July 29, 1965 — and I quote the headlines:

"Allen Calls Some Aides Incompetent. City Solicitor Defends Hiring of New Men in his Office."

As a part of that article it states: "Joseph Allen, the City's Chief Legal Officer, said one reason he has been obliged to add men to his staff was the presence of dead wood inherited by him when he took office some two years ago."

I submit to you, ladies and gentlemen of this Convention, that the question before us is the identical proposition that was propounded by Judge Henderson concerning the judiciary when he stated that there