

adopt a different date specified in the law under the terms of that law.

THE CHAIRMAN: Are there any further questions, Delegate Barrick?

DELEGATE BARRICK: That may be correct, but to leave it without doubt, would you accept an amendment to leave out the word "general"?

THE CHAIRMAN: Delegate Hanson.

DELEGATE HANSON: I would prefer not to accept such an amendment. I would rather vote on this as it stands now and permit the Committee on Style, which I believe is attempting to reconcile the terms "general public law", "by law", and other uses of the term throughout the Constitution, to bring it into reconciliation with the definition which have just given.

THE CHAIRMAN: Delegate Barrick, there are so many delegates wishing to ask questions. I will have to recognize them, and I will have to restrict each delegate to one question.

Delegate Rybczynski.

DELEGATE RYBCZYNSKI: It will be a long question.

THE CHAIRMAN: Well, do not do that, because there are eight delegates desiring to ask questions, and less than four minutes remain.

DELEGATE RYBCZYNSKI: Delegate Hanson, our Committee met for nine weeks before we submitted our proposal with our wording. During the twenty minutes that your Committee met this morning, did you determine which judges are going to be elected? I have not heard about any elected judges since I have been here.

THE CHAIRMAN: Delegate Hanson.

DELEGATE HANSON: I am sorry that your Committee overlooked this. I referred to the election of judges running against their records as provided in the judicial article.

THE CHAIRMAN: Delegate Weidemeyer.

DELEGATE WEIDEMEYER: Delegate Hanson, in line 9, "except that judges may be elected", would you accept an amendment which struck out the word "elected" and inserting in lieu thereof "approved or rejected"? We are no longer electing judges. We approve or reject them, and that is in conformity with the provisions and wording in section 5.21.

THE CHAIRMAN: Delegate Weidemeyer, would you be content to leave that to the

Committee on Style, if it is stated clearly that the intention is to make this conform?

DELEGATE WEIDEMEYER: As long as they say we are not electing but just approving or rejecting judges.

THE CHAIRMAN: Is that the intent, Delegate Hanson?

DELEGATE HANSON: That is the intent as determined in the judicial article.

THE CHAIRMAN: Delegate Chabot.

DELEGATE CHABOT: The sentence beginning on line 10, "Unless otherwise provided by public general law or by instrument of government", are those coordinated exceptions or if there is a conflict between them does the general law govern over the instrument of government?

THE CHAIRMAN: Delegate Hanson.

DELEGATE HANSON: It is my understanding that a general public law would govern over an instrument of government in this State.

THE CHAIRMAN: Delegate Gallagher.

DELEGATE GALLAGHER: Delegate Hanson, in order that there may be no mistake about the application of the local government section to this particular amendment, would it be accurate to say that section 706, General Application of Laws, applies in its entirety, including the sentence which begins "The General Assembly may nevertheless enable any county or counties to exercise any power or perform any function denied to other counties subject to such standards as the General Assembly may prescribe"? Is this applicable in its entirety to the amendment before us?

THE CHAIRMAN: Delegate Hanson.

DELEGATE HANSON: Yes.

THE CHAIRMAN: Delegate Schloeder.

DELEGATE SCHLOEDER: Delegate Hanson, I do not detect in your argument for this amendment, do I, an argument for the separation of elections?

THE CHAIRMAN: Delegate Hanson.

DELEGATE HANSON: Delegate Shloeder, I hope that you do not detect that in my argument. My argument is that we should not determine that question in the constitution. My argument this morning was that if we should determine it in the constitution we should make them synonymous with state elections.

It would be my fervent hope that the charter commissions in the local govern-