

*(Call for the question.)*

Delegate Carson.

DELEGATE CARSON: I would like to ask a question of Delegate Gilchrist.

THE CHAIRMAN: Delegate Gilchrist, will you take the floor to yield to a question?

DELEGATE GILCHRIST: Certainly.

DELEGATE CARSON: By this amendment you certainly do not mean to imply by use of the past tense that a person who was once authorized and was since disbarred could qualify. You mean is authorized, is admitted at the time?

THE CHAIRMAN: Delegate Carson, the Chair calls your attention to the language of Amendment No. 3 which would be the phrase immediately preceding the one to be substituted by Amendment No. 9 and I take it that Delegate Gilchrist is intending to tie the two together. Is that correct, Delegate Gilchrist?

DELEGATE GILCHRIST: That is correct.

THE CHAIRMAN: As the sentence would read with Amendment No. 3's language and Amendment No. 9's language, it would be, "To be eligible for election as Attorney General, a person shall have been a qualified voter in and have been authorized to practice law in the state for at least five years," and so forth.

There is another amendment which changed a phrase but it does not change the meaning.

DELEGATE CARSON: To make it abundantly clear, you do intend at the time a person runs or becomes attorney general that he is then admitted to practice in this State?

DELEGATE GILCHRIST: Yes.

THE CHAIRMAN: I think the question goes a little further than even you originally suggested, Delegate Carson, so that there be no doubt of the Committee on Style, you mean not merely the question of being disbarred, but that he had been authorized for five years immediately preceding or do you mean at any period?

DELEGATE CARSON: Mr. Chairman, as I understand it, the intent is that a person must have been a member of the Bar which means the same as having been authorized to practice in this State for the entire preceding five years and also at the time of his appointment.

THE CHAIRMAN: Delegate Gilchrist, is that the intention?

DELEGATE GILCHRIST: That is the intention.

DELEGATE CASE: Would we understand that a similar change would be made by the Style Committee in Section 5.13 which specifies the eligibility rules for one to become a judge? This says "A person shall have been a citizen of the State and a member of the Bar," so the same critique you give to this particular section is equally applicable there.

THE CHAIRMAN: Delegate Gilchrist.

DELEGATE GILCHRIST: Yes, Delegate Case, it has already been discussed with Chairman Mudd of the Judicial Branch and the same kind of language was in the present Constitution as is suggested for use in this and they certainly ought to be uniform.

THE CHAIRMAN: Delegate Beatrice Miller.

DELEGATE B. MILLER: Since we are changing this language all the way through the Constitution to use the phrase "have been authorized to practice law" instead of "a member of the Bar," could we change "citizen of the State" to read "a qualified voter" as we have done in this section?

THE CHAIRMAN: The Chair would assume not. That would be a substantive change so the Style Committee could not do it.

Are there any further questions?

*(There was no response.)*

Are you ready for the question?

*(Call for the question.)*

The Clerk will ring the quorum bell.

The question arises on the adoption of Amendment No. 9 to Committee Recommendation EB-2.

A vote Aye is a vote in favor of Amendment No. 9. A vote No is a vote against. Cast your vote.

Has every delegate voted? Does any delegate desire to change his vote?

*(There was no response.)*

The Clerk will record the vote.

There being 113 votes in the affirmative and none in the negative, the motion carries. The amendment is adopted.