

Is there any further discussion on these sections?

Delegate Hanson.

DELEGATE HANSON: Mr. President, I have a question for Delegate Boyer relating to section 9.10.

THE PRESIDENT: Delegate Boyer, do you yield to a question?

DELEGATE BOYER: Yes.

THE PRESIDENT: Delegate Hanson.

DELEGATE HANSON: In discussion of section 9.10 in the Committee of the Whole we centered the whole discussion around the trial for impeachment, but in the sentence beginning on line 22 where you state "concurrence of three-fifths of the judges of the Court of Appeals shall be required to convict," was it the intention of your Committee that more than a majority of the judges of the tribunal be required in order to obtain conviction?

THE PRESIDENT: Delegate Boyer.

DELEGATE BOYER: No, Delegate Hanson. The intention of the Committee was concurrence of three-fifths as it came out of the GP Committee.

THE PRESIDENT: I think the earlier discussion indicated in this situation that majority and three-fifths were the same. I think it was the suggestion that if the number on the panel were ever changed the intent that it be three-fifths shall be indicated.

Am I correct about that, Delegate Boyer?

DELEGATE BOYER: As usual, Professor.

THE PRESIDENT: Delegate Hanson.

Are there any further questions?

Delegate Gill.

DELEGATE GILL: On page 30, provision for all elected officers, is that all elected state officers?

THE PRESIDENT: It says "all elected officers of the State of Maryland."

Your question is what?

DELEGATE GILL: Would you leave it like that, or just say "elected state officers," like you have in line 13?

THE PRESIDENT: Delegate Penniman.

DELEGATE PENNIMAN: This is a question of the intent of the Committee on the Legislative Branch.

THE PRESIDENT: I think Delegate Gill's question is purely one of style. She is asking whether instead of using the term "elected officers of the State of Maryland" you could use the term "elected state officers" to mean the same thing.

DELEGATE PENNIMAN: Yes, of course.

THE PRESIDENT: Do you desire such modification?

DELEGATE PENNIMAN: Yes, I do.

THE PRESIDENT: Is there any objection to modifying the report of the committee on line 1, on page 3, to insert the word "state" before the word officers and to strike all of line 2?

Delegate Winslow.

DELEGATE PENNIMAN: Is that not possibly a matter of substance?

Could "an officer of the State of Maryland", could that possibly be intended to include more than just "State officials"?

THE PRESIDENT: Delegate Boyer.

DELEGATE PENNIMAN: It is Delegate Gallagher.

THE PRESIDENT: Sorry.

Delegate Gallagher.

DELEGATE GALLAGHER: I presume you are addressing me with respect to 9.08.

THE PRESIDENT: The question is whether or not in lines 1 and 2 on page 3 the expression that has been modified to read "elected officers of the State of Maryland" is intended to mean "elected state officers", or whether it could include elected officers in the State who are not officers of the State but of a county, for instance.

DELEGATE GALLAGHER: Mr. President, I believe it was the intention of our Committee and Mrs. Miller, the principal sponsor of this, that it would apply to elected state officers rather than all officers who happen to be elected in the State of Maryland.

DELEGATE PENNIMAN: In that case I would accept the proposal of Delegate Gill.

THE PRESIDENT: Very well.

Is there any objection to modifying the recommendation of the Committee by inserting the word "state" before officers in line 1 and striking all of line 2?