

1 obviously can't be the case, and for that reason the Commit-
2 tee suggested the inclusion of the words "now or hereafter"
3 which raised the question in Delegate Chabot's mind that
4 that might go back too far and he suggested that he use
5 the date in 1891, or thereafter. The Chair suggested that
6 while he could not be sure, he had a very distinct
7 recollection that there was either a settlement act or
8 a settlement arrangement that maybe was not embodied in
9 legislation in 1848. There was definitely a settlement
10 act in 1878, and another one in 1890.

11 The problem, we had the research assistants
12 check and there were no constitutional amendments between
13 1867 and 1891 dealing with this question. It is impossible
14 to check to ascertain that there are: 1, no other settle-
15 ment acts affecting the question prior to 1891 and no
16 settlement agreements with the executive.

17 For this reason, although it is true, as
18 Delegate Scanlan says, that the sentence states the
19 opposite, it does in addition, however, make it abundantly
20 clear that in this section the Constitutional Convention
21 is endeavoring to put, not only the Baltimore and Ohio