

As a matter of fact the exact language of this amendment was proposed and voted upon in our Committee and lost by a vote of 11 to 8. Accordingly, the view of the majority is that requiring one to be registered to vote as a qualification for appointment to the bench is unnecessarily restrictive and could conceivably deprive the bench of the services of a valuable lawyer who through inadvertence or otherwise had not chosen to register or who had registered and whose right to vote had been lost by virtue of its not being exercised.

We oppose the amendment.

THE CHAIRMAN: Does any other delegate desire to speak in favor of the amendment?

Delegate James.

DELEGATE JAMES: Is there a division of the question on the amendments? I see two.

THE CHAIRMAN: Division has not been called for. It can be.

DELEGATE JAMES: The second matter is different.

THE CHAIRMAN: It is divisible. Do you call for a division?

DELEGATE JAMES: Yes.

THE CHAIRMAN: The first will be that embraced between lines 2 to 5 and the second question will be that embraced in lines 7 and 8.

Is there a second to the motion? Delegate Sybert.

DELEGATE SYBERT: I second the motion for the division. The second part will give force and effect in section 5.13 to Amendment No. 18 which was made the other day to section 5.10 to require that there be at least one district court judge resident in each county.

As long as that amendment was made, certainly the second amendment here, in line 28 of section 5.13 should be acceptable.

In the first part as Delegate Storm explained, it will simply require that a district court judge live in the county long enough to become a registered voter instead of being able to move in one day and then be appointed a district court judge in that new county to which he has moved, the next day. We think it is reasonable to require three or six months, whichever this Convention comes up with, as residence in the county before a person can be ap-

pointed a district judge. We want to obviate the possibility that a person can move in one day and be appointed the next day.

THE CHAIRMAN: Do any other delegates desire to speak in opposition to the first question?

Delegate Beatrice Miller.

DELEGATE B. MILLER: I have a question.

THE CHAIRMAN: To whom is it directed?

DELEGATE B. MILLER: To Mr. Mudd.

THE CHAIRMAN: Will you respond?

DELEGATE MUDD: Yes.

THE CHAIRMAN: Delegate Beatrice Miller.

DELEGATE B. MILLER: Do you have any figures which indicate how many lawyers there are at the present time in Kent County, or some of the other counties?

DELEGATE MUDD: Not off-hand. The only figure I have is 3,500 in the State of Maryland. There may be a member of my Committee who can answer. If so, can you volunteer?

THE CHAIRMAN: Delegate Boyer, could you answer the inquiry as to how many lawyers there are at the present time in the Kent County bar?

DELEGATE BOYER: Yes, sir, very gladly. At the present time there are ten practicing lawyers and we also have four part-time lawyers who are members of the Maryland State Bar Association but who are not actively practicing.

THE CHAIRMAN: Did you hear the answer, Delegate Miller?

DELEGATE B. MILLER: Yes, thank you.

THE CHAIRMAN: Does any other delegate desire to speak in favor of the amendment on the first question?

Delegate Rybczynski.

DELEGATE RYBCZYNCKI: I want to speak in favor of the amendment and I want to make an observation while I am doing this. It occurs to me this is the kind of thing that can open the door to a little bit of what we want to eliminate.

The person can live in the county and move back into the city long enough to be