

feelings in an effort to vote a favorable impression through this poll.

We feel that the responsibility of the lawyers in selection is a substantial one as officers of the court.

I sense no feeling among lawyers to dictate in the matter of the appointment of judges. I do feel that there is some thought among lawyers that they have, as officers of the court, a responsibility to give to the public those who have an opportunity to vote the view of the profession as to the qualifications of the judge seeking renewal of his term. The inclusion of this provision in our recommendation is nothing more than an effort to provide for a public service by the lawyers to the voting public. I would therefore urge rejection of this amendment.

THE CHAIRMAN: Delegate Johnson.

DELEGATE JOHNSON: Mr. Chairman, if the minority committee's amendment to section 5.21 has been redrafted, I would urge that we discuss that amendment before we reach the amendment offered by Delegate Bennett.

I think that that would be the proper order in which to consider the matter, and if it is read, I would ask Delegate Bennett if he would so kindly withdraw his amendment temporarily, with the understanding, of course, that he would have full opportunity to recover it.

THE CHAIRMAN: Delegate Bennett.

DELEGATE BENNETT: If that is agreeable to the Chair, I would be happy to do so.

THE CHAIRMAN: Let me inquire of the Chief Page.

The amendment will be ready in a few minutes. The other amendments to this section all relate to the question of election. The Chair is a little perplexed as to how they can be properly offered; and if you will just bear with me a few minutes, we will decide what to do.

There are three other amendments to section 5.21, which deal with the term of election. One of the amendments would simply change the term from ten years to eight years. The other two amendments would change the term to seven years, but have differing provisions.

I think the proper course to follow would be to proceed with the amendment sponsored by Delegate James Clark while we

are waiting for the other amendment. Do you still intend to offer that amendment?

DELEGATE J. CLARK: Yes.

THE CHAIRMAN: Does Delegate Schloeder and Delegate Chabot each intend to offer their respective amendments, EG and BH?

DELEGATE SCHLOEDER: Mr. Chairman, it was my amendment, but whether or not it was offered would largely depend upon actions taken by the Committee of the Whole before that time.

THE CHAIRMAN: With respect to which amendment?

DELEGATE SCHLOEDER: I only have one. I have already withdrawn one, and the other is the amendment BH, the New Jersey plan.

THE CHAIRMAN: Whether you offer it would depend upon what?

DELEGATE SCHLOEDER: It would depend upon the action of this Committee as far as whether or not there would be competitive or noncompetitive elections.

THE CHAIRMAN: Is that going to be covered by your amendment, Delegate Johnson?

DELEGATE JOHNSON: Yes, in effect it will, Mr. Chairman.

THE CHAIRMAN: Delegate Chabot, would your amendment be dependent upon the same circumstance?

DELEGATE CHABOT: Yes, sir.

DELEGATE J. CLARK: Mr. Chairman.

THE CHAIRMAN: Delegate Clark.

DELEGATE J. CLARK: Mine would be also dependent on the matter of election.

THE CHAIRMAN: I think maybe we had better wait just a few minutes.

Delegate Weidemeyer, do you intend still to offer your amendment CT?

DELEGATE WEIDEMEYER: Yes, I do, Mr. President.

THE CHAIRMAN: Then I would suggest that you be giving some consideration to the question of whether it should be offered as a substitute for the amendment to be offered by Delegate Johnson, which I have not seen yet, when you get it.

DELEGATE WEIDEMEYER: Mine and Delegate Johnson's go to a little dif-