

to his amendment. We will take it up first. Then we will consider Delegate Needle's amendment and the Chair very much appreciates the position taken by Delegates Borom and Boyce.

DELEGATE BARRICK: Mr. Chairman, I will be very brief. My amendment would eliminate the word "general" in line 11, which would read, "unless otherwise provided by law." I think it has been made very clear that if we do this the General Assembly could in an affirmative way pass on these election laws on a county by county basis by setting the time of the election.

It seems to me this is desirable in order to get the flexibility we have been looking for. We have been flexible in giving Baltimore City what they want, and I submit we can be flexible in giving each county what they want. I can see metropolitan areas of our State may wish to have all their elections at the same time other than the time when state officials are running. However, in the more rural areas, it is imperative in my opinion that state officers run at the same time the county officers run.

This gives a somewhat longer ballot, gives much more interest in the election, and in my opinion it brings out a much larger vote than if we would only have our county issues in question.

The idea is for flexibility so that we can deal with our different counties by law in different ways. It would give the General Assembly the flexibility that I think is desirable to have in this particular instance.

THE CHAIRMAN: Delegate Schloeder, do you desire to respond to Delegate Barrick's support of Amendment No. 21-A to take the word "general" out of line 11?

DELEGATE SCHLOEDER: I am sorry, Mr. Chairman. I was out of the room and just came in. I would hate to have him repeat all that, but could he sum it up in a word or two?

THE CHAIRMAN: No, you will catch the drift. Delegate Hanson, do you desire to reply?

DELEGATE HANSON: Mr. Chairman, I think I already replied to Delegate Barrick. I think the degree of flexibility which is desirable is contained in the language as we used it. It would permit those things which we have discussed on the floor before in the way of options available to the General Assembly in the form of general public law. I do not think we should be in the position of having the General Assembly

act for each county without a consideration of what it has been doing for other counties in this area. For that reason, I feel it is very important that we retain the phrasing as it has been used in my amendment and I would hope Senator Barrick's amendment is rejected.

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

Delegate Byrnes.

DELEGATE BYRNES: Mr. Chairman, I have a parliamentary inquiry, if I might.

THE CHAIRMAN: State the inquiry.

DELEGATE BYRNES: For the record, it would be helpful to make it clear whether adoption of Amendment No. 21 would strike out Amendment No. 14.

THE CHAIRMAN: You are talking now about Amendment 21, not 21-A, I take it?

DELEGATE BYRNES: 21, sir.

THE CHAIRMAN: If Amendment No. 21 is adopted, it would eliminate the last two paragraphs of section 7, which would, of course, include the second paragraph as amended by Amendment No. 14.

Delegate Clagett.

DELEGATE CLAGETT: Mr. Chairman, another parliamentary inquiry. How can we get to a vote on section 7 eliminating Amendment No. 14?

THE CHAIRMAN: The effect of Amendment No. 14, you mean apart from a consideration of Amendment No. 21?

DELEGATE CLAGETT: Well, as I understand it, Amendment No. 21 is before us now and we are going to have to yea or nay on that.

THE CHAIRMAN: If it is adopted, it in effect nullifies everything done in Amendment No. 14.

DELEGATE CLAGETT: Then my question is how can we go back and vote on section 7 as the Committee originally recommended it.

THE CHAIRMAN: To move to reconsider Amendment No. 14.

DELEGATE CLAGETT: If 21 is adopted —

THE CHAIRMAN: I thought you said if 21 is rejected.

DELEGATE CLAGETT: If 21 is rejected. Now the other side of the coin. If 21 is