

is more a matter of the schedule of legislation than it is of Article 2.

Is Delegate Hardwicke here?

Delegate Hardwicke, Delegate Grant directs attention to the fact that in section 2.06 on page 6, the General Assembly is directly authorized to prescribe by law disqualifications from voting in any event by reason of conviction of serious crime, but on page 65, section 3, in the schedule of legislation there are interim provisions for disqualifications from voting. It raises the question of whether the inclusion of section 3 in the schedule of legislation is intended in any way as a definition of what is meant by the words "serious crime" in section 2.06.

Delegate Hardwicke.

DELEGATE HARDWICKE: I think in a measure, Delegate Grant, it is a definition.

Let me say that section 3 on page 65 is excerpted from Article 33, sections 3, 4, and 5 of the present *Annotated Code* and that was the attempt of the existing legislature to define the term. This is our interim attempt to continue that in our statute law.

THE PRESIDENT: But you do not mean to indicate, I take it, that section 3 is intended in any way as a binding interpretation of section 2.06, either to enlarge or restrict the power of the General Assembly.

DELEGATE PENNIMAN: We do not consider it to be a constitutional definition. It is what you might consider to be a legislative definition and only an interim measure.

THE PRESIDENT: Delegate Grant.

DELEGATE GRANT: I only point this out that the old qualification section had "infamous crime" instead of "serious crime" and this is why I believe the dichotomy exists right now.

THE PRESIDENT: Any questions to section 2?

Delegate Gill.

DELEGATE GILL: In the schedule of legislation there is just a typographical error.

THE PRESIDENT: Let us hold it until we come to that.

This is Article 2. Are there any other questions?

The Chair hears none.

Proceed to Article 3.

DELEGATE PENNIMAN: When we were discussing Article 3 we had the assistance of Dr. Loevy, the staff advisor to the Legislative Branch Committee. There were a couple of items that came up which were discussed on which we did nothing on because it appeared to us that there was a substantive matter that might conceivably be involved so those would come up from the floor and not from us.

On page 10, section 3.04, line 8, we changed the word "drawn" to "redrawn". The reason we changed it to "redrawn" is that elsewhere in the schedule of transitional provisions there is a provision for the districts to be drawn in 1970, as you know. We did not want to suggest that this would be the first time in line 8, so if the word "redrawn" was used, and it would have been just as accurate the other way, but we did it this way for a certainty.

In section 3.01, we changed "The legislative power of the State" from "is" to "shall be", to correspond with what was done in the other parts of the article.

In section 3.06, in lines 44 and 45 in addition to shortening it by saying "commission plan" rather than "plan of the commission", we put the "commission" in the active voice to say "If the Court of Appeals finds" rather than in the way it had been before.

Again, in line 16 under 3.07, we use "redrawn" rather than "drawn" and also in line 17 we used the word "in every tenth year thereafter". The same thing was true back on page 10, line 10, "in every tenth year thereafter."

Let me note also at this point that we did shift the sections so that we have Congressional Districts—Congressional Redistricting Procedure—immediately after the ones on the legislature.

There are arguments going both ways on it and we first moved them at the end to separate them from any state legislative matters. However, since each is involved or rather the commission is involved in each of the redistricting whether congressional or legislative, we moved it back to have it "commission". It is a change which I think is for the better.

You will notice also we put in headings of the sort of intermediate variety on page 9. We inserted the heading Districts