

same law is still subject to a statewide referendum, is it not?

DELEGATE KOSS: I suppose it would. In that event, if I understand you correctly, there would be the possibility of two referenda on the same question appearing in the areas affected by that change of boundary?

DELEGATE CLAGETT: As well as statewide?

DELEGATE KOSS: Yes.

THE CHAIRMAN: Delegate Bennett.

DELEGATE BENNETT: If the legislature of Maryland passed a law abolishing a dispensary system for instance in Montgomery County, could that be petitioned to referendum?

DELEGATE KOSS: It is my understanding, and I might be corrected, that the General Assembly under the terms of some of the provisions that have been made would not be empowered to pass a law abolishing the dispensary system in Montgomery County.

DELEGATE BENNETT: Let us say it applies statewide.

DELEGATE KOSS: That would be a provision of the referendum.

THE CHAIRMAN: Delegate Bennett.

DELEGATE BENNETT: Put it another way around: a law passed by the legislature authorizing slot machines in a county, would that be subject to statewide referendum?

DELEGATE KOSS: Again, Delegate Bennett, it is my understanding and I might be proven wrong, that the General Assembly could pass a law abolishing slot machines in the State of Maryland, and that could be petitioned to referendum. It might very well be that this would affect only less than the full part of the state, but it would have to be petitioned as a statewide public general law, statewide referendum.

THE CHAIRMAN: Are there any further questions?

Delegate Carson?

DELEGATE CARSON: Delegate Koss, in Section 4, the last sentence, "No other verification shall be required."

I take it that the word "verification" means no other affidavit shall be required?

DELEGATE KOSS: I am listening. You are correct.

THE CHAIRMAN: Delegate Carson.

May I ask each of you before you start another question, could you wait until I announce you, because otherwise the person operating the console cannot turn on your switch. Delegate Carson.

DELEGATE CARSON: Am I also correct in assuming, therefore, that any check made by the Secretary of State, Attorney General or other officer of this State as to the correctness of the referendum petition would still be permitted under your proposed sections here?

DELEGATE KOSS: Absolutely.

THE CHAIRMAN: Are there any further questions?

*(There was no response.)*

If not, we will proceed to section-by-section consideration of Committee Recommendation S&E-1.

The matter before the Committee is the consideration of Committee Recommendation S&E-1. It is open to amendments. Under the procedure we move to section 1, on lines 9, 10 and 11 of the Recommendation. Is there any amendment? Delegate Scanlan.

DELEGATE SCANLAN: We have asked the research staff to prepare an amendment a few minutes ago. It is a fairly simple amendment. It would strike section 1, that is, lines 9, 10, 11, on page 1 of S&E-1; Mrs. Bothe and I are the sponsors of that amendment. It has not yet been prepared, to my knowledge.

THE CHAIRMAN: You mean it has not been prepared?

DELEGATE SCANLAN: It has not been distributed.

THE CHAIRMAN: Do you know how long ago it was?

DELEGATE SCANLAN: Within ten minutes ago, I would say, Mr. Chairman.

THE CHAIRMAN: Mrs. Marx.

CHIEF PAGE: I will check.

DELEGATE SCANLAN: It is a fairly simple amendment in at least the terminology.

THE CHAIRMAN: Are there any other amendments to be offered to Section 1 which are already printed?

*(There was no response.)*