

procedure. It has become a word and nothing more, and the definition has been ignored. I think that if you will reflect upon the fact that after 100 years this Convention had to be called into being by an emergency law, which could not wait an additional thirty or forty days before going into effect, and which could not be suspended because of the urgent need for a Convention at this moment, and not a few months later, I think you will see that the word "emergency" had lost all of its meaning.

Objection had been raised last Friday with regard to the use of the word "special". I am suggesting the use of another word, which should not result in any of the objections that had been raised to the use of the word "special".

I am suggesting that we require the General Assembly simply to say that when they have determined that a law shall not be suspendable by a petition for referendum, that they say so in language that the public and all the members of the General Assembly can understand, but they simply say this law shall not be suspendable.

This amendment would accept the other suggestions that are implicitly embodied in Delegate Hostetter's amendment, that is, it would require that this be stated in a separate section in the law, so that it could not be buried in the middle of an otherwise lengthy paragraph and go unnoticed.

It accepts the recommendation of Delegate Hostetter that it is not necessary that this statement be made at the introduction of the law; simply that it appear in the law at some time before it has been passed by a three-fifths vote of either House. In this manner, once again it follows the provisions of the present Constitution. Consequently, the effect of adopting this amendment would be to follow through the present salutary procedural requirements of the present Constitution, except to eliminate the, what I have termed, Mickey Mouse and potentially misleading term "emergency", and substituting I think a far more straightforward term, "nonsuspendable".

THE CHAIRMAN: The Chair recognizes Delegate Weidemeyer.

DELEGATE WEIDEMEYER: Mr. President and members of the Convention, I rise to oppose the Amendment No. 6, because the Amendment No. 1 to Amendment No. 6 in my mind is a perfectly useless

amendment, to corrupt a very good amendment, No. 6, introduced by Delegate Hostetter. I am sorry the proponent of this amendment to the amendment looks upon the Maryland public as having lived with this language for so many years and not having understood it. However, I believe that all the members of the legislature have understood this language.

I do not think the Court of Appeals has been deluded and I do not think the public of Maryland has been deluded by the decisions of the Court of Appeals, nor have they been deluded by the actions of the legislature.

In four years' experience in the House, I would say that there is not a member of the legislature who does not clearly understand what the words "emergency legislation" on the head of a bill mean, and also what the concluding paragraph of any piece of emergency legislation means. It means that it is emergency legislation and not susceptible to immediate suspending. You can take it out on referendum but the law stays in effect until the public has voted on it.

That is what the interpretation means. It has meant that for years.

Now we come along and abandon this language and for the sake of a few words in the constitution, we come up with a new word, "nonsuspendable".

I would say this, Mr. President, this new word "nonsuspendable" did not originate in Anne Arundel County; it could only have come from Montgomery County.

Mr. President, I say that when we depart from the known verbiage and interpretive verbiage of our present Constitution to get the same result, I say we are stepping into deep water and into a sea of trouble, and therefore I would urge you to defeat this amendment to the amendment and eventually to go for Delegate Hostetter's Amendment No. 6.

THE CHAIRMAN: Does any delegate wish to speak for the amendment?

Is there any further discussion?

*(There was no response.)*

The question arises upon the adoption of the amendment to the amendment. All in favor say Aye; opposed, No. The Noes seem to have it.

Now the question arises upon the adoption of Amendment No. 6, as presented by Delegate Hostetter.