

there will be any part-time judge at the superior level or at the district level, but that those judges at either level who may not be entirely occupied with the business in the county where he may reside may be assignable to a jurisdiction where the caseload is greater.

THE CHAIRMAN: Delegate Fox.

DELEGATE FOX: And therefore he would not be part-time?

THE CHAIRMAN: Delegate Mudd.

DELEGATE MUDD: If you mean part-time in occupation, no. A judge could be a part-time judge in one political subdivision and part-time in another.

THE CHAIRMAN: Delegate Sybert.

DELEGATE SYBERT: Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the motion to reconsider.

I think it may be significant, but those who spoke in favor of the motion to reconsider are from Baltimore City, or the large metropolitan counties. Most delegates do not know, since they do not live in the small counties the difficulties, the inconvenience of obtaining justice. A lawyer or litigant must go 10, 20, 70 miles and plus that in a round trip, in order to see a district court judge.

I submit that justice and even law enforcement will in some cases be delayed if we do not have a district court judge residing and holding court in each district. I subscribe entirely to everything that Delegate Adkins said in his well reasoned and very persuasive address. I think the question boils down to one of availability, and ready justice. As far as cost is concerned, I cannot see how it will cost much more to have a district court judge residing in the county, along with the commissioner, and the necessary clerks over and above, perhaps just a little more than the present system where there are one or more magistrates or peoples courts and the clerks.

I submit, Mr. President, that we have already spent forty minutes on this motion to reconsider. I suggest that the delegates by an even more resounding vote than they gave on Amendment No. 18, turn back this amendment to reconsider the question.

THE CHAIRMAN: Does any other delegate desire to speak in favor of the motion to reconsider?

Delegate Ulrich.

DELEGATE ULRICH: Mr. Chairman, I have a question of Mr. Mudd.

THE CHAIRMAN: Delegate Mudd, do you yield to a question?

DELEGATE MUDD: Yes, Mr. Chairman.

THE CHAIRMAN: Delegate Ulrich.

DELEGATE ULRICH: Delegate Mudd, would it not be true that the district judges will be sent to another district to hear cases when they are not busy in their own court, and by doing so, would not they be trying cases for people that they did not know, either? It seems to be the consensus of some delegates that they want to have a judge that knows their people, but would not they be transferable, anyway?

THE CHAIRMAN: Delegate Mudd.

DELEGATE MUDD: You are entirely correct.

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

Delegate Weidemeyer.

DELEGATE WEIDEMEYER: Mr. President —

THE CHAIRMAN: I should have said in favor of the motion to reconsider.

DELEGATE WEIDEMEYER: I am opposed to the motion to reconsider.

THE CHAIRMAN: Does anyone desire to speak in favor of the motion to reconsider?

Delegate Bushong.

DELEGATE BUSHONG: I hate to take exception to my good friend Senator Malcus, but it seems to me that this Convention, having given every county in the State a superior court judge, and knowing something about the caseload in some of these small counties, and now to give them a district judge, seems to me to be going just too far with judges, and the thing is getting out of hand.

If these judges are needed, they can get them; but if they are not needed, why have them?

I believe that the district court judge can go into Garrett County twice a week and any of these other small counties, and do a good job for them; but on the other hand, to have him sitting in Garrett County every day in the week is somewhat