

And I say this — and I don't want to be rough about the things that Delegate Malkus pointed out, here — but I would say this, time and time again I have noticed that some of us feel because we are elected to a Constitutional Convention that we are ordained to see all of the things and give the people what we think they ought to have. I think we have to be close to the people and give them the service they need.

I have said many times during this Convention that the only person that I know who is ordained to do something for an individual and make him take it is the mother who gives a sick baby castor oil.

We cannot treat the public that way. We have got to give them service, and I think we must give them a district court judge who is their trial magistrate — now mind you, he is going to handle the same cases, whether you call him district court judge, or people's court judge, and put a robe on him; he is going to do and handle the same cases that those trial magistrates handled before.

THE CHAIRMAN: You have one-quarter minute, Delegate Weidemeyer.

DELEGATE WEIDEMEYER: And when in recent years have we had a county without its trial magistrate?

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

Delegate Schneider.

DELEGATE SCHNEIDER: Mr. Chairman, I think the issue is being clouded here, and being cast as an emotional matter of one district court judge for each county. That is not the question before us. The question is whether we should here decide the merits of the Case report versus the delegates who say there is a need for one district court per county; and whether we here should decide whether Delegate Grant's county is so large that a man cannot drive from one end to the other without being severely inconvenienced, and whether there are not perhaps some counties elsewhere in the State where the driving distance between points in the county is short.

The question here is whether we want to make this decision now or whether we want to leave it to the legislature. A vote Aye, to reconsider, and a vote No on Amendment No. 18, to leave it to the legislature, where Senator Malkus could present his case.

Perhaps some counties would get a judge, perhaps Garrett County would get one and perhaps some of the other counties where the distance is close would not. I would hope you would vote no on Amendment No. 18.

THE CHAIRMAN: Delegate Della.

DELEGATE DELLA: Mr. Chairman, I believe the motion to reconsider is before the body, not Amendment No. 18, and all we are doing is hashing over Amendment No. 18.

THE CHAIRMAN: This is correct, but the Chair rules that discussion of the motion to reconsider a vote by which the amendment was passed would be proper to discuss any matters pertaining to the amendment.

DELEGATE DELLA: The merits of Amendment No. 18?

THE CHAIRMAN: Hopefully we would not have to rediscuss them.

Are you ready for the question?

Delegate Key.

DELEGATE KEY: I would like to say a few things in favor of this recommendation to reconsider, because I think we need to decide whether we are really for a statewide system of courts.

Now, in asking my questions I had a very good reason. As you know, the counties, as they like to tell us, are small; they are less sophisticated, and therefore need their own to judge them. This is true. That is why we have different juvenile laws in the State; one is a juvenile in the county at the age eighteen, and in the City he is an adult at age sixteen.

This means that crimes supposedly in the City are created by more sophisticated people. If you are saying that your county people are less sophisticated, and need hometown people to try them, then I say that they are not sophisticated enough to come up to Baltimore City on this statewide system and try our people who have more sophisticated crime.

You are either for a state system, gentlemen and ladies, or you are not; and I want you to tell me by voting on Amendment No. 18 whether I should be for it, and give up a just court system in Baltimore City, or be for a state system and depend on the legislature to decide who needs the judges.

THE CHAIRMAN: Are you ready for the question?