

THE PRESIDENT: The amendment having been submitted by Delegate Kiefer and seconded by the co-sponsors, the Chair recognizes Delegate Kiefer.

DELEGATE KIEFER: Mr. President, ladies and gentlemen of the Convention, this is purely to clean up this language and make it clear that a jury will be of twelve people in civil cases, though the General Assembly may provide for not less than six nor more than twelve in cases involving the District Court.

It is only a matter of clarification, and I hope therefore we can pass it very quickly.

Delegate Burdette.

DELEGATE BURDETTE: Mr. President, I should like to support the amendment, since I think I happen to be the member of the Committee on Style who insisted that the change could not be made because it is a change of substance and not of style, but apparently it is desired by all of the original movers as well as the Committee, and is desired by the Committee on Style.

THE PRESIDENT: Is there any discussion? Are you ready for the question?

(Call for the question.)

The Clerk will ring the quorum bell.

The question arises on the adoption of Amendment No. 10 to Committee Recommendations R&P-1 and R&P-2 as amended by S&D-9. A vote Aye is a vote in favor of the amendment; a vote No is a vote against. Cast your vote.

(Whereupon, a roll call vote was taken.)

THE PRESIDENT: Has every delegate voted? Does any delegate desire to change his vote?

(There was no response.)

The Clerk will record the vote.

There being 104 votes in the affirmative and none in the negative, the motion is carried, the amendment is adopted.

Delegate Singer, did you get a copy of — is Delegate Singer out? See if Delegates Dulany and Singer are in the lounge and, if they are, ask them to come in.

Delegate Singer, have you seen a copy of the section as it would be rewritten?

DELEGATE SINGER: No.

THE PRESIDENT: I think it is probably on your desk. I asked the pages to get it to you.

Do you still have a question, Delegate Singer, or are you satisfied?

DELEGATE SINGER: I am satisfied.

THE PRESIDENT: Very well. Amendment No. 9, which is not printed, would make section 1.12 read as follows: "No person shall be imprisoned for debt, but an obligation for the support of a dependent, or for alimony, created by a valid decree of a court or created by an agreement approved by a decree of a court, shall not constitute a debt within the meaning of this section."

Does that state your intent, Delegate Dulany?

DELEGATE DULANY: That is correct, Mr. President.

THE PRESIDENT: Delegate Willoner.

DELEGATE WILLONER: Mr. Chairman, I have a question to raise. This particular constitutional provision had the language "dependent children" in, at one time, and it was held not sufficient to cover illegitimate children. I assume "dependent" is assumed to be broad enough to cover illegitimate children.

THE PRESIDENT: Delegate Dulany stated earlier the use of the word "dependent" is in no way limited by any legal or other kind of relationship. It is intended to describe a status which would exist regardless of any relationship. Is that correct, Delegate Dulany?

DELEGATE DULANY: That is correct, Mr. President.

THE PRESIDENT: Delegate Carson, have you seen the language of the section?

DELEGATE CARSON: Mr. Chairman, the language is agreeable to me.

THE PRESIDENT: Delegate Kiefer.

DELEGATE KIEFER: Mr. President, I do not want to be cantankerous about this, but I am afraid this goes further than was contemplated and further than the original amendment or original recommendation of the Committee.

I have no objection to it, but there has been nothing in the law at this time which would allow an imprisonment for debt for nonsupport of a parent. I suppose it would be all right if we wanted to put it in, but it is a new concept. I think we ought to understand that we are doing something quite different from what we started out to do.