

trying to decide here what is a subject of constitutional dimension, a word that I have heard bandied about ever since I have been here.

How do you determine what is the basis for measuring this dimension? Do you determine it upon the basis of the number of people, the number of citizens involved? If that be your criterion, then of course consumer protection will yield to no other problem. If you measure it upon the basis of the effect it would have upon the underprivileged, the disadvantaged, the credit buyer, if you please, then of course it is of constitutional dimension.

If you base it upon succinctness—I have heard much talk about things to be succinct; could anything be more succinct than this provision? I think not. Would something of this kind be enforceable if enacted by the legislature? I certainly think it would.

Now, there are other precedents in this constitution that we are drafting of a similar nature. I call your attention, my fellow delegates, to what we have already done with regard to the structure of county government, where we say in section 7.03, within one year following the adoption of this constitution the General Assembly shall provide by public general law a choice of procedures by which an instrument of government of a county may be proposed.

That is a direction to the legislature and whether the legislature acts or does not act is perhaps open to some subsequent decisions. The legislature may not be capable of drafting a model county charter.

In our proposed article relating to suffrage, we state that the General Assembly shall make certain laws with regard to registration, with regard to residence, et cetera. That is a mandate, just as clear as anything can be and I predict to you before this Convention is over there are going to be many other mandates to this legislature, and I think, if I can repeat again, without belaboring the arguments of those who support this thing, that here we have a problem of great proportions. It depends, as Delegate Wheatley says, upon your value concepts, as to whether you shall undertake the provision of this kind in the constitution, and certainly we must do that if we are to carry out our responsibilities to those who are most in need of consumer protection.

Thank you.

THE CHAIRMAN: Does any other delegate desire to speak in opposition to the recommendation?

Delegate Mentzer?

DELEGATE MENTZER: I am an employee of Kiplinger, Washington Editors, with whose weekly business letters some of you may be familiar. You may not know they also publish a weekly magazine, CHANGING TIMES, which stresses education in many fields. I speak as a housewife who realizes the need for and supports federal aid to education in this field. I feel, however, our job here is to debate and devise a structure of state government and not to supply courage or spurs to the legislature to do its job, and I intend to vote against this provision.

THE CHAIRMAN: Delegate Borom.

DELEGATE BOROM: Mr. Chairman, fellow delegates, not too long ago this Convention approved a section of the constitution which dealt with natural resources. I think your action there represented your recognition that not only the State of Maryland, but across the United States, our natural resources have been exploited. Today we are talking about human beings. We are talking about exploitation. Now if we could give the kind of consideration to natural resources, trees, hillsides, countryside, waterfronts and all, why can we not take the time to recognize that we are talking about the citizens of the State of Maryland. They are resources, human resources. They are as important, if not more important than the green countryside that we voted not too long ago to mandate the General Assembly to look out for and take care of. We are talking about exploitation. We are in a different time than we were in 1941. Madison Avenue, high-pressure tactics are things that we all live with. I am not talking about the poor people. I would classify anybody with an income of \$15,000 or less as vulnerable to sharp business practices, and if any of you who sit here today think that this has no relevance to you, if you have not had the experience, I suggest you stop and give it a second thought. We are talking about human beings in the State of Maryland. We are not talking about whether the federal government itself ought to take the regulatory action. We are talking about the State of Maryland.

We had some speeches earlier in the Convention saying that as we write this constitution, we want to strengthen state government in Maryland. We do not want to lean back on the federal government. For that reason I say we cannot wait for the federal government to take charge of regulating business practices. I think you have to keep in mind we are talking about the