

and also the General Assembly will be forced to comply with this provision, if it is accepted.

THE CHAIRMAN: Delegate Barrick, any further questions?

DELEGATE BARRICK: No, I do not agree with his answer, but I have no other questions.

THE CHAIRMAN: Are there any further questions of the sponsor of the amendment?

Delegate Wheatley.

DELEGATE WHEATLEY: Yes, sir.

THE CHAIRMAN: There is only one and a half minutes left of time, sir, so make your question brief.

DELEGATE WHEATLEY: Mr. Chairman, I have a point of parliamentary inquiry.

THE CHAIRMAN: State the inquiry.

DELEGATE WHEATLEY: Would a question of the Chairman of the Committee be in order at this time?

THE CHAIRMAN: It would not.

Are there any other questions to the sponsor of the amendment?

*(There was no response.)*

Delegate Winslow, do you have a question?

DELEGATE WINSLOW: No.

THE CHAIRMAN: If there are no further questions the Chair recognizes Delegate Gallagher.

DELEGATE GALLAGHER: Mr. Chairman, ladies and gentlemen, I think the colloquy between Delegate—

THE CHAIRMAN: Let me interrupt you a moment, Delegate Gallagher.

Delegate Wagandt, the reason the Chairman did not recognize Delegate Winslow is that under the rule, you cannot allocate any part of your time, since this is not controlled time.

The Chair will recognize Delegate Winslow in a few moments.

DELEGATE GALLAGHER: I believe that if one thought of the colloquy between Delegate Wagandt and Delegate Weidmeyer, you could see you could get into a numbers game over what the maximum percentage deviation ought to be. I remember

going through that once before in connection with another matter here.

I agree with the objective of Delegate Wagandt. I do think we want as properly reflected representation as possible. One man ought to equal one vote. But we are in a state of somewhat uncertainty at the present time as to what the Supreme Court is going to do.

We know that it is going to affect Maryland. I think it would be far better to adopt a flexible and yet somewhat generally fair approach to the subject matter by using the language of the Committee. I am afraid that if we do go to a percentage, and we have to hold to it in all cases, that it will produce situations which people will regret, even those who have served in this Convention.

I think it is far better at this time to go with the language of the Committee, "substantially equal," rather than to go to a particular number, and I would urge you to follow the recommendation of our Committee, which did exactly as you have done here.

We went from one side to another. Our final agreement was a compromise. We think 15 percent is a good figure but we would sooner have it reflect the general intention of the Committee, with a variation for those cases where there would be hardship. Consequently I would ask you therefore to vote against the amendment, recognizing as I do its objective to attain fairness, nevertheless.

THE CHAIRMAN: Delegate Winslow.

DELEGATE WINSLOW: Mr. Chairman, my remarks will be very brief.

In connection with what Chairman Gallagher has just said, that we are uncertain about the position of the Supreme Court, this is one of the very reasons that I support the amendment.

Why should we play around with a half dozen different plans until we finally hit upon one which is acceptable for the country. What we will be doing is very much in the spirit of what Delegate Weidmeyer and Delegate Wagandt just commented on, playing the numbers game.

We prevented playing the numbers game in this provision by setting the number. In the report, in the memorandum from the Committee, there is a statement, on page three, beginning with line 30, as to what they mean by substantially equal. The difference between the populations of the