

I was adhering to the loftiest governmental principles. And, I am willing to admit that this seems practical because I realize that some day my party could cease to be the party of reform—we could cease to be the party working for the good of and rendering the best service to the people—all the people—rich and poor—low and high—pink and beige. I realize that my party could change and become a party wedded to the anti-Roosevelt or anti-Wilson or anti-Jeffersonian principles. We could change and even be anti-Lincoln. And if we do—then we should become the minority. We would deserve it. But this Convention appears bent on hastening the day without our deserving such a fate and without the vast majority of the other party deserving such ascendancy.

It appears to me that this sort of gerrymandering, section 3.03—this changing of all the rules with the idea of putting into power more representatives of a party which has not been able to sell itself to its community—this is not the proper way to change this state around.

Let parties change the people before we change their representatives. A party should strengthen itself by working and serving the best interests of the people of this State—not by working through a “non-political Constitutional Convention.”

I earnestly submit, Mr. Chairman and fellow delegates, we are misusing this opportunity to write a good constitution if our aim is to strengthen one political party which has not shown the people that they deserve to be so strengthened. I submit that the best government possible is the one that the people will support in fair elections on a community-wide basis. I will admit that a regional or state basis would be better, Delegate Byrnes—better, but not now practical. So—don't misuse our opportunity here by using the “non-partisan” label to accomplish highly political and partisan purposes.

I am sorry I had to say this, but I felt I had to, and I have said it.

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

Delegate Bennett.

DELEGATE BENNETT: Mr. Chairman, how could anyone use so many words, speak so long, without telling us specifically what party was involved? Would you please enlighten us?

THE CHAIRMAN: Delegate Storm.

DELEGATE STORM: What party? Do you mean, Mr. Bennett, my party or the party that is getting the benefit here?

THE CHAIRMAN: Delegate Bennett.

DELEGATE BENNETT: Either one.

THE CHAIRMAN: Delegate Storm.

DELEGATE ARMOR: I have a question.

THE CHAIRMAN: Just a second.

Delegate Storm had not replied to the previous question.

DELEGATE STORM: Well, I will admit it, I am a Democrat.

*(Applause.)*

THE CHAIRMAN: Delegate—

DELEGATE STORM: But honestly I do not want to consider that every minute down here and read everything with suspicion. I just do not want to do it that way.

THE CHAIRMAN: Delegate Storm, do you yield to a question from Delegate Armor?

DELEGATE STORM: Yes.

THE CHAIRMAN: Delegate Armor.

DELEGATE ARMOR: Delegate Storm, yesterday morning one of our honorable delegates mentioned a load of baloney. Is this the second load?

THE CHAIRMAN: Delegate Storm.

DELEGATE STORM: Well, friend, Max, do you remember when we were young men together, fighting, when I was really like some of the young fellows here, I was really a reformer. I am still a reformer, and I do not know whether you would call this a second load or not.

THE CHAIRMAN: Are there any further questions?

Delegate White.

DELEGATE WHITE: Delegate Storm, I appreciate your views on the minority and majority parties. Would you permit your daughter to marry a member of a minority group—excuse me, I mean a member of a minority party?

DELEGATE STORM: I have wondered about this and I am very serious. I should not—well, yes, I will. My youngest daughter was very much in love with, I do not know what party this young fellow was a member of, but he was of a minority group that I think should not be classed a mi-