

Yesterday, in the invocation, the minister referred to the difference between that which ought to be and that which can be. This is the problem we are facing now.

Politics, and that is what we are engaging in, in the best sense of the term, has been defined as the art of the possible. The possible is that what we believe this Convention must seek.

The majority report of the Committee, on page 9, shows the apportionment of the proposed 35-105 legislatures in the 1970s. I invite you to take a look at it. If you take the legislature as apportioned on that sheet you will find that 17 counties do not have a senator they can call their own, and nine counties do not even have a delegate they can call their own. A delegate in 1970 will represent 37,700 people, and the senators, 113,000 people.

The senate does not bother me so much and it does not bother the other members of the Minority so much; but the idea of the House of Delegates does.

I might say that I am not now and never have been a practicing member of a political machine, nor do I come from a county which is likely even in the distant future to be without a delegate it can call its own. But I do believe that the eight counties on the Shore who do not have population enough for five delegates under the majority proposal are entitled to some consideration.

Under the majority recommendation, in 1970 only seven political subdivisions of this State will be represented by a man they can call their own. On the projected 1970 population this figure will drop to five subdivisions of the State, and every delegate will represent nearly 45,000 people.

It is possible for us to do far better by these people without compromising for all time the principle of maintaining a limit on the size of the house. As the Chairman of our Committee said, most of the legislators who appeared before us suggested that the present size was about the top limit of workability, even though it might be a bit more efficient if it were reduced somewhat.

An apportionment of 144 delegates as a maximum can be made from 1970, which will give each county at least a chance to be represented. We have made a sample of this kind of an apportionment, and it can be done.

The majority proposal freezes every

legislator into a little freedom with single member districts for all. This minority believes that the legislature should have flexibility in the years to come. Our amendment offers alternative solutions and indeed flexibility.

In 55 legislative bodies out of a total of 99 in the United States combinations of single and multi-member districts are used. Maryland could do so, too, and still reduce the voter confusion which results from long ballots.

The minority proposal also permits the use of the slot system, a system which is used in 18 bodies, mostly in the Southwest, but including California, a system where if there are three-member delegate districts, a delegate can run for slot one, slot two, or slot three, and the people can choose their appointments from those slots.

The legislature might even use a system which is in use in the lower house in Illinois, that of cumulative voting, where if there are three delegates running in your district you may cast three votes for any one of three persons, or you can pass two for one and one for another. This is the kind of a system that could help to assure these small counties representation.

The Constitution which we are writing here in Annapolis will not last unless it has flexibility, but at the same time it will not pass unless it offers representation.

A very few years before Maryland wrote its first Constitution a ship called the PEGGY STEWART was burned in the Harbor of Annapolis on the question of taxation without representation. I do not suggest that we should go back to the harbor and burn the MARYLAND LADY on the question of small county representation.

I am not ashamed of compromise. Edmund Burke, in his speech on the conciliation of America said, "All governments, indeed every human benefit and enjoyment, every virtue and every prudent act, is founded upon compromise."

This minority report and amendment offers flexibility. The ratio between the number of members in the House and that in the Senate can be changed. Alternatives in districting, and the hope of representation for diverse areas and communities of interest are offered.

It offers a size which permits more latitude than the limited numbers of the majority proposal. Yet it is smaller than the