

that is on the edge of your district, you may well find yourself over in the other district as a result of the lines being redrawn. This hardly seems fair if you have been representing your district for four years or eight years, to suddenly find you can no longer run in that district, even though you only live one block out of it.

This is the kind of situation to which we are addressing ourselves.

THE CHAIRMAN: Are there any further questions?

Delegate Dukes.

DELEGATE DUKES: I think I understand the value of the proposal to the current elected officials, and to those who have been active in politics in the past. I am not sure I understand the value to the State of Maryland.

Would you explain that to me, please?

THE CHAIRMAN: Delegate Hopkins.

DELEGATE HOPKINS: The value to the State of Maryland?

I think if you have an experienced official who has been doing a good job in the legislature of the State, that the State of Maryland still needs him. I think it is a value of the people who are elected.

DELEGATE DUKES: Do you think it is not also possible to have experienced legislators who have not done a good job for the people who could maintain their position?

DELEGATE HOPKINS: You can always have that. I do not take such a dim view of the legislature.

THE CHAIRMAN: Delegate Groh.

DELEGATE GROH: Does the Committee Recommendation which requires residence in the senatorial districts only, not in any individual single member district, not tend to eliminate your problems to a certain extent?

DELEGATE HOPKINS: It makes the problem somewhat less of one, Delegate Groh, but with 120 districts in the State, or even 40 senate districts being redrawn every ten years there are a lot of boundaries all through the State of Maryland. You could have a large number of people living near these boundaries. It is less of a problem, true.

THE CHAIRMAN: Are there any further questions?

Delegate Borom.

DELEGATE BOROM: Mrs. Hopkins, if I gather the gist of your minority report, your concern is to protect those office holders who by virtue of boundary changes may be having to compete against the incumbents. Would it not seem better to include in your suggested section, a specific reference to an incumbent being eligible? Otherwise I see you leaving the door open for any Johnny-come-lately to roam anywhere he wants to all over the State because he thinks he has a better chance in one section than another.

I would vote for this if you were more specific in terms of an incumbent who is affected having the opportunity to run for office outside of the place where he resides.

DELEGATE HOPKINS: What you are suggesting is a little closer to the majority report, but it was our intention in order to be totally fair, if we were going to do this at all to go the whole way; and again we get back to the same old business that you are concerned about, we think we can trust the voters, with modern methods of communication, et cetera, not to be fooled by a Johnny-come-lately.

When you have fewer candidates probably in the future and only one from a district, I understand what you are talking about and it may suffice, but for now it does not go far enough for us.

THE CHAIRMAN: Delegate Chabot.

DELEGATE CHABOT: Delegate Hopkins, you mentioned the federal law and pointed out that a member of Congress need not under the United States Constitution, reside in the district that he represents.

However, the United States Constitution also does not require that the member of Congress have been a resident of the state for two years. It merely requires that he be an inhabitant, which is presumably something less than residence, only at the time of his election.

Why would you depart from the federal model there if you use the federal model as part of your argument?

DELEGATE HOPKINS: I do not quite see what you are driving at.

THE CHAIRMAN: State your question again, Delegate Chabot.

DELEGATE CHABOT: The United States Constitution does not require that a