

It seems to me that the central question is not whether a delegate lives in the neighborhood, but the central question is whether he represents his district. There is a difference between representing a district and being statistically typical of that district. It may be quite possible, for example, that a district may have a strong Republican majority and yet the most popular Republican in the surrounding area or in the entire area lives across the line as a result of the vicissitudes of redistricting rather than in that district. Why then should the Republicans in that district be deprived of their preferred candidate?

I think the likelihood is as Delegate Hopkins has expressed, that only in rare instances would a non-resident even become a candidate in a district in which he did not live. It is certainly true, as Delegate Weidmeyer suggests, that I, having been defeated in Montgomery County, could decide to run on the Eastern Shore for the House of Delegates. I would promise this Convention that the likelihood of that occurring is somewhat remote. I do not believe that that would be the most pleasant environment in which I might seek public office. It may not be less hostile than the environment in which I have previously sought it, but I do not think it would be more to my liking.

I think, ladies and gentlemen of this Committee of the Whole, the issue is not whether we prefer single or plural members, it is one of whether we should prefer to allow the people who live in any district the maximum opportunity to have whomsoever they want to represent them.

THE CHAIRMAN: Delegate Hanson, your time is up.

Delegate Gallagher?

DELEGATE GALLAGHER: Mr. Chairman, I yield three minutes to Mrs. Miller.

THE CHAIRMAN: Delegate Beatrice Miller.

DELEGATE B. MILLER: Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to this amendment and in support of the majority passage of the Legislative Committee. Those of us who were on the Committee and who voted for the Committee Report in its entirety were even unhappy a little bit with this part of the residency requirement in that we had hoped we could even require residency within the district. That we did not do so was because of requiring single-member districts. We hoped that within a senatorial district the people of each dis-

trict would know who their own candidates were and would do as Mrs. Hopkins and the other people have suggested, would vote for the man who lived in the district.

I have heard no one today who has spoken against the advisability of such a thing happening. It seems we are all trusting to the voter to use his good sense and intelligence and vote for the man who resides in his district, but we do not want to put this in the constitution.

I would give you that the argument has been made today that gerrymandering will result, and I wish to take issue with this. Most of the time gerrymandering is done to control the votes of the majority party or the majority of voters within the district.

It is not done to suit the residency requirement of the candidate. I am aware that this did happen in the previous legislature, because the legislature redistricted itself. We have sought to avoid that evil by having someone other than the legislature do the redistricting plan and having the legislature approve it. In this way we hope that kind of gerrymandering will not occur.

But I do believe that in attempting to get rid of a comparable evil or an unfortunate circumstance which might occur to several people who might live in a district that might be redistricted out from under them, we are replacing it with a greater evil; that is the evil that was spoken of facetiously yesterday, possibly lightly, I hope so, but which would exist, the evil of carpetbaggers and sundowners. I give you that in today's world with political campaigns becoming the major occupation and major industry of the public relations firms, it is perfectly possible for a man from one end of this State to run and to win in a small delegate district in another end of this State, and not to represent at all the voters in his district.

THE CHAIRMAN: Delegate Miller, your time is up.

Delegate Hopkins.

DELEGATE HOPKINS: Mr. Chairman, I think our case rests. We really do hope we will not prolong the session on this point. I hope we have made our point clear and we certainly would be glad to answer questions.

We have no further speakers.

THE CHAIRMAN: Delegate Gallagher?

DELEGATE GALLAGHER: Mr. Chairman, we have no further speakers.