

and on that point I certainly agree with his interpretation of the law, and certainly agree that Mr. Hanson pointed out the significant differences in the reapportionment cases.

The courts have struck down cases as unconstitutional, and there was a void, and if the void had not been filled by legislative action as a temporary expedient, under the equity powers, the court could have acted. That is a far different thing from suggesting that a court of this State can force a legislature to pass a particular law in order to carry out a platitude or statement of policy or aspiration; to suggest the latter would be a dangerous thing, indeed.

I think if we fail all along the line, if we do not come out with a decent judiciary, local government, or legislative, article, but yet go home having trimmed our constitution, modernized it, and eliminated some of the platitudes that permeate it, at least we will have done something. But I think if we admit at this stage that this type of provision has an appropriate place in our constitution we are opening the doors to the ones that stand back of it.

There is one on the very next page, protection for consumer information, and a good argument could be made that the city voters are entitled to have that statement of policy placed in the constitution, an argument that could stand on equally firm ground with the argument of the conservationists.

Next week the farmers will be in here with a statement of policy for the protection of agricultural land. We have seen others coming in with a statement of an economic bill of rights. For goodness sakes, we are drafting a constitution, not laying out the principles of the new social order. And no matter how enlightened and noble those aspirations may be, whether they be as noble as those of St. Augustine's CITY OF GOD OR Aldous Huxley's BRAVE NEW WORLD, they have no place in the Constitution. Please keep them out.

THE CHAIRMAN: Does any other delegate desire to speak in favor of the amendment?

Delegate Storm.

DELEGATE STORM: Mr. Chairman, it seems to me that there is one thing that maybe Delegate Scanlan has overlooked. In putting in "The General Assembly shall, provide by law," et cetera, I think this

makes it a little simpler for the General Assembly to retain and have the power to enact local legislation regarding conservation; and there are so many sections of the State that will require more or less local legislation in reference to conservation, for example, because of the difference in the duck season within one section of the State and another.

America in miniature is so different that I think the conservation of natural resources has to be protected by the General Assembly, rather than parcelled out. Some of the local government people may be able to tell me whether or not my thinking on this is correct.

In addition, Delegate Hardwicke's suggestion, and I am certainly sympathetic with him, that it shall be the policy of the state government seems to me to broaden the power to include even the judiciary, which appears most of the time to be part of the state government. It seems to me the Hardwicke amendment would give them more power than they now have; so I speak in favor of the Committee's Recommendation, and urge everyone to support it.

THE CHAIRMAN: Does any delegate desire to speak in opposition?

Delegate Gleason, do you desire to oppose the amendment?

DELEGATE GLEASON: Mr. Chairman, I have concern that the pending amendment to the Committee report would have just the reverse effect that the delegate envisages for it, because if this power is granted to the State, it seems to me that any citizen can go into a court with an injunctive process and challenge any action of any board or any agency of the State government if such a law did not meet the criteria established within the proposed amendment.

I see, frankly, nothing wrong with the Committee amendment in this respect.

Delegate Scanlan has pointed out that there is in the existing Constitution a provision that the General Assembly shall pass laws necessary for the preservation of the purity of elections. I do not know, and I do not think he does, whether the Corrupt Practices Law relates to that basic power, but we are dealing here, unlike in the federal Constitution, with basic values within a state, whereas in the federal Constitution, although the Congress has the power to do a lot of things, it is not mandated to do certain things.