

The critical issues here are two-fold: First, to provide a maximum degree of latitude for county government to develop, based on the economic circumstances in that county, the kind of fiscal package that makes sense there to finance the programs that the county will want to conduct under the new grant of power made available by this Constitution.

Second, and sometimes in conflict with that, to provide a procedure which assures that in developing its own tax package, the county does not intrude upon the fiscal stability and the fiscal requirements of the state.

The proposal submitted by Delegate Needle does this. It permits the county to develop, using its own fiscal resources and experts, the kind of program that it needs. It permits it, in fact it encourages it, to bring that kind of program before the General Assembly for review. It does not permit that program to go into effect unless the General Assembly has approved it, thereby permitting the General Assembly to assure itself that there will be neither a raid on the Treasury, nor a program of nuisance taxes.

I think it provides a better compromise between those of us who would prefer no restrictions on the tax powers of the counties in the Constitution and those who would prefer that all tax power be taken away from the counties.

THE CHAIRMAN: Delegate Hanson, the majority has decreed that you have one-quarter of a minute.

DELEGATE HANSON: Mr. Chairman, that is probably right.

THE CHAIRMAN: Delegate Sherbow.

DELEGATE SHERBOW: I shall be very brief. I rise in opposition to the amendment.

While these matters were being considered by the Committee on Local Government and other tax matters by the Committee on State Finance and Taxation, we thought it best to have committees working between the two groups in order to avoid the kind of debate on intricate, complicated matters that might follow if there were divisions between the committees.

We sent our representatives to the Local Government Committee to discuss this matter on taxation. We considered this proposal and other variants of it, and the State Finance and Taxation Committee, I think with only one exception, unanimously re-

jected it. It was very seriously discussed and considered.

I know nothing of cross currents. I only know of pouring oil on troubled waters, and this we have tried to do throughout all of the discussions.

It had been taken up and both Committees felt it was improper. We hope the Committee of the Whole agrees and votes against this amendment.

THE CHAIRMAN: Is there further discussion?

Are you ready for the question? The question arises on the adoption of Amendment No. 7. A vote Aye is a vote in favor of adopting the amendment; a vote No is a vote against. Cast your votes.

Have all delegates voted? Does any delegate desire to change his vote? The clerk will record the vote.

We seem to still be having trouble with the tally on the board. There being 17 votes in the affirmative and 103 in the negative, the amendment is lost. The amendment is rejected.

DELEGATE CLAGETT: Mr. Chairman.

THE CHAIRMAN: Delegate Clagett.

DELEGATE CLAGETT: I rise to a point of personal privilege.

May I say that the oil that was cast upon the troubled waters is still there.

THE CHAIRMAN: Delegate Kirkland, your amendment is now here. We will revert to a consideration of section 7.10. This will be Amendment No. 5. The clerk will read the amendment.

READING CLERK: Amendment No. 5 to Committee Recommendation No. LG-1 by Delegate Kirkland: on page 4 strike out all of lines 31 through 45, section 7.10 Establishment of Multi-County Governmental Units.

THE CHAIRMAN: Is the amendment seconded?

*(Whereupon, the amendment was duly seconded.)*

THE CHAIRMAN: The amendment is moved and seconded.

The Chair recognizes Delegate Kirkland to speak to the amendment.

DELEGATE KIRKLAND: Mr. Chairman, for these reasons: first, the General