Resolving highly controversial issues is not the most important reason for including initiative in a constitution. More important is the fact that by denying the right of persons to initiate legislation, an inherent contradiction arises in our system of government. The theory upon which our government rests recognizes that all sovereignty rests in the people; the people then delegate powers between the three branches of government. If a sovereign can grant a power, surely it has the right to exercise that power.

Here we are concerned with the powers that are granted by the people to the legislature to draft and enact laws. To deny initiative leaves the subordinate body, the legislature, with those powers granted by its superior, the people, but not exerciseable by the superior. It may be argued that this situation also exists with respect to the other two branches of government; however, in those cases it is not feasible for the people to exercise the powers in question. On the other hand, it has been demonstrated in other states that it is feasible for the *people* to draft and pass legislation.

Whether or not initiative is adopted, it would seem imprudent to remove referendum from the Constitution since it appears that this is also an inherent power of the sovereign people.

Assuming that there will be a referendum provision in Maryland's new constitution, such a provision must be workable. To limit this power unreasonably defeats its purpose. A provision so limited would be mere words, without rendering value. Whether the present signature requirement hinders the provision's effective use is a matter for debate. Prior to 1962, 10,000 signatures were required. Although this seems liberal, only ten statewide questions have been submitted since the adoption of Article XIV in 1915. In 1962, the signature requirement was amended to require a petition to bear the names of 3 per cent of the number of persons who voted for governor in the preceding gubernatorial election. In 1964, only one question was submitted under this new requirement.

Since only one petition was prepared for the 1966 election, there would seem to be no pressing need to raise the signature requirement. The voting population in the State is increasing. If one million votes are cast for governor (in the 1966 gubernatorial election there were 919,760 votes cast for the candidates for governor), 30,000 signatures would be required for a subsequent petition. Collecting this number of signatures would be a formidable task for any person or group.

Any increase in the percentage of signatures required, if thought desirable, should be kept to a one or, at most, a 2 per cent increase. It should be remembered that the 3 per cent requirement was adopted in 1962.

Collecting signatures is a difficult task in itself, but when the time for gathering them is short, the burden is even heavier. Most states provide petitioners 90 days in which to compile signatures; but this is not the case in Maryland. The governor, if he desires, may shorten the time permitted to about 25 days, requiring the solicitors to gather over 500 signatures a day in order to amass the required 15,000 signatures by June 1 for a petition requiring 30,000 signatures. It would seem that all petitioners should be expressly guaranteed 90 days from the passage of a measure (passage being the date on which the governor's