

1 THE CHAIRMAN: Any further discussion?

2 MR. CLAGETT: In support of Dr. Burdette's
3 motion I think it is a very practical approach one
4 which really might be the means by which at least a
5 substantially new document would be brought forward
6 successfully whereas otherwise it might well be
7 defeated.

8 MR. BROOKS: I would have to take a different
9 position which is that you can't really draw a completely
10 new Constitution with the various articles inter-related
11 to the extent that this Commission is recommending a
12 new Constitution and then be in position of having any
13 one article accepted or another one rejected. It would
14 leave the resultant Constitution in worse shape than the
15 present Constitution of Maryland is because one
16 article would work under one theory and the very next
17 article that may have been retained from the old Consti-
18 tution would retain a different theory. I don't think
19 it is a practical approach. I think the Constitution
20 in the case of an overhaul of the significance being
21 contemplated has to be accepted or rejected in its