

local government section 7.01, which said that "For the purposes of this Constitution county shall include Baltimore City."

The feeling is that the real issue or only issue here is that county elections would now be separated. The majority feeling, as far as the Committee is concerned, is simply this, that separating county elections so that county officials would run separately would mean greater visibility in those elections. Those elections would be indicative of a vote on local issues and it separates the issues so that a candidate is accepted or rejected on the basis of his position or record on local issues.

We feel that while evidence has been established that the turnout for local elections in Baltimore City is lower than that in elections for the state offices or for the president, we feel that this is not an indication of a more informed electorate. We feel that by separating the issues and separating the candidates and their positions on the issues, we would be able to present a more informed electorate that would go to the polls and make a decision.

Another reason for separating the county elections which would, of course, include Baltimore City, is that candidates would be accepted or rejected on the basis of what they could do as far as issues are concerned and they would not be held responsible for that aspect or that part of an issue that they could have no control over. It certainly is true that there is an overlap of issues on the state and county level. There is an overlap of issues on the federal and county level in some cases. But the county officials would be held responsible for what they could do with regard to that problem.

If they were to run with a president or if they were to run with the governor, they in campaigning would be held responsible for the governor's responsibility on issues or the president's responsibility on issues that might overlap into the local area.

We feel that the main thrust of this particular section of our article is to provide greater visibility which would then provide greater responsibility on the part of the elected official. It would separate issues so that the vote would be a clear indication of countywide issues and not statewide issues or federal issues.

Another reason for the majority position on this particular point is that this would shorten the ballot. We certainly have eliminated in this constitution certain offices. But we have retained a great many offices.

We are going to have an elected judiciary. It would seem to me if it is going to run every eight years, there might be great mechanical and administrative problems as far as the ballot is concerned because the cost of voting machines is a very important one. There comes a time with a lot of questions and issues, bond issues, referenda, and so on, when there might be a real question concerning places on the ballot, how much room there would be on the ballot.

Also as was made abundantly clear during the very lengthy and exhaustive debate on the judicial article, there was a great fear on the part of the supporters of the judicial article, those that supported the position of noncompetitive elections, that in a competitive election a judge would find himself so far down on the ballot that the ability of any one group to focus attention upon his particular stand on issues that would pertain to his particular office would be very difficult and with the shortened ballot, this, of course, would be made much easier. The third and major reason the Committee supports this position is that it is a rejection of the coattail effect. It has been traditional where you have local officials running with either statewide officials or with presidential officials to set up a ticket, where people low on the ticket will run with the hope of establishing some kind of coattail effect. I think those people who are elected at the top of any ticket, whether they be governor or president of the United States, are not elected on the same issues that a county executive is elected on or that a member of the county council is elected on. Nor do I think they should be. This whole question of coattail effect reminds me of what some politicians call Shorenstein's Rule. Some may be familiar with Shorenstein's Rule. It seems Shorenstein was a political boss who was a power in Brooklyn during the time of Franklin Roosevelt in the 1930's. Shorenstein was a Democrat and had a very powerful organization and one of those years when his organization was, of course, supporting the top of the ticket, Franklin Roosevelt, he had on his ticket, a man running for judge. Well into the campaign the judge came to Shorenstein and said, look, what is all the problem here, what is going on? All I see in all the advertisements, all the billboards, all brochures, and all the publicity, the only thing I see is Franklin Roosevelt. Where am I? I never see that. Where are my brochures, where are my billboards, where is my campaign money, how am I going to get elected when all you are doing is highlighting