

rected by someone in the room, the gubernatorial election of 1966 was a very hotly contested one whereas the mayoralty election in Baltimore City of 1967 was not terribly exciting.

DELEGATE J. CLARK (presiding): Delegate Child.

DELEGATE CHILD: That is all, Delegate Schloeder, thank you.

DELEGATE SCHLOEDER: Thank you, sir.

DELEGATE J. CLARK (presiding): The Chair recognizes Delegate Cardin.

DELEGATE CARDIN: In view of the fact that we are discussing a radical departure from what has been a stable and traditional form, may I suggest the absence of a quorum?

DELEGATE J. CLARK (presiding): The absence of a quorum has been suggested. The Clerk will please ring the bell.

DELEGATE CARDIN: Thank you.

DELEGATE SCHLOEDER: May I take this opportunity to read some of these figures?

DELEGATE J. CLARK (presiding): Wait a minute, Delegate Schloeder. We have to take the roll. The Clerk will take the roll. Indicate your presence, please.

*(Whereupon, a roll call vote was taken.)*

DELEGATE J. CLARK (presiding): Has everybody indicated his presence?

*(There was no response.)*

The Clerk will take the roll.

Are there any further questions of Delegate Schloeder? Delegate Hanson.

DELEGATE HANSON: Delegate Schloeder, I would like to go back to something you said a while ago about your feeling that in a matter of urban problems, for example, there was great value in separating the mayoralty race or the county council race from the gubernatorial race or any other higher level race.

I wonder if you are suggesting in that that in spite of the fact you said these were combined local, state, and national problems, the elections between the various levels of government have no relevance to each other.

DELEGATE J. CLARK (presiding): Delegate Schloeder.

DELEGATE SCHLOEDER: Not at all. I did not mean to give you that impression. If I did, I think they have a relevance and a very great relevance but the answer is, not at all.

DELEGATE J. CLARK (presiding): I want to announce for the tape that a quorum is present. Delegate Chabot.

DELEGATE CHABOT: Delegate Schloeder, in response to a question by Delegate Child, you gave us the gubernatorial figures for Baltimore in the last two years. Could you give us comparable figures for some elections before that?

DELEGATE SCHLOEDER: Be very happy to and I would like to ask Delegate Weidemeyer what is the reverse of being Chabotaged? The election figures for 1954, the gubernatorial turnout was 254,000, in 1955 the mayoral turnout was 218,000. Now for the three elections, 1958 to 1967, here is the way it worked. In 1958 the gubernatorial turnout in Baltimore City was 151,000. The following year in 1959, I might say the 1958 gubernatorial election was one in which certainly one of the participants precluded a large turnout because of his fine performance in running scared. Everybody knew he was going to win easily. The next year, however, in a mayoralty election in 1959, 228,000 turned out. That makes 78,000 more turned out the following year in a mayoralty election.

In 1962 the gubernatorial election, 203,000 turned out in Baltimore City and the following year in 1963 in a mayoral election 212,000 turned out.

So again there were 9,000 more turning out in a mayoralty election running alone without any coat-tail effect with greater visibility.

DELEGATE J. CLARK (presiding): Are there any further questions? Delegate Hopkins?

DELEGATE HOPKINS: Delegate Schloeder, in the statistics you have up there, do you have any that show what happened in a gubernatorial election, not voter turnout, but how many of those actually voted for the county offices that were on the ballot with the governor? I think those are the figures we really need.

DELEGATE J. CLARK (presiding): Delegate Schloeder.

DELEGATE SCHLOEDER: I would yield to Delegate Byrnes who is going to have the minority report on this. He would be very happy to provide those.