| Senatorial Districts | Number of Senators | Counties |
|---|---|---|
| 1 | 3 | Allegany, Garrett and Washington |
| 2 | 2 | Carroll and Frederick |
| 3 | 5 | Howard and Montgomery |
| 4 | 5 | Prince George's |
| 5 | 1 | Charles and St. Mary's |
| 6 | 3 | Anne Arundel and Calvert |
| 7 – 12 | 2 each | Baltimore City Districts |
| 13 | 7 | Baltimore |
| 14 | 1 | Harford |
| 15 | 2 | Caroline, Cecil, Kent, Queen Anne's and Talbot |
| 16 | 2 | Dorchester, Somerset, Wicomico and Worcester |

The population per senator varied from a low of 60,749 in the 15th district to a high of 85,207 in one of the districts in Baltimore City. The maximum deviation from the mathematical norm for population per senator was 18 per cent. In three other districts, the deviation fell between 15 per cent and 16 per cent. Looking at the State as a whole, the smallest percentage of the population that could elect a majority of the Senate was 47.8 per cent.

The Circuit Court of Anne Arundel County held Senate Bill 8 to be unconstitutional. The Court of Appeals affirmed, holding that the Senate apportionment with its variation of six to one in representation was not acceptable.[85] The deviations allowed by Senate Bill 5 in the Senate and House of Delegates were found to be within permissible limits. Certiorari was denied by the Supreme Court.[86]

[85] Hughes v. Maryland Committee, 241 Md. 471, 217 A.2d 273 (1966).

[86] 384 U.S. 950 (1966).

***EPILOGUE***

The Supreme Court's denial of certiorari in 1966 appeared at the time to mark the end of the long turmoil over reapportionment in Maryland. The reapportionment provisions in Senate Bill 5 were implemented and the ensuing General Assembly went on to establish a historical record of accomplishment.

The problem of the constitutionality of the apportionment provided by Senate Bill 5 may have been reopened by *Kilgarlin v. Hill.*[87] *Kilgarlin* involved an apportionment scheme for the Texas House of Representatives where the maximum deviation from the average population per representative was less than 15 per cent. The Supreme Court, after observing that it doubted whether such a variation could be justified by local policies counseling the maintenance of established political subdivisions in apportionment plans, declined to reach the constitutional issue. Texas policy, the Court noted, permitted the

[87] 386 U.S. 120 (1967).