

guesses of the General Assembly with respect to what the districts ought to be is a situation which I think we ought to correct, and if we can correct it by setting forth some guideline for their action, that is what we are attempting here, and I hope to support the amendment.

THE CHAIRMAN: Does any other delegate desire to speak in opposition?

Delegate Weidemeyer.

DELEGATE WEIDEMEYER: Mr. President, and delegates of the Convention; I consider this amendment unnecessary.

In the first place, as pointed out by the Chairman, this is purely a statutory matter. In the second place, after the next census and assuming our State keeps increasing in population much more rapidly than other states, then there will be allotted, probably, one or two additional congressmen after the 1970 census and Congress will require that we then redistrict; on the other hand, should our population remain static and we keep the same number of congressmen, there would be no need for redistricting.

In the third place, while the theory of the districts being composed of adjoining territory and being compact is a fine principle, it should not be frozen into our constitution where, under certain circumstances, we could not vary it.

I know at the time in the House I objected to being joined across the Bay in Southern Anne Arundel County with the Eastern Shore, but I find that is not so bad at all, and that Chesapeake Bay is a nice little area to cross and we have had some very congenial congressional fellows and a fine Congressman. So to freeze that in would be terribly bad.

Now, also the Supreme Court has not ruled on the percentages and if we are to do as good a job under the Supreme Court decision, that is, as nearly equal as practical, I would say if we froze in 15 percent and we had a very good district that might run 16 and a half percent, we could not carry through. It would seem that while some of the thoughts on this are very good, it is absolutely unnecessary. This is purely statutory and should be left up to the legislature. I think under the new census the act of Congress and the duty of the legislature to act, they will act without this amendment being in the constitution.

THE CHAIRMAN: Delegate Chabot.

DELEGATE CHABOT: Mr. Chairman, I think that all of these comments about the failure of the Supreme Court or of the United States Congress to set down absolute limits up to now and the suggestion that until they have set down absolute limits we should not set any minimum standards all boils down to this. We want to have districts as bad as we can possibly get away with under the federal judiciary or under what Congress allows us to do, and that is why we do not want anything in our Constitution.

I suggest that those who do not want to have the worst possible districting that they can get away with, would vote for this amendment.

THE CHAIRMAN: Is there any further discussion?

*(There was no response.)*

Are you ready for the question?

*(Call for the question.)*

THE CHAIRMAN: The Clerk will ring the quorum bell.

The question arises on the adoption of Amendment No. 9 to Committee Recommendation LB-2. A vote Aye is a vote in favor of Amendment No. 9. A vote No is a vote against.

Cast your votes.

Has every delegate voted? Does any delegate desire to change his vote?

*(There was no response.)*

The Clerk will record the vote.

There being 35 votes in the affirmative and 71 in the negative, the motion is lost. The amendment is rejected.

Delegate Adkins, I now have your amendment Y. Do you desire to offer it?

DELEGATE ADKINS: Yes.

THE CHAIRMAN: The pages will please distribute amendment Y.

While that is being distributed, the Chair would like to announce if at all possible it would like to conclude consideration of this amendment this evening.

Amendment Y. This will be Amendment No. 10.

The Clerk will read the amendment.

READING CLERK: Amendment No. 10 to Committee Recommendation LB-2, by Delegate Adkins: