

Several thousand, such as 28,000 people in one community could really do a lot of damage there; let us face it. A local group of people can be completely out-voted and out-weighted by several thousand people freshly put on the rolls who are there to go to school, who can register under this three-month provision that we will adopt now, I am sure, and who can actually determine an election in a college area.

Incidentally, this reminds me of our discussions back in Goucher College. Not all of you were in the room at the time, so I will repeat the story.

When I heard about this proposal for the first time of lowering the voting age, and talking about the various reasons for doing that, and talking about reducing residency requirements and all the other things, I then asked the panel up at Goucher if it were not possible that a group of college students, just on a whim, let us face it, could take over a college town or a college county, and it evoked a loud laughter, and the various professors who were there ridiculed the question.

However, when we got to the last man on the panel, who happened to be the president of the National Students' Association. He gave us a very interesting answer, and I want to tell you part of it. He said that he was aware of a movement in California to get a group of students to move to Oklahoma, where the population is very small, to make an attempt to take over the state legislature in that state, just for kicks.

So this is not something that is just fantasy. We are talking about a true possibility. After all, kids these days have money. A lot of them in school have a lot more spending money than I have, that is for sure. So if they decide to do a lot of damage, they can do it. I see I made an error when I talked about 125 people who might register. Of course I meant 125,000, as Madam Chairman said.

Now, what are we going to do with this figure of 16, 18, 19 or 20? Is it just going to be a question of letting them vote and then say this is going to be your full participation in government, or are we going to go back to the legislative section now and say, all right, they can vote, so now we will drop the age of legislators. Is anyone prepared to do that? Is there anyone who is prepared to say, yes, I want sixteen and eighteen-year-olds to sit in my legislature and spend over \$1 billion a year?

Another thing which we think you should not overlook by any means is that in most

states, not in all states, but in most states, the voting age is equated with the age of majority.

You must again wonder in your own mind as you vote on this question, that is, if this tiny majority has left any room in which to think about what is going to happen to the age of twenty-one as it represents the age of majority in this State. Are you prepared to drop the age for drinking alcoholic beverages? Are you prepared to allow eighteen-year-olds to enter into contracts for automobiles? Are you prepared to have eighteen-year-olds making applications for small loans, \$3,000 or \$4,000, to \$9,000, then having to answer for those loans for the rest of their lives?

Are you prepared to subject the legislature of this State to the tremendous pressures that will immediately follow on the heels of a decision here to reduce the age in every commercial field immediately from twenty-one to the age which you set, whether it be sixteen, eighteen, or nineteen?

Are you prepared to allow young married couples at the age of sixteen or eighteen to sign thirty-year mortgages for \$20,000 or \$22,000 in the purchase of houses?

These are all things that are directly connected, not indirectly. They are going to follow just as sure as day follows night and night follows day. These things will follow immediately, not ten years or twenty years hence, but immediately.

At this time even though we allow sixteen-year-olds to drive an automobile, is it not true that sitting in the financial seat is the parent? We are all aware of this, are we not? Many of us are aware of the fact that most insurance companies will not take a driver under twenty-five without a parent being also responsible under the same policy.

So we are talking about a very serious problem. This is not a problem being debated in the vacuum that some of us might like to believe that it is. This is a matter directly intertwined with practically every facet of our legal lives.

Another factor which you cannot overlook, we believe, is that at the time that the age of twenty-one years was established, the number of years, or the anticipated length of a life was only about one-half of what it is today. So that when the age of twenty-one was established, the average person lived to thirty-eight or thirty-nine or forty. He got an opportunity