

dette's question. The intent of the Committee was that the municipality could establish residence terms for voting in municipal elections. But this has no relevance to the House of Delegates districting. Does that answer your question?

DELEGATE BURDETTE: That is the intent of the Committee. I have another question of Delegate White, which also may be a matter for the Committee as a Whole. It seems to me so far, Delegate White, your remarks have been directed toward property owners who are in fact non-resident or only occasionally resident. I am quite familiar in Maryland with just the opposite situation, in which actual physical presence is practically year round. There are many municipalities in Maryland which permit persons to vote who vote in other states and who keep their legal residence in other states in order to work with the federal government. When I came to Maryland a quarter century ago, for instance, I found that the immediate past mayor of the Town of Cheverly was a voting resident in the State of Missouri and he kept that residence in order to maintain his quota arrangement in the federal civil service. I really raise the question whether you are speaking to the situation which we have around the metropolitan Washington area where many persons who may keep a legal residence, though they may not vote in a state a great distance away, are allowed in fact to vote in the municipal election.

DELEGATE WHITE: My chief concern is with the question of property as a qualification for permitting a non-resident to vote but I address myself further. I do not feel that any non-resident should be permitted to vote in a municipal election.

DELEGATE J. CLARK (presiding): Delegate Koss.

DELEGATE KOSS: Delegate Burdette, may I suggest that it is perfectly within the power of the municipality to define residence and they might so define it.

DELEGATE J. CLARK (presiding): Delegate Burdette.

DELEGATE BURDETTE: Is it then the interpretation of the Committee that the issue in the minority report does not go to that question? That is, you feel that the intent of the Committee under its language is that the municipality could define it?

DELEGATE KOSS: Yes.

DELEGATE BURDETTE: The second

part of the question is, even with Delegate White's minority proposal that outside of property, so far as we have had any discussion, if a person actually lives in a house and owns the house, but perhaps for some technical reason is, say, a resident of Egypt, but visits the United States, this could be defined by the municipality.

DELEGATE J. CLARK (presiding): Delegate Koss.

DELEGATE KOSS: That is correct.

DELEGATE BURDETTE: Thank you.

DELEGATE J. CLARK (presiding): Delegate Vecera.

DELEGATE VECERA: Delegate White, do you believe, as I understood you to say a few moments ago, that this violated some constitutional question as far as voting here in the municipalities is concerned? Is that what I understood you to say?

DELEGATE WHITE: I indicated that I am not attempting to get into the strictly legal area. Of course, a presentation was made before our Committee which indicated that it is a constitutional question that in time maybe, after very costly litigation, the Supreme Court will indicate is a dilution of the right to vote. This could be the outcome, but as I recall it, the very latest research we have does not indicate that the Supreme Court has taken such a position as of this moment.

DELEGATE J. CLARK (presiding): Delegate Vecera.

DELEGATE VECERA: Is it, therefore, your intention, if this is not adopted, to suggest that a case be taken to court for court disposition?

DELEGATE WHITE: I would suggest that but I feel we have no need to do that. We are writing a constitution and we can indicate what citizenship is for the purpose of Maryland. If we do our job, we do not need to go to the courts.

DELEGATE J. CLARK (presiding): Delegate Vecera.

DELEGATE VECERA: Do you think some indication of that nature would be successful if this particular proposal is not adopted at this Convention?

DELEGATE WHITE: This is possibly suggested, but this has no relevance to our obligation to act now and to make it impossible for voting rights to be connected with ownership of property.