

report is to take the 35-105 figures, determine what the state population would be per one-thirty-fifth and one-one hundred and fifth, and on the basis of 35-105 allocated the House and Senate seats on a per county or political subdivision basis.

DELEGATE CASE: Obviously this does not mean that Calvert County will have one-fifth of the Senate.

DELEGATE GALLAGHER: No.

DELEGATE CASE: That would be pretty hard to do.

DELEGATE GALLAGHER: Yes.

DELEGATE CASE: Even in Calvert County.

DELEGATE GALLAGHER: The mathematicians would be required to put together districts which would assumedly have one full house district, and then having three of those, the corresponding senate district.

THE CHAIRMAN: Delegate Case?

DELEGATE CASE: So that the plan does envision an ultimate obliteration of county and city lines, is this correct?

DELEGATE GALLAGHER: The plan envisions the obliteration of existing county or city lines no more than it had to. It is not the intention to remove the county boundaries or the city boundaries. It merely attempts to conform with the constitutional mandate of the Supreme Court, that there be one man, one vote, and while we would have been delighted had we been able to find a way to provide one vote per county, it was not possible as practical matter for the reasons which I mentioned before lunch.

THE CHAIRMAN: Delegate Case?

DELEGATE CASE: So that this would be the ultimate result?

DELEGATE GALLAGHER: The ultimate result would not be the obliteration of county or city lines. It would merely be for the purposes of representation in the General Assembly, a carrying over in some areas.

Now, under the reapportionment section, which is not in here yet, the Committee will say that political subdivision lines and natural and geographical barriers should be followed as closely as possible in determining the redistricted areas.

THE CHAIRMAN: Delegate Case?

DELEGATE CASE: Can you give us any county or the City of Baltimore, if it is true in the city, where the lines would not in at least one case be obliterated for this purpose, and everything I am saying is of course for this purpose.

DELEGATE GALLAGHER: We did not believe that we were required or should undertake the business of doing the districting. This is precisely the power which we believe belongs elsewhere in the General Assembly under the plan that we have developed. If we attempted to work backwards, picked the plan and then wrote the Constitutional provision, we could never have found a satisfactory plan.

THE CHAIRMAN: Delegate Fox?

DELEGATE CASE: Mr. Chairman.

THE CHAIRMAN: Delegate Case, pardon.

DELEGATE CASE: I suggest the Chairman did not answer my question.

THE CHAIRMAN: He deemed it to be an answer, I take it.

DELEGATE CASE: The question was, and I will repeat it, can you tell us or give us any county or the City which would not have its lines obliterated for these purposes in at least one instance?

DELEGATE GALLAGHER: I do not like "obliteration" but if we agree, we are not using that term, I will say that it would be possible to draw a redistricting plan which would accomplish the non-obliteration of at least one county or one city district.

THE CHAIRMAN: Delegate Fox.

DELEGATE FOX: Mr. Chairman, looking at page 2 of the committee's recommendation, the latter part of section 3.04, the top of page 2, line 2, where it says, "Each delegate shall represent one delegate district and each senator shall represent one Senate district," would that not prevent a delegate from being elected in more than one delegate district?

DELEGATE GALLAGHER: I would say it would have that felicitous effect.

THE CHAIRMAN: Are there any further questions? Delegate Scanlan.

DELEGATE SCANLAN: Chairman Gallagher, I think the answer to this is clear. I think the Committee was clear on it, but you did not touch upon it because you had more important matters to cover.