

a 120 vote in the House of Delegates for 1970, and using the projected population as provided by the State Planning Commission, these are the nine counties which would have percentage votes in 1970, and the percentages they would have: Calvert would have a 70 per cent vote, that is, seven-tenths of one vote, Caroline, six-tenths of a vote, Garrett, six-tenths of a vote, Kent, five-tenths of a vote, Queen Annes, seven-tenths of a vote, Somerset, six-tenths of a vote, Talbot, seven-tenths of a vote, Worcester, eight-tenths of a vote, Wicomico, eight-tenths of a vote.

Now, happily, these nine percentage figures add up to an even 6.00 per cent.

In order to implement the amendment as we have it before us, to provide for 120 votes we would have to add three more bodies and have 123 delegates casting 120 votes. As a result of this you would be required to increase the number of warm bodies in the Senate from 40 to 41, since the Senate must reflect one-third the total of the bodies in the House.

The amendment, of course, calls for votes and you must keep adding people until you are at a point where you do have 120 votes in the House, so as a result of nine counties sending nine delegates to cast in the aggregate six votes, you have 123 in the House and 41 in the Senate, and you ought to have, I would say, a computer to help.

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

Delegate Gill, do you desire to speak in opposition?

DELEGATE GILL: Yes.

When the fractional vote was introduced in the Legislative Committee by Delegate Clark, I think most of us voted for it tentatively, until we thought about it. We were all in sympathy with it, but the group was at a disadvantage. There was a close count. I cast my vote for it because as I said then, this seemed to be a bridge.

I am not a native Marylander, but in the 23 years I have been here, I have learned one thing, that the people in Maryland do not change fast. Realizing that, I thought perhaps this could be a bridge, while the counties could be oriented to the idea that county lines are not sacred.

As times change, and we progress, county lines will have to give some. We would like to reapportion the state, but we have been considering the fact that when it is re-

apportioned, it would be done within certain outlines. The district would be compact, and other ingredients, and as one committeeman said, though in a joking way, they would be contagious.

To me that was not too much of a joke, because the people who move into the counties want to stay close together. Even though across the county line, or the district line, the people next door might have more things in common with them than the people in their own county or their own district. With the idea that perhaps for a period of time this might act as a bridge to help make the transition while the counties were learning to realize that they will eventually have to give up their county lines, I thought that this might help. However, after I went home and thought about it more, I decided that I did not see how it could be constitutional. The one-man, one-vote idea is very good, and I live by the principle that you do unto others as you would have them do unto you, but I could not imagine anybody's representing me with a half vote, or a quarter vote—I don't care what part of Maryland I lived, in—and satisfying me. So if I would not be satisfied with it, I certainly would not vote for it for somebody else, especially if the number of the legislature were as large, as this is proposed to be, 160 people. I am, therefore, speaking against the amendment for two reasons: First, I do not think it would be constitutional—I am not a lawyer, and I was hoping to get an opinion from you, or from the Attorney General, but that was not requested. However, I appreciate Delegate Henderson's hasty research, and that strengthens my belief in the fact that what we are doing would not be constitutional.

Second, it would be a false hope for the people in the county. Since what has been suggested in other amendments, that is, fair representation with one full vote for one person, can be adopted, I see no reason to go this way and see some people under-represented.

THE CHAIRMAN: Does any other delegate desire to speak in favor of the amendment?

Delegate Rybczynski?

DELEGATE RYBCZYNSKI: Mr. Chairman, there are two matters which are bothering me, as much as I would like to vote for this matter. I will yield my time, after stating the two things that are bothering me, to whoever would want to address himself to the problem.