

person who pays some other type of tax. He is paying a part of that municipality too. Should he not also have the right?

Why are we restricting it just to the tax. It can be argued as to whether it is legal. Still, why restrict it to one class? Why not let all taxpayers vote if they live outside the municipal limits?

DELEGATE J. CLARK (presiding): Before the Chair recognizes Delegate Rybczynski, I would like to make the announcement that we have in the balcony a group from Franklin Junior High School in Baltimore County, with their teachers, Miss Pegal and Mr. Lee.

We will give them a welcome.

(Applause.)

DELEGATE J. CLARK (presiding): Delegate Rybczynski.

DELEGATE RYBCZYNSKI: I yield up to five minutes to Delegate Grant.

DELEGATE J. CLARK (presiding): Delegate Grant.

DELEGATE GRANT: First of all, I want to say to both Delegate Della and Delegate Smith that I would be delighted to join them in extending this privilege even further, but I certainly feel that we should go this far in any event.

The question is not a matter of one man, one vote. It is a question of one man, no vote.

Trying to stand on a very old and archaic test that a person is only interested in a governmental community or community of interest in the one locality in which he may reside is completely false and it ignores the present situation where we have a mobile population.

People are interested in many communities. No longer does a man live and work and die in one specific location. His residence in a suburb may be many miles from where he works and if he is fortunate enough to have a summer residence, that is also located in a much different location.

And basically, you get around to a question of taxation without representation and that is the real question that is here. That is why I said I would be glad to extend this even further for other taxpayers.

The question of Ocean City was discussed at length at the same time that I was testifying before the Committee on a similar question, the plight of people who pay an

enormous amount of money in taxes and yet have nothing to say about how their tax money is spent.

Now Ocean City is very exemplary and, subject to correction by members of the Committee because I do not have any exact figures, the situation in Ocean City is something like this.

When they had an election and cast some 800 votes, 700 or more were cast by people who were actually non-residents in the sense of actually living there full-time in Ocean City. They also pointed out that three of the seven members of the council of Ocean City were not residents. They also pointed out that the election was conducted in the summer, so that these people who lived there could actually vote, and they would not discriminate against them by requiring them to come down on a cold day in December if they wanted to vote. There was also the question of how long they had to be a resident. To my recollection it had to be about a year. Also they had to own a certain amount of property. In other words, it was a very responsible situation.

I was interested because of the situation in my own county. I agree with Delegate White completely about poverty and I think that poverty in Appalachia is just as grinding as poverty in the central part of Baltimore City.

So I agree with you that property qualifications are not the sine qua non. However there is an element of fairness. In Garrett County we have some 36,000 people in the county who are not residents of Maryland. We have some 21,000 who are residents of Maryland. These 36,000 people who are vacationers, tourists, residents of Ohio, Pennsylvania, Illinois, create about \$11 million of the \$24 million worth of total business done in the county. Of the total assessable, of about \$60 million, their ownership is \$20 million.

That is they own a third and produce approximately less than a half of the total income, and yet there is not yet a single one of these persons except a very few of them who may come from the Baltimore and Washington area who are entitled to vote, who have anything to say about how their money is spent, whether they get roads, whether they get police protection, and so forth. To me, I think it is the grossest kind of taxation without representation.

I would certainly vote for an extension of section 2 to other types of taxpayers besides the people who own property.