

cession, and the other was the National Institutes of Health cession.

Mr. Lazowska had a suggested amendment to GP-5, but then when we read him the Jett-Storm amendment, he agreed that this would clear up any questions or objections that the federal government might have, and he also made a suggestion which was incorporated into the suggested amendment. I thought maybe I had better correct that one thing.

THE CHAIRMAN: Are there any other questions?

Delegate Pullen.

DELEGATE PULLEN: Mr. Chairman, I might be able to help out this matter, but I suggest that even what I have to say should be re-checked, because I have been out of the office connected with this for three years.

Impacted areas have nothing to do, if I am correct, with people who actually live on government property. It is only those surrounding areas that are affected by people who work for the government, in part.

Furthermore, it does not affect, I think, those communities which are operated by government agencies in which money or funds are given in lieu of taxes. I think that is correct, but Delegate Raley is a little concerned, and I will let him raise his question. I do not think it would affect this, but we had better check it.

THE CHAIRMAN: Delegate Raley.

DELEGATE RALEY: Mr. Chairman, I do not really know what the point is but I heard Dr. Pullen say something, and I do think the people that live aboard bases are considered as part of the impact area money, because they do go to school outside and that money is counted.

THE CHAIRMAN: Delegate Willis.

DELEGATE WILLIS: If I might speak to this point, I would say that in fact today our county has been involved in this since back in 1952, and this proposed section, as I see it, would have no effect either way on payments for impacted areas.

THE CHAIRMAN: Are there any further questions?

Delegate Singer.

DELEGATE SINGER: I would like to know what this section purports to do that

is not already accomplished by statute, if anything.

THE CHAIRMAN: Delegate Singer, I call to your attention that the discussion now is on Amendment No. 1 to this section. Do you have this in front of you?

DELEGATE SINGER: Yes, Mr. Chairman, I do, and I have compared it with the existing statute. Part of it is the same; part of it has been transposed.

THE CHAIRMAN: Your question is directed to the amendment?

DELEGATE SINGER: Amendment No. 1.

THE CHAIRMAN: Delegate Boyer, do you want to answer that, or do you want Delegate Storm to answer it?

DELEGATE BOYER: Since this is the Storm-Jett amendment, I would prefer Delegate Storm to explain what he intends here.

THE CHAIRMAN: Delegate Storm.

DELEGATE STORM: Mr. Chairman and Delegate Singer, the idea behind this amendment is to recognize the problem that people on federal enclaves have no state government to serve them the way our Court of Appeals has held in the Loeb case, and not only to recognize the problem but to adopt a uniform policy so that these people will have state government, and to make it uniform as to all future acts of cession while leaving the flexibility to cooperate with the federal government to meet any special requirements.

If you would look over Article 96, you would see that our approach has been an extremely haphazard approach since 1791. Also, since section 47 was adopted, the Attorney General has ruled in the case of Dietrich, and in the case of the National Institutes of Health, that since section 47 was not referred to in those acts of cession the jurisdiction ceded in the case of Dietrich and NIH is more exclusive than ever before. The idea of having this in the constitution is to adopt a policy which says that we will treat these people the same as other people living in Maryland are treated.

THE CHAIRMAN: Delegate Singer.

DELEGATE SINGER: Delegate Storm, my question, though, was the difference in language between your amendment and the present status. Does it accomplish any difference other than constitutionalizing it?