

a mess. Even when they took in Indian Head they said "We are going to give them the rights that all the people in Annapolis at the Naval Academy have", but those people have no rights.

If we leave this to statute, the legislature would have to review each and every residence requirement and all of their laws, and that specific statute specifically giving or denying rights as residents.

Now, I submit there is no reason to discriminate against these people, since we have already given them the right to vote, and we have given them the right to divorce, although we do not require them actually to reside in Maryland in order to get that right. We have given them the right to be adopted, but why leave out the questions of marriage, death and birth certificates, jury duty, wills, and intestacy proceedings. All of these things are unanswered and would have to be answered specifically by the legislature if we leave it out of the constitution.

Why can these people not be treated exactly like their neighbors and fellow taxpayers? Why not give them the benefit of being citizens and residents of Maryland?

THE CHAIRMAN: Delegate Macdonald.

DELEGATE MACDONALD: A parliamentary inquiry, Mr. Chairman.

THE CHAIRMAN: State the inquiry.

DELEGATE MACDONALD: Has Amendment No. 1 been accepted by the Committee?

THE CHAIRMAN: It has not. Do you mean by the Committee of the Whole or the Committee on General Provisions?

DELEGATE MACDONALD: I had thought, I could be mistaken, that Amendment No. 1 had been accepted as a substitute by the Committee on General Provisions.

THE CHAIRMAN: No. Delegate Boyer stated that he personally favored the amendment but that he could not speak for the Committee.

DELEGATE MACDONALD: After this vote we will then be voting on the committee's recommendation?

THE CHAIRMAN: The question now before you is the adoption of Amendment No. 1, to Committee Recommendation GP-5. If Amendment No. 1 is adopted, then you will vote on the approval of that as

the substitution for the committee recommendation. If Amendment No. 1 is rejected, then you will be voting on the committee recommendation as submitted.

Delegate Bennett.

THE CHAIRMAN: Mr. Bennett.

DELEGATE BENNETT: Mr. Chairman, may I ask Delegate Storm one question?

THE CHAIRMAN: Delegate Storm, would you take the floor to answer a question?

Delegate Bennett.

DELEGATE BENNETT: What worries me, Delegate Storm, is this section beginning on line 18 where a specific act of Congress is required to make these exceptions. Knowing how difficult it is sometimes, and how Congress gets involved in small matters, and knowing the competition and jealousy for certain government facilities, would you be willing to accept an amendment where, instead of saying "specifically required by an act of Congress", say "except to such extent as may be specifically required by the President of the United States."

THE CHAIRMAN: Delegate Storm?

DELEGATE STORM: Delegate Bennett, I might say that I did not have this phrase in this section when it was first drawn. This phrase was specifically suggested by the Department of Justice attorney who went over this, and he interprets this, and I believe that he is right, that acts of Congress which authorize various federal agencies to acquire jurisdiction and to acquire land, would be able to do so under this amendment. In other words, many acts of Congress have been passed in the past which require executive action or action on the part of boards, and agencies, and he was the one who suggested that this be put into the provision so as to make it very clear that Congress, or the Department of the Army, or almost any federal agency, could ask for a particular amount of jurisdiction.

THE CHAIRMAN: Delegate Storm, I take it your answer to Delegate Bennett's question is "no".

DELEGATE STORM: Yes.

THE CHAIRMAN: Delegate Bennett.

DELEGATE BENNETT: Delegate Storm, you were speaking of Mr. Ladowski?

DELEGATE STORM: Yes.