

actuality this is a somewhat better arrangement than the prior language because you will only have ten-year intervals instead of twelve and eight-year intervals.

THE PRESIDENT: Are there any questions of the sponsor of the amendment? The Chair hears none. Is there any discussion? Delegate Rybczynski.

DELEGATE RYBCZYNSKI: Mr. President, the way I understand the amendment, it looks like two clearly different questions. I would move for separation or division.

THE PRESIDENT: I do not think it is, Delegate Rybczynski. I can see that the two questions could be presented differently, but the first part of the amendment is to strike out all of the lines—I see what you mean. The Chair rules it is divisible. The first question will be on the portion of the amendment in lines 1 to 5 and the second question will be on the portion in lines 7 to 8. The Chair makes the ruling on the assumption that each of the parts of the amendment can stand independently of the other. In other words, that if the first amendment does not carry, you would have a situation in which the section would read “boundaries and districts shall be withdrawn according to each standard, according to the general election in 1970 and every twentieth year thereafter and prior to the general election in 1982 and every tenth year thereafter.” There is no inconsistency in that. The division stands. Delegate Gallagher, do you follow my comment?

DELEGATE GALLAGHER: I do, Mr. President, but I do think it presents a certain problem.

THE PRESIDENT: I realize it presents a problem, but it could stand that way?

DELEGATE GALLAGHER: It is possible for them to stand that way. I will leave the question of wisdom up to the floor as we reach each problem. I will take it one at a time.

THE PRESIDENT: Very well. The question will be divided. The first portion of the question will be lines 1 to 5. Second portion lines 7 to 8. Is there any discussion?

Delegate Marion.

DELEGATE MARION: May I address a question to Chairman Gallagher, please sir?

THE PRESIDENT: Do you take the floor to yield to a question?

DELEGATE GALLAGHER: Yes, sir.

THE PRESIDENT: Delegate Marion.

DELEGATE MARION: If both portions of this amendment are adopted, would it be your intention that every ten years after 1982, even in those years in which there is no general election for the election of state officials in Maryland, for instance, 1992 and 2012, that the language of this section would apply as to the redrawing of the boundaries of districts? The effect of the sections dealing with the redistricting commission and when it would take effect and when it would have to have its recommendations into the General Assembly and so on would also apply?

THE PRESIDENT: Delegate Gallagher.

DELEGATE GALLAGHER: Excuse me one second.

The answer is yes. In other words, it would be 1982, 1992, 2002, regularly all the way through.

THE PRESIDENT: Delegate Marion.

DELEGATE MARION: There would be some occasions when the redistricting would, by the constitution, have to take effect in a year in which no election was to be held.

THE PRESIDENT: Delegate Gallagher.

DELEGATE GALLAGHER: That is correct.

THE PRESIDENT: Is there any further discussion?

Delegate Schneider.

DELEGATE SCHNEIDER: Could I ask Delegate Gallagher a question?

THE PRESIDENT: Delegate Gallagher, do you yield to a question?

DELEGATE GALLAGHER: Yes, sir.

DELEGATE SCHNEIDER: Delegate Gallagher, have you considered the possibility of the transitional legislation being knocked out by the legislature resulting in no reapportionment or no redrawing of district lines until 1982?

THE PRESIDENT: Delegate Gallagher.

DELEGATE GALLAGHER: The General Assembly does not have the power to knock out the transitional legislation. It can only be done by way of constitutional amendment, as I understand it.

THE PRESIDENT: I think it would be inaccurate to say transitional legislation. Transitional provisions.