

Apparently state censuses have been accepted by the courts, at least the ones that are made under official state auspices, and every argument that I can see calls for a reapportionment in 1970 rather than four years later.

THE CHAIRMAN: Does any delegate desire to speak in favor?

Delegate Rosenstock.

DELEGATE ROSENSTOCK: Mr. Chairman and fellow delegates: I just want to give you the benefit of the experience I had last year in working with biostatistics. We had statisticians from the State Planning Department, The State Health Department, the University of Maryland, The State Department of Education, the state teachers colleges, and fortunately we were loaned two gentlemen by the American Telephone and Telegraph Company through the local offices of the C&P Telephone Company.

When we started to analyze population growth in Maryland, we found that the greatest problem was the in-migration and migration within the large counties of Maryland, particularly Montgomery and Prince George's counties. The Telephone Company had to admit that in those two counties it was very difficult to plan for any growth because there were so many people coming into the scientific industries, and all. It was very clear in some of the small counties there were no problems.

Now, since we have developed the single delegate district, it will be necessary to learn the population of each election district in each county because there will be many counties where there will be a divided delegate in a delegate district and to do that it will almost be necessary to have the official census, that is, two election district will hardly be available before 1971.

THE CHAIRMAN: Delegate Hopkins.

DELEGATE HOPKINS: We have talked a great deal about what we would do when we went to the voters. How about how we would tell the voters about this constitution and what the voters would accept? I tell all of you, if we say we thought it was a good idea in 1967-1968, but we really do not think you should adopt it until 1974, that we are going to look a little bit silly.

Now, Chairman Gallagher has already told you how carefully the members of the Committee on the Legislative Branch went

into the problem of finding out what the figures are on the population statistics, how we should apportion.

We have given to the members of the still current General Assembly the ways to most fairly apportion. We have done the best job that we can. At this point it would be absolutely foolish for us to change the work of several months. We have gone into this as carefully as we have. This is not the time to suddenly postpone for four years the decisions we have already arrived at.

I urge the defeat of this amendment.

THE CHAIRMAN: Are you ready for the question?

Delegate Boyer.

DELEGATE BOYER: I do not know if it is in order to have one last word on this in rebuttal. It has been mentioned that our figures are out of date now. Our figures will be out of date in 1969, it is said. Our figures will be out of date in 1972 and so on, ad infinitum.

It would be difficult to computerize it every other year. There is a historical basis for census figures. We have used it since the birth of this country. Do not swallow this gilded pill blindfold. Think what we have done over the past several hundred years on census figures and reject the figure of computerization.

I do not know where this will lead. Perhaps next year they will computerize what income tax you must pay, or the real estate taxes, or maybe in the next generation who your spouse shall be.

This is computerization. I suggest that historically it is a sound constitutional legal basis that we should wait and act on official figures.

THE CHAIRMAN: Are you ready for the question?

*(Call for the question.)*

The Clerk will ring the quorum bell.

The question arises on the adoption of Amendment No. 6 to Committee Recommendation GP-13.

A vote Aye is a vote in favor of Amendment No. 6. A vote No is a vote against.

Cast your vote.

Has every delegate voted? Does any delegate desire to change his vote?