

determination and wide responsibility for the proposed General Assembly.

In particular, it avoided the temptation to bypass such agitating questions as determination of length of session and salary setting by such a devious device as the creation of commissions to carry this burden.

By and large, the Committee recognized that it was writing a long-term document, and consequently it sought to avoid restrictions within it which would admittedly meet the problems of the immediate future but which, over the long run, might well prove to act as impediments.

In searching for the outline of the modern structure, the Committee was not unmindful of the value of tradition and history. Nothing of value was discarded because it was old, and nothing new was provided solely on the basis that it was some glittering innovation.

Within the framework of this balancing of the old and proven with the new and necessary, the Committee decided upon a bicameral legislature, but it reached disagreement on the premise that the accompanying recommendations supplied the best kind of bicameralism. Admittedly then in a certain sense the Committee report is a consensus document. It represents a legislative structure based upon a rationale which the vast majority of the Committee could well support. Radical deviations in either direction would destroy this consensus and would render the recommendations abhorrent to those on the far side of the spectrum. To say, therefore, that the recommendations represent a compromise is not to detract from the simplicity, clarity and recognition of values represented and preserved.

The Committee has not been unmindful of the existing basis of actual political strength, nor has it sought intentionally to destroy vested interests, although some might well be destroyed. Since, however, it has sought a responsible legislature, a legislature easily observed and a responsibility explicitly imposed, its by-product will, hopefully, be a concentration of public attention upon the individual legislator.

The Committee would hope, therefore, that it has fashioned a body where the opportunity to serve is commensurate with the likelihood of being accurately evaluated by the electorate on the basis of actual performance.

To be lost among large numbers, not to be accountable for decisions, and to carry

but a portion of the responsibility to the electorate are evils which the Committee sought to eliminate.

These are the reasons which impelled Committee approval of what follows. These recommendations may not be what each of the 20 members of the Committee would have preferred if he were the sole author of the section, but the recommendations do represent what the vast majority of the Committee agreed upon in the crucible of the democratic process, and on that basis the committee report is presented.

I would stress in taking up section 3.01 which provides that the legislative power of the State is vested in the General Assembly, which shall consist of two houses, the Senate and the House of Delegates, that this particular section be read in conjunction with the remainder of the recommendations. That is to say, I am suggesting to the Committee of the Whole that the report which you have before you is a package, and was voted upon with the idea that it contained the elements throughout which made each and every section satisfactory to the majority of the members of the Committee.

The Committee heard 68 witnesses, of whom 31 were present or former members of the General Assembly, 11 were professionals in the field or authors and academicians—I hesitate and do not use the word experts—and 13 were legislative agents or lobbyists or fell into other categories.

In suggesting the adoption of a bicameral General Assembly, the Committee did not believe that we should depart from tradition or history. In each of the four Constitutions under which the State of Maryland has operated, there has been a bicameral General Assembly of various sizes and various compositions, and throughout practically the entire colonial period of the State of Maryland, with the exception of a few years, the experience of this State was to operate both with an upper house and a lower house.

I think our Committee perhaps was somewhat amused, but nonetheless impressed by the colloquy which is said to have occurred between Thomas Jefferson and George Washington with respect to a bicameral General Assembly. Jefferson, we are told, was chiding Washington at the breakfast table as to why Washington had voted for a two-house General Assembly, to which Washington replied to Jefferson, "Why, sir, do you pour the tea from your cup into your saucer?"