

into being a member of the General Assembly. An examination of the salaries paid in other States will indicate that in recommending a figure of \$8,000, we err only on the conservative side.

It may always be that there may be some individuals who do not deserve the full amount, but be that as it may, we believe that by and large, on the basis of the testimony that we have heard, the vast majority of the members of the General Assembly are entitled to a substantial increase in wages. We believe that not only will it help attract valuable and capable people to public office, but it will also retain in the General Assembly of Maryland, men who have made considerable dollar sacrifices over the years in order to perform public service.

We believe, therefore, that the \$8,000 figure is one which certainly ought to be a floor.

Now, after the adoption of the Constitution, assuming the favorable action on the transitory legislation by this Convention, thereafter the General Assembly itself may vary the salary, but no increase in salary shall take effect for those members of the legislature and that particular General Assembly which voted for it.

In other words, when a salary increase is enacted, those people who vote for it will not have the benefit of it, unless and until they stand for election and are reelected, at which time they return as a new General Assembly and shall be entitled to the increase; so that there is an opportunity for the public to demonstrate by the way it selects or fails to select those who return to the General Assembly what its reaction may be with respect to the salary increase.

We have provided that there be no living expenses only during the regular sessions of the General Assembly. This does not prohibit off-regular session payments for committee work, or per diem expenses for meetings of the special sessions of the General Assembly. All this does is to guarantee, if adopted, that while the General Assembly itself is in regular session, there shall be no per diem payments.

This probably will act to some degree as a restraining influence upon those who might be tempted to vote for a continuation of the 90 day session for another 30 or a second 30 days, simply on the enticement of the additional \$25.00 per day. Consequently, the meeting of the regular session will not be accompanied by this additional payment.

Now, I should like to say one word about pensions. The General Assembly has created a pension system which is more favorable to itself than to the other State employees. However, I should point out that the 15 percent contribution which is required on the part of the members of the General Assembly is the second highest in the nation of all those states in the Union which provide for pensions for members of the legislature, and those States are in the vast majority.

Now, in the ordinary course of events, one retires voluntarily from one's position. That, however, as so many in this room can testify to, is not the case with those who hold public office. One has not the slightest control over whether one continues or fails to continue in the General Assembly. There is a higher non-parenthetical power known as the electorate that takes care of that particular matter. Consequently, the risk involved in holding public office and the risk in setting oneself up for reelection means that a member of the General Assembly is in a different kind of category from the regular state employee. He may under the present system be entitled to, and is entitled to, some pension benefits at the end of eight years.

The Committee recognized, having heard testimony, that the pension system was indeed quite generous. It recognized that the increase of the salary to \$8,000 would have a corresponding increase in the impact of the beneficial aspects of the pensions upon the members of the General Assembly. Consequently, the Committee authorized writing to the Speaker of the House and the President of the Senate to request that they review the pension arrangements of the General Assembly, and I am told that the Legislative Committee has met and has decided to recommend a review of the present pension arrangements.

We did not feel it was our duty, and certainly it was beyond the scope of our knowledge, to attempt to change the pension system, because this would have involved an exploration into actuarial areas which would have consumed far more time than our Committee could have possibly allotted to it.

We believe that the question should be, how much salary should the General Assembly be paid in good faith, and rightly, because of the work that the General Assembly does and the amount of time that it devotes to the office.

We have concluded what the figure should be, and we believe that the matter of the