

DELEGATE HANSON: Mr. Chairman, I submit the following amendment.

THE CHAIRMAN: Will you send it forward, please?

The Clerk will read the amendment. It will be marked Amendment No. 1. Please strike out the printed language to Amendment No. 1 so that it will read "Amendment No. 1 to Committee Recommendation No. LB-1."

READING CLERK: Amendment No. 1 to Committee Recommendation No. LB-1, by Delegates Hanson, Miller, Sollins and Gill: On page 1 of Committee Recommendation LB-1, strike all of Section 3.01. Legislative Power and insert in lieu thereof the following section:

"Section 3.01. Legislative Power

The legislative power of the State is vested in the General Assembly, which shall consist of one house."

THE CHAIRMAN: Is there a second to the amendment?

*(Whereupon, the amendment was seconded.)*

THE CHAIRMAN: Amendment No. 1 to Committee Recommendation LB-1 is now before you. The debate on this section is controlled under Debate Schedule 1. There are 45 minutes allocated to Delegate Hanson and to such persons as he may designate and 45 minutes to Delegate Gallagher, after which there are 45 minutes of uncontrolled debate.

The Chair recognizes Delegate Hanson.

DELEGATE HANSON: Mr. Chairman, fellow delegates, what does it state in this amendment? It states whether or not the legislative branch in Maryland is going to be co-equal with the other branches of the Government, and whether it is going to be effective and responsible. As I indicated a few moments ago, we believe that to have a strong and effective legislature, we must be able to make it possible for it to unite in its confrontation with the governor; that it must have the ability to attract outstanding citizens of public service in the legislature; that it must be a body in which the public has confidence; that the public business will be transacted in full view, and that each member will act responsibly; that it must be accountable to the electorate and it must have high visibility.

The argument has been made that other states have not adopted a unicameral sys-

tem. To that I would reply that one of the great tragedies in state government is the propensity of each state to accept without criticism or question the errors of its sisters.

We are here assembled in a Constitutional Convention, in which we are going to be doing a good bit of innovating and developing a good bit of new approaches to state government. Had this argument prevailed in the Missouri Constitutional Convention not too long ago, there would never have been a Missouri plan for establishment of the judiciary. No state had ever done it. Had it prevailed—correction, not Missouri, New Jersey—had such an argument that no other state had done it before prevailed, there would be no unified court system and no unified executive in New Jersey. So, Mr. Chairman, I think our job here is not to be concerned with what others have done, but to be concerned with what we need to do to establish a strong and effective Constitution and to make as a citadel for the people in that Constitution a strong and effective legislature.

Mr. Chairman, I should like to yield five minutes to Delegate Sollins.

THE CHAIRMAN: The Chair recognizes Delegate Gallagher in opposition to Amendment No. 1.

DELEGATE GALLAGHER: Mr. Chairman, ladies and gentlemen of the Committee of the Whole, I rise to speak in opposition to the amendment offered by Delegate Hanson.

I believe it is only fair to say that the shortcomings which he has described in his attack on bicameralism are not due to the nature of bicameralism itself, but some of the other failures to which I made reference in the presentation of the committee report.

I would suggest, for example, that the last-minute rush of bills is not due to bicameralism but rather to the limited sessions and the unrealistic limitations that are placed upon the number of days during which a General Assembly has to act.

It is perfectly possible, I would suggest, to the Chair and to the members of the Committee of the Whole, that bicameralism could be adopted in such a manner as to provide sufficient time to eliminate the rush of bills. I would also point out to the members of the Committee of the Whole that because of the provision that none of the money bills can move until the budget bill has been passed, there is a natural tie-up