

for the purpose of providing facilities and organizing a workable body of full-time legislators who are able to devote their time and energy to representation of the people, submitting this amendment creates a well-organized legislative body similar to that in sister states which utilize this type of organization.

THE CHAIRMAN: Is there any further discussion?

Delegate Gallagher.

DELEGATE GALLAGHER: Mr. Chairman, ladies and gentlemen, I rise to speak against the proposed amendment. I should say at the outset that this matter of 40-80 was twice considered by the Committee on the Legislative Branch. It failed to receive a majority on the first vote by a ten to ten tie, and then on the second vote it failed by a vote of 13 to 7.

In supporting the position of the Committee, I should like to point out that the recommendation of 105 and 35 is quite close to the national median which I mentioned yesterday, that is, one hundred in the House and 38 in the Senate.

I think, too, that the members of the Committee of the Whole should have certain data before them before the vote is taken. That is this: according to the figures contained in the Eagleton Report, from 1953 to 1966 the House Judiciary Committee and House Ways and Means Committee, which is now composed in the aggregate of 61 members, handled approximately 80 per cent of all the legislation that went into the House hopper, so that we had, therefore, about 40 per cent of the membership of the House on those two committees handling 80 per cent of the total legislation.

Now, through 1966, the committee of the House were 13 in number, and as a result of restructuring the committee system for the 1967 session the number of committees in the House was reduced from 13 to 9. However, the House Judiciary Committee continued to handle 42.9 per cent of all the bills that went into the House, and the Ways and Means Committee in 1967 considered 27.4 per cent of all the legislation. Between those two committees, even with the reduction of other committees from 13 to 9, 70.3 per cent of the total legislation that went in the House was handled, while the other 7 committees handled only 29.7 per cent of the legislation.

Now, the Committee of the Legislative Branch, in recommending 105 could of

course allow for a third committee comparable to the newly created committee in the Senate on Economic Affairs, which would consist of another 30 or 31 members. Both the House Judiciary and Ways and Means Committees could continue to have a slight increase, so that, therefore, you could utilize all 105 members of the House, if that amendment were to prevail on three major committees.

It is true that the Eagleton report suggests that the nine committees presently existing in the House of Delegates be reduced to five, but I think it is only fair to say that in all probability, no matter what is done, Ways and Means and Judiciary will continue to handle approximately 70 per cent of all the House legislation.

It is interesting to note on the Senate side that after the new Committee on Economic Affairs was formed, Judicial Proceedings and Finance in 1967 handled 72.5 per cent of the legislation, whereas in the prior 14 years it had handled approximately 90 per cent of all the legislation that went through the Senate. The creation of the third major committee did substantially establish an opportunity to handle roughly one-third of the total bills that went through the Senate.

What I am suggesting here, therefore, is that it would seem that a House that is a little larger than 80 would be able to utilize the full potentialities of all the members.

Turning now to the question of cost, I should like to provide the following information to the members of the Committee of the Whole.

At the present time, the salary of 43 Senators and 142 Delegates at the rate of \$2,400 per year, plus the \$1,750 per diem, has an aggregate cost to the people of Maryland of \$767,750.

That is the present payroll for members of the House and Senate under the existing 43-Senator, 142-member House. If the amendment now before you were adopted, the 40-80 amendment, and presumably with an \$8,000 salary, and no per diem during the regular session, the cost would be \$960,000, a very slight increase over the \$768,000 now paid, just a little less than \$200,000.

More interesting, I think, is the fact that if there were an \$8,000 per annum salary for 35 Senators and 105 Delegates, which is the majority committee recommendation, that cost would be only \$1,120,000 per year, not even—well, roughly \$350,000 over and