

power to adjust the size of each house accordingly.

"The Commission recognizes the possibility that the advantages of relatively small houses may succumb to the pressure to increase the number of legislatures, when the required apportionment would eliminate the seats of incumbent legislators, that it is of the opinion that reliance must be placed on the General Assembly to whatever action is appropriate."

That finishes the reference to the Commission's draft that I think has relevance to our consideration of this question today.

Let us take up next what the Eagleton Institute of Politics of Rutgers University has recommended with respect to the size of the legislatures.

In the relative portions of the Eagleton Institute's Report, the following language is included:

"In comparison with other state legislatures, the General Assembly is large. Only one-fifth of the states have larger houses. Only one-third have larger senates. On a per capita basis as well, Maryland ranks high, but what difference does the difference between 185 and 140 or 100 members make?"

"This is the question that I think is relevant to your consideration today.

"Although our survey did not specifically ask legislators to evaluate the size of the General Assembly, it is significant that not one respondent mentions size as a problem in need of remedy. Moreover, subsequent interviews reveal that with few exceptions, members did not think a Senate of 43 and a House of 142 unwieldy. If numbers create a problem, it is in the conduct of committees, not in the House or Senate as a whole, and for this there is another remedy. . . ."

They discuss their remedy later in the report which of course is for more committees with substantive powers.

Let us take a look at the recommendation of the third group to which I referred. Their recommendation is found at page 6 of the so-called majority report.

"The Committee majority," the last paragraph of that report says, "came to the conclusion that the two biggest factors contributing to the invisibility and anonymity of the average Maryland legislator was the fact that the present House of

Delegates is too large and that too many senators and delegates are elected from large anamorphic multi-member districts."

That is the substance of the report that is before you and its justification which is also before you the majority report says we shall have from now until ad infinitum a legislature not any larger than 35 and 105. It is possible, of course, under their recommendation for the legislative size in both bodies to be smaller—80-40, or whatever you will have. I bring this up now in reference to the question raised by the delegate who is Chairman of our Taxation Committee.

All three groups that I have referred to were interviewed in one form or another, present, past legislators or members of the legislative body.

The Eagleton Institute interviewed about two-thirds of the existing members of the body. We interviewed I would say approximately no more, and this is just a guess out of the blue, no more than one-twentieth of the members of the present legislature, and that is probably too high. There was no unanimity of opinion among them that the size of the legislature today was too large. There were several that said they thought it was too large. There were several others that said they thought it could be larger, but nobody said you had to get the size of the body down to be able to deal with it more effectively.

With that background, one group, the Committee on the Legislative Branch, studying this proposal for a period of no more than two months, recommended that the size of the legislative bodies for the future be 35 members in the Senate and 105 members in the House of Delegates.

The Constitutional Commission, studying this proposition for a period of two years, said, leave it to the legislature.

I think we should take a look at what the majority vote of the Legislative Branch Committee really represents as far as it sits before you here today. On page 7 of that Majority Report is the following language:

"The Committee adopted these limitations, 105 and 35, by a vote of 15 to 4," and then it lists the members voting for the adoption by that margin.

I find, as I go through the list, that there are one, two, three, four, five, six, seven, eight, nine, ten of the fifteen who have already voted in this chamber in the last