

only two months deliberations, that the size of the legislature for all time, barring a Constitutional amendment sometime in the future—and we know how difficult this is to get accomplished—shall be in the ratio of 35 to 105.

There seems to be some implied criticisms of the remark I made, that my remarks were intended to imply some derogation of the members of the Legislative Branch Committee. If any of those remarks were so taken by any member of that Committee I do hereby apologize for it. I thought it was appropriate to point out that there was no unanimity of opinion on that Committee, that the condition existed while the Committee had this matter under consideration, and I say to you fellow delegates, it exists here today.

The Chairman of the Committee of the Legislative Branch has mentioned the fact that never in the tradition of Maryland has this formula that we are recommending here today been applied to the State as far as apportionment is concerned. I have to say that never in the State of Maryland has it had to face two Supreme Court decisions and try to resolve two difficult decisions as they have today in *Baker v. Carr* and *Reynolds v. Sims* decisions. I say again the testimony of the legislators that came before our Committee was mixed. It was mixed. The Chairman mentioned 12 people who talked and said that we should set that figure in the Constitution—12 members of the legislature. He says that somewhere we have to draw the line: the buck stops here.

It seems to me that he is afraid to let the legislature handle their job. I think Delegate Bamberger pointed out that this is a difficult job. Nobody has ever said that the life of the legislator is an easy job. It never will be if the legislator is doing his job.

THE CHAIRMAN: Delegate Gleason, you have three-quarters of a minute.

DELEGATE GLEASON: I say once more to my fellow Delegates in this Committee and this Convention, we are here dealing with a situation that is unique in the history of state government in the United States. We should allow time for the Supreme Court decision to have effect. We should allow time to see what the gambits and parameters of these decisions may be, and we should allow this matter to be discussed in committees, and be discussed with people who can take a lot of time to

consider it and not freeze it into the constitution.

Thank you.

THE CHAIRMAN: Delegate Gallagher.

DELEGATE GALLAGHER: Mr. Chairman, it is most unfortunate that the sponsor of the amendment would hold out what I would characterize as the whimsical hope that the Supreme Court of the United States is going to change its one-man/one-vote rule, and that we feel inevitably will not happen. I have said that we developed figures to show that if every county in this State were to have one member of the House in 1970, it would at least be 192; in 1980, 227; in 1990 or 2000 undoubtedly it would parallel the Congress of the United States at 435.

Unfortunately, he has confused the fixing of the number of the members of the House and the Senate with the process of apportionment. That matter has not as yet been reported upon by the Legislative Committee, but I described it yesterday to Delegate Adkins; the legislature itself will have the job of drawing the districts within certain confines, that is, to say, compact and contiguous and other general confines. So we are not redistricting or reapportioning any body in or out of this legislature as a result of fixing the number.

The question is simply this: is there some number which this Constitutional Convention feels provides the ideal way to operate the General Assembly of Maryland; and I suggest there is such a number. We may not have it at 105 and 35, but I submit to you that we are in a far better position here to decide what the ideal balance may be between efficiency in government and representation in government. Those who urge a number are not opposed to representative government. We are interested in effective government, and representation can become such a runaway cause that efficiency, indeed effectiveness, may well disappear from the General Assembly.

All I ask this Committee of the Whole to do today is to provide the avenue of maximum efficiency with maximum representation. We have told you that the members of the General Assembly do not want to fix their numbers.

Why should we give them a job which is ours, and which they do not want? How long do you think it will take them to straighten out the matter of numbers if we entrust them with that responsibility?