

tion of the General Assembly. But there are other reports which do deal with size. The report of the Committee for Economic Development, which our Committee considered carefully, the model constitution, the new constitutions of this decade all urge very strongly that we do not have an assembly of too large a size or put the maximum number at 100.

It was on this basis that we considered the type of General Assembly we would like.

I would also make one further point: the issue is not the representation of political subdivisions. The issue is the representation of people.

The Constitution, this Constitution which we are writing will rise or fall by the number of individual votes cast upon the issue of whether we want it or not and it will not stand by the number of voters in political subdivisions.

I would urge that we support the majority report.

THE CHAIRMAN: Delegate Burdette, do you desire to speak in favor of the amendment?

DELEGATE BURDETTE: Yes.

THE CHAIRMAN: Proceed.

DELEGATE BURDETTE: Mr. Chairman, I rise to say that I shall vote for this amendment. I think I should say that at this time because the majority report quite correctly lists my name as one of those voting for the recommendation.

This proposal has been evolved in informal Committee discussions since the time of that vote. I should say also that my name is not in the list of proposers because I felt that the last sentence which has now been divided out presented entirely separate problems.

I urge, of course, this is not a representation of counties per se, but on balance, I am inclined to think it is a better representation of the people of Maryland, either in large counties or in small counties, although no county will be guaranteed per se a representative.

THE CHAIRMAN: Does any other delegate desire to speak in opposition to the amendment?

Delegate Gallagher?

DELEGATE GALLAGHER: Just briefly, Mr. Chairman. This morning in

giving the members of the Committee the workload of the House of Delegates I pointed out that the House Ways and Means and Judiciary Committees handled 70 per cent of the legislation.

No matter what may be suggested by the Eagleton Report, it is quite obvious the other committee or committees created will only carry 30 per cent.

Using roughly 32, 33 or 34 as the maximum number of people that you can place upon a committee for effective committee work, it seems quite obvious that the number you would want to strike in the House is about a hundred, in other words, it is very close to the 105 figure.

I do believe from the point of view of effective committee work, 144 is too high. I say 144 again because I am convinced that that will be what will happen under this amendment.

There are those in this house who believe 142 is too high. Certainly 144 is just a little bit higher yet.

I should also point out in order to accomplish keeping the House at 144, there would have to be a reduction of seven members in the Senate, the present Senate being 43. To get the four-to-one ratio, which would be required to preserve the House at 144, you would have to go to 36.

As Delegate Hanson has pointed out, this provides the most obvious form of inter-house warfare and by its very nature suggests a stalemate.

I do not think we ought to provide the materials of warfare for the House and Senate to fling at each other.

Therefore, I would oppose the amendment.

THE CHAIRMAN: Does any other delegate desire to speak in favor of the amendment?

Delegate Malkus?

DELEGATE MALKUS: Mr. President, Members of the Convention, we are probably fighting a losing cause, but my people, our people want us to keep fighting so that we will have some representation in the General Assembly of Maryland.

I think the Senate of Maryland at 43 and the House at 142 is not unwieldy. If the President of the Maryland Senate is opposed, wants to cut this matter down, if he cannot handle the job, I am sure there will