

DELEGATE DORSEY: Mr. Chairman.

THE CHAIRMAN: Delegate Dorsey.

DELEGATE DORSEY: Mr. President, I was a member of this body in the session of 1931 and 1933, when the population of this State was just a little over a million people. The membership of this house then was 123. My good friend, Glenn Beall, and Stuart Bushong, who were members of the General Assembly at that time, will testify that it operated in an efficient manner and was not unwieldy.

Now that the population of this State has more than tripled, the leadership here now is trying to reduce the membership even lower than it was when there were only a little over a million people in this State.

You have called, Mr. President, to the attention of this body what happened in New York yesterday. If we want to present to the people of this State a draft which they can vote for, we should not deny them a voice in representative government.

If you reduce this number to that brought in by the majority report, it will be taking away from the small counties of this State a voice in the General Assembly.

I feel, Mr. President, in view of what has happened in this present body, when the leadership, when the membership is as it is, when the press not only in Maryland but in metropolitan Washington praises the past session for the splendid work, saying it was outstanding as a legislature, I feel the membership of both bodies should remain as it is. Therefore, Mr. President, I hope this amendment is adopted.

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

Delegate Chabot.

DELEGATE CHABOT: Sometimes we make one change and find that we have done a number of different things. I am afraid if we adopt this amendment we will not only have affected the size of the legislature, but we will also have made a number of changes without at all considering the matter with regard to residence requirements. I see no great magic in continuing the present number. I see great value in not discombobulating the other parts of the Constitution in order to continue the present number which was arrived at by happenstance and under the court gun. I suggest we vote against this amendment.

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

Delegate Kiefer.

DELEGATE KIEFER: Mr. President, I hesitate as a delegate from that small county known as Baltimore County to get involved in this kind of argument. However there are several things that occur to me to be important:

One, I sense a distinct state of unhappiness on the part of those people from small rural areas. I frankly have sympathy for them because we are making a constitution for the entire State of Maryland.

I also note that the figure of 105 delegates and 35 senators was a compromise suggestion arrived at after serious hard debate. However, I have also heard the statement made by the Chairman of the Committee on several occasions that the legislature during the last session worked effectively and efficiently. The proposed amendment does only one thing, as I see it: it provides a ceiling, it shall not exceed the present legislature. But if it will make the people from the rural areas happier, if it will protect their interests to a fairly logical and legitimate extent, I frankly would much rather see the compromise of this number than to have people going away unhappy, feeling they have been slighted.

I frankly don't think the argument in favor of a more efficient operation carries nearly as much weight when there is only a difference of approximately 45 in the entire group. I would therefore vote in favor of it.

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

Delegate Scanlan.

DELEGATE SCANLAN: I am against this amendment. If the Gilchrist compromise was not a good amendment—and by a majority the delegates have indicated it was not—this one is far worse. I will not repeat the arguments against the amendment made by Chairman Gallagher. The Gilchrist amendment at least had some flexibility to it, some elasticity that permitted some intelligent arrangement in the future.

In opposing the amendment, I would like to remark upon an argument that has been made on this floor several times today in connection with the various amendments that have been before the Convention. Constant reference has been made to the sad