

selves, something to work with, and give us a chance to prove this Constitution is good, you are giving us an almost impossible burden to try to sell to our people.

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

Delegate Carson.

DELEGATE CARSON: Mr. Chairman, as I understand it, the proponents of this amendment would say that it would permit some time for the small counties to phase out their General Assembly representation. I suggest that in 1970 there will be a reapportionment. I think under this constitution and what we are talking about, then, is two years' time. It seems to me a high price to pay that we forever enshrine 143, and I suggest the legislature would do just that for the sake of two years. The price is much too high, and I oppose it.

THE CHAIRMAN: Do any further delegates desire to speak in favor of the amendment?

Delegate Vecera.

DELEGATE VECERA: Mr. Chairman, Members of the Committee:

Delegate Scanlan stated that the New York State Constitutional Convention apparently did not know the reason it went down to defeat. I think we will find one reason the Maryland Constitution may go down to defeat may be this particular issue. I urge you to support this amendment.

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

Delegate Ulrich.

DELEGATE ULRICH: Mr. Chairman, we in the Local Government Committee have worked diligently and long hours to give power to the counties, realizing that a situation such as this would arise after the 1970 census. I urge members of this Committee of the Whole to defeat this amendment. It will not solve the problem of the counties. We have solved it in the Local Government Committee.

*(Applause.)*

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

Delegate Weidemeyer.

DELEGATE WEIDEMEYER: Mr. President and members of the Convention:

The matter of local government may be controversial, too, before it is all over, so if we are going to follow controversy after controversy, I would wonder who in the state will be for this Constitution.

I did say before and I say again, we would be making a mistake at this time to cut down by this Constitution the number of men in the legislature.

There is another practical aspect some of you have not thought about. Right after we leave here, 142 men are coming back into this legislature in this very hall, and 43 across the way, and all of them are powerful influences throughout the State. When you say that by this Constitution to be adopted in May that you 142 members of the legislature have got to go out and sell this Constitution to these people, and they know that 62 of their number are going out and they know not who is going, I will venture to say that you will not get 50 percent of them to go out for this Constitution.

The same way with the senators across the hall. Both bodies will be in a hopeless state of confusion, not knowing what the future holds for the state legislature.

So I say you are playing with dynamite to cut it down. If you want to defeat the Constitution, this is one of the ways to do it.

THE CHAIRMAN: Is there any other delegate who desires to speak in opposition to the amendment?

Delegate Hanson.

DELEGATE HANSON: Mr. Chairman, I think it might be useful in this debate to inject a historical note about the science by which the numbers 43 and 142 were determined.

In 1962 when the Circuit Court in Anne Arundel County declared unconstitutional the then composition of the House of Delegates, the Governor called for a special session of the General Assembly, at which time two bills were prepared for introduction.

The objective of these was ultimately to keep the size of the General Assembly at 123, which most of the participants agreed was far better than an expanded size. The first bill or, correction, the second bill