

would have been a Constitutional amendment to achieve that and provide that after 1966 the size would revert to 123. Because the General Assembly only had five days in which to act and this was quite a new problem at the time, having just arrived on the judicial scene, the spirit of compromise was much in the air.

It was determined that there would not be very much possibility of getting a bill through the General Assembly if seats were cut as well as added, especially since the primary election for the 123 seats had already been held.

So the number 123 was divided into the entire population of the State to determine the number of representatives in the House that each county should have. Then those seats were all indicated and it means increasing the size to 142, allocating 19 additional seats. But in order to meet the practical problem of timing, 19 seats were not taken away from the small counties at that time. The House and Senate then declined to enact the Constitutional amendment to bring the size of the House back down in 1966, and later when the problem arose as to reapportioning within the 142, it was left at that figure for convenience.

As to the Senate apportionment, the critical problem I believe there was to find a total number of senators equally divisible by six, because that was the number of legislative districts in the City of Baltimore whose senators would have to vote on the question in order to assure its passage, so that senate districts in the City of Baltimore would not have to be redistricted.

This is the kind of science that was applied to this kind of problem.

It seems to me incredible that this Constitutional Convention would involve in the constitution of this State this kind of measure. Instead we should look at what we need in the State. This is what the Committee has done. We should look at the kind of General Assembly that can address itself to those needs, and this is what the Committee has done.

I urge the Committee of the Whole to defeat this amendment so that we can vote on the proper question, the proper size of 105 in the House and 35 in the Senate.

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

Delegate Adkins.

DELEGATE ADKINS: I wonder if

Delegate Hanson would yield to a question?

THE CHAIRMAN: Do you yield for a question?

DELEGATE HANSON: Yes.

DELEGATE ADKINS: You explained in great detail the manner in which the present size of the two bodies was arrived at, the science, as he referred to it.

Would he give us a brief explanation of the scientific manner in which the 80 and the 105 was arrived at.

DELEGATE HANSON: You mean the 35 and 105.

DELEGATE ADKINS: Yes.

What is the scientific justification?

THE CHAIRMAN: You mean 35 and 105?

DELEGATE ADKINS: Yes, as in the Committee report.

DELEGATE HANSON: I would be happy to yield to the chief scientist in charge, the Chairman of the Committee.

THE CHAIRMAN: Delegate Gallagher, can you respond to the question?

DELEGATE GALLAGHER: I do not want to trespass too much on the time of the Committee, but I think I explained that the attempt was to get, first of all, a three-to-one ratio, which we felt to be important so that the senate districts and the house districts would be different and distinct on the basis of population. We felt three-to-one was satisfactory.

We then approached the question of how large the Senate should be. We believed with Edward Clark and Senator James that 20 was too small. We realized it would have to be some number in excess of 29, so that we would eliminate the element of clubbiness, and we decided that 35 was probably enough of an addition to 29 to make it a less personal body.

I think we have their testimony to that effect, that they believe this is the case.

We then applied a multiple of three, and we arrived at a figure of 105. Working from the committee assignments point of view and recognizing that Ways and Means and the Judiciary each carried about a third of the total load, meaning two-thirds of the house carried about 30 or 31 members of the house on each committee, and