

will remind you that the Committee on General Provisions last week reported on the oath, after many hours of debate within the Committee, and we were struck down in a matter of two minutes.

The fact that these members of this Committee have worked long and hard on the subject does not necessarily mean that this should influence our vote, no more than my coming from a large county should influence my vote on this issue.

I do not choose at this moment to engage Chairman Gallagher on the remarks concerning work in the House, except to say this: whereas it was true that Ways and Means Judiciary had 70 percent of the bills and the other committees had 30 percent, I might point out that the 70 percent constituted a great deal of paper which was never passed upon, never acted upon, whereas the 30 percent referred to minor committees was all something of substance.

Ladies and gentlemen, to drop the House from 142 to 108 is tantamount to tearing it down. This would be a shock from which Maryland would be a long, long time recovering. Perhaps the present House does have too many members and too many committees, but the work of the House is such that it needs at least 120 members. This number would provide for a committee structure of three to five major committees, supported by a strong subcommittee structure and system.

Ladies and gentlemen of the Committee of the Whole, I urge you to vote against the 108 amendment and to give the people of Maryland the minimum necessary for fair representation, 120-40.

Thank you.

THE CHAIRMAN: Delegate Gallagher, the Chair will recognize you for the purpose of yielding to a question from Delegate Malkus, if you choose to yield.

DELEGATE GALLAGHER: I do, sir.

THE CHAIRMAN: Delegate Malkus, do you desire to put a question to Delegate Gallagher?

DELEGATE MALKUS: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

The Chairman mentioned that it is hard to have a workable committee divided like Gaul into three parts if you have 120 members.

Is there anything wrong with the House of Delegates having four committees, or

even five committees? I mean, I just walked over there to see where my friend Carlton Sickles was and to see how our great body worked over there in Washington, and for some reason or other, Carlton is not here this morning. I am sorry.

However, my question is serious, Mr. Chairman. Why do we have to adhere to three committees? Why can't we have four or five? There is a lot of work to be done. I really agree that the State of Maryland, in the Senate, under the great leadership of my Chairman, Mr. James, is working well with three committees, but I also know that the House of Delegates over the years has worked very well — you ought to know that — with more committees than the Senate ever had. If we have a little larger body in the House of Delegates, is it too wrong to have more than three committees? That is my question.

THE CHAIRMAN: Delegate Gallagher.

DELEGATE GALLAGHER: Senator, I do not think there is anything wrong in having more than three committees, but I do believe that when a representative comes to Annapolis he ought to be on one of the two, or as in the Senate, three major committees, because the people who elect the representative are entitled to a voice in these significant committees where, as you know, the real work is done in the House.

When you have other committees beyond the two or three, you get conflicting meeting times. I remember serving on the Judiciary Committee and the Motor Vehicles Committee simultaneously, and I used to have to ask the chairman of each committee when there was a conflict in the meeting time — and there were many — if something important came up to please send for me, so that I could vote.

I do not think that is the way we ought to conduct the business of the House of Delegates or the Senate. I believe that three major committees in the Senate and three in the House would be an excellent idea, because it would expedite joint hearings on major matters when experts and interested parties come a long distance and enable them to be heard once on a joint basis rather than to force them to come back another time. I think three major committees in the House, as the wisdom of the Senate has already provided, would be an ideal way to operate the General Assembly.

THE CHAIRMAN: Delegate Malkus.

DELEGATE MALKUS: Mr. Chairman, I guess my time is not already up.