

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

Delegate Lloyd Taylor.

DELEGATE L. TAYLOR: Mr. President, fellow Delegates:

I would like to quote from a magazine, *The Reporter*, the issue of September 21, 1967. There is an article on the Tennessee Legislature, and it is entitled "Reapportionment." The author states that when the Supreme Court in 1962 handed down a landmark decision in *Baker v. Carr*, the Tennessee Legislature was called in special session and one representative, a Mr. James Clements, announced, "This is in the routine rule of government in Tennessee."

That was five years ago. This year, in 1967, the first reapportioned legislature since 1901 was seated. At the end of the 75-day session the same Mr. Clements said, "This has been my finest hour."

It may have been Tennessee's finest legislature. The article says, "Reapportionment, it seems, was not the destiny for rule in Tennessee after all."

In the State of Tennessee there is a population of 3,500,000. They have a State legislature, a House of 99 representatives, and a Senate of 33.

In the State of Maryland you have 3,100,000 people. We have 123 members in the House of Delegates, and 43 senators.

I am for the amendment to the amendment because of these facts.

It is a known fact that in the State of Maryland, as in the State of Tennessee, the shift of population is toward the urban areas. Of course, the State legislature in both the State of Tennessee and the State of Maryland should reflect this.

I wish you would read this article and the report in the magazine of September 21, 1967. You will find that the real interests can retain their particular influence, and that despite the movement of the country toward urbanization, and the need for more consideration of urban problems, we still have to consider the problems of rural interests.

THE CHAIRMAN: Delegate Price, do you desire to speak in opposition to the amendment?

The Chair recognizes Delegate Price.

DELEGATE PRICE: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

I have heard some references to generations in back of me. It seems that these are the times when we have more generations than we have people. We had a lost generation, referring to those after World War I; and after that we had a silent generation, referring to their children; and their children begot the beat generation, those who try to hide in the pseudoworld of make-believe.

There is another generation among us that has been called by a popular manufacturer the Pepsi generation: "Come alive, you're in the Pepsi generation." I do not want to comment too much on their slogan, but the reasons why they chose it I think are very interesting. They knew they had to win this generation, and I think we do, too, as well as all the other generations.

I would like to submit to the delegates here that what we do and the way we go about doing it will be very influential, and it must, first of all, be intellectually respectable. It seems to me that were any of our Committees to come onto the floor and maintain their position simply because it had been the result of many hours of deliberation, it would be a foolish kind of consistency that would quickly become a hobgoblin for us.

I think that the proposal, 40-120, therefore, is an intellectually respectable thing to do.

The second thing I think which we must keep in our minds is this, that everything we do and the way we do it must also be morally demanding. I think that in all due respect to the theorists, whatever we may say about the future, we must also deal with the present, and we must to some degree keep in mind these small counties of the hinterlands. I think that 40-120 is the most morally demanding thing that we could do.

I think, thirdly, that what we do and the way we do it must finally be spiritually and socially correct. I think that to set the limit at 40 and 120 allows for the maximum kind of creativity in the General Assembly.

I would like to submit that there is nothing more fickle than the spirit of the times, because we do not know what tomorrow will bring. I rise, hoping that we can defeat the amendment to the amendment, that we can accept the number of 40 and 120 on the basis that it is for all the people of Maryland the most intellectually respectable thing we could do. It is the most morally demanding thing we can do, and