

appropriate, that we should at this time in this Convention solemnize them in the Constitution? Do you want to allow this test tube solution to ride roughshod over the established political boundaries of this State? Are not all political subdivisions important?

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

DELEGATE GALLAGHER: I notice that Delegate Bard has a question, Mr. Chairman.

THE CHAIRMAN: Delegate Bard.

DELEGATE BARD: Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask Delegate Lord—

THE CHAIRMAN: Delegate Lord's time has expired. I will permit you to ask a question when he is permitted to speak again. Delegate Gallagher.

DELEGATE GALLAGHER: Mr. Chairman, ladies and gentlemen of the Committee, I must say at the outset that I think that Delegate Bard's proposal contains many of the features which the Committee on the Legislative Branch is trying to obtain by its proposal.

As a matter of fact, in all candor, I have an amendment prepared which is identical to his in the event that we lose, and so he saved me that trouble.

I think the important thing to recognize about this proposal is that it destroys the basis upon which we approach the bicameral General Assembly, and that is this: we want the Senator to have three times the geographical spread, so to speak, at least three times the population spread of the single delegate. What we have here is, presumably, three delegates representing the identical area which the Senator represents. Consequently, there really will not be in those areas where there are three delegates to the one Senator (the 3 to 1 ratio accomplished in many instances with the 40 and 120 that we voted upon) a real difference in perspective between the members of House and the member of the Senate. This seems to me to destroy one of the arguments and one of the very sound justifications for the bicameral General Assembly, where we had posited that the perspectives would be different. I believe that it does injury and violence to the kind of bicameral legislature that we were trying to establish. It may well be that there are people in this assembly who voted for bicameralism on the theory that there would

be a different point of view from the senator compared with that of the delegate. I think that by and large the effect of this approach would be to destroy any different points of view.

I have to commend the proposal, however, for retaining the single member approach for the Senate. It certainly goes a long way toward eliminating the evil that we were trying to eliminate in those delicate situations, both delegate and delicate, where seven or eight people are running from a House of Delegates area, and the question of low visibility is at issue. I must commend the amendment because it goes a long way toward establishing constituent identification of who represents a given area.

We believed, of course, in the Committee on the Legislative Branch, and I recollect that the vote was 15 to 5, that it would be a far better thing if each voter in the State of Maryland had a single senator and a single delegate so there would be no question that he would have a better opportunity of knowing who his representatives were. Now, the proposal of Delegates Lord and Case has preserved the single senator concept, but has instead interjected the possibility or the probability, as the case might be, of up to three delegates, while eliminating the evil that we discussed earlier. In speaking against it, I would say that while it has many of the merits and certainly eliminates many of the evils which the Committee sought to eliminate, it really does do a basic injustice to our whole concept or scheme of a bicameral assembly.

I feel that a single member district for both House and Senate would be a very dangerous thing. I do not think it is really experimentation to go to what the Committee proposed. There are other States of the Union, including New York, under the Constitution, which have single member districts both in the House and Senate.

THE CHAIRMAN: Delegate Gallagher, you have one-half minute.

DELEGATE GALLAGHER: I will give you, if I may, just from recollection, the breakdown throughout the Union: 39 bodies in 26 states are based exclusively on single member districts; 5 bodies in 5 states are based exclusively on multi-member districts, and 55 bodies in 35 states are based on a combination of single and multi-member districts; so the suggestion that we go to a combination of single member districts in the Senate and multi-member districts in the House, is not unusual, but I do not