

as many which brought us to war in 1864. They saw then that you could not fix a session when you had serious problems. It was only the 1867 Constitution which under Article III, sections 14 and 15, set forth a specific closing date 90 days after the opening. Why was that specific closing date set?

I am not just quoting history to be historical, but to draw parallels. There was a real fear that the legislature would be doing too much. Here we believe that we want the legislature to assume leadership itself, the fear there had been damage on the part of the legislature that had in a sense supported the Union position. Thus you note by giving the Maryland legislature the power to set the length of its session, we reestablish the faith in this body, the faith in 1776, 1851, and 1864, when this body had the privilege of meeting when it needed to meet.

We cannot run the risk of establishing a new Constitution and having it lose its full import when the forthcoming legislative sessions of 1969, 1970 and 1971 find too little time to put into effect the kind of statutory laws that must dovetail with the Constitutional ones. Any way you look at it there is much to be lost if the length of the legislative sessions are determined.

Now, a few closing remarks: if they are determined for a long time to come in an era when life and problems do not fit into neatly determined packages, my conclusion to this would be, let's not clutter—this isn't just alliteration—let's not clutter the Constitution with contradictions of 30 or more days if needed and 30 more yet, an organizational session, and other sessions. Let's have one clearcut statement on legislatively determined sessions, put the responsibility and privilege where they belong, in the legislature.

We in our Committee have spent a good deal of time and soul-searching as to how our State of Maryland can really come to grips with serious problems of rural life, urban life, human relations, with economic development. We talk about recapturing the main concept of the federal system, that the states shall share with the national government the responsibilities of our times, and that the citizens look to our state legislators for assistance in these serious problems. No narrowly fixed schedule can do that. Only a flexible schedule can do it. This can be done only if the state sees it as a continuous task.

Yesterday we voiced objection to having

some of our legislators be fractional representatives. Can you not see that the 90 day session, plus the 30, plus the 30, if we have them, whatever you add, gives the citizens the concept that our legislators are fractional. They are fractional in that they are 90 day legislators. That is how we see them now. Then 30 more, if we add another fraction—90 to 365, whatever that fraction would be.

The legislators themselves say they work on state problems all-year around.

Let's have the Constitution reflect this view, that there are no fractional representatives, and that our legislators seek to solve problems all year around, not on any particular moment.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman, and ladies and gentlemen.

THE CHAIRMAN: Are there any questions of the minority speaker for purpose of clarification?

Delegate Byrnes.

DELEGATE BYRNES: Delegate Bard, is it your intention to place the option in the General Assembly both as to length of session and as to the time of convening?

DELEGATE BARD: You will note that the day of convening is clear. We say the term shall start, the General Session shall meet in regular annual sessions, convening on the third Wednesday of January of each year, unless otherwise prescribed by law.

We have just passed, as you will note, Delegate Byrnes, an earlier statement in respect to the so-called organizational meeting. This would still hold true for 3.06. We are merely changing that long statement on 3.12.

THE CHAIRMAN: Delegate Byrnes.

DELEGATE BYRNES: If the Committee of the Whole were to adopt this proposition, Delegate Bard, would you at a later point recommend to us that a salary in excess of \$8,000 be scheduled in the legislation?

THE CHAIRMAN: Delegate Bard.

DELEGATE BARD: My own personal feeling on that matter would not necessarily be that of the Committee, but I personally believe that on the legislatively determined session, \$10,000 or even \$12,000 would be a more reasonable salary than \$8,000. As a matter of fact, there are other states that have gone far beyond that. But I sincerely believe the \$8,000 is minimal.