

180 million to 190 million people, a far different scope of problem than affects a legislative body meeting here in Annapolis. The second answer is the Congress undoubtedly needs some legislative reform in the administrative procedures it has. The last reform that has taken place in the Congress occurred back in 1947. There are too many committees in both branches of the Congress. This is not a matter we can do anything about here in this Convention.

One of the ironies, it has always seemed to me, in those that argue that a legislature should be restricted as far as its time is concerned is that this argument generally is coming from people who are concerned at the same time with the great size and scope of activities of the federal government. They see nothing inconsistent with this.

I think Dr. Bard has pointed out that what we are dealing with here is really a kind of rational approach to the problem so state legislators should have and will have time to work out final solutions to the problems on a state level and not have the federal government move in ahead of the time when they have opportunity to study whether these problems can be handled on a state basis.

I think it is interesting to look at other states and what they are doing in this area because here again we find a trend that has developed. As recently as World War II all the states except four were meeting on a basis of once every two years. Since that time twenty-one states have changed their procedure so they meet only on a once a year basis.

The next statistic that has some relevancy is that twenty-six of the fifty states explicitly limit the length of one or two regular sessions in the biennium. But if you look at the twenty-six states you will find that seventeen of them meet on a once every two year basis. Four of the remaining states meet on the second year only to handle budget problems.

A point has been made in this discussion with respect to the handling of the budget. I think Delegate Sherbow pointed out that his Committee is coming in with a recommendation of the Legislative Branch Committee and will meet collectively with the members of that Committee. We are unanimous, I think, in the fact that the budget shall be handled on a timely basis; so there will be no power in the legislature to let this budget go beyond the time when an executive budget must be determined.

The question has been raised about salary. I think the concern here is whether there is something implicit in this amendment if it is adopted, that the salary will increase, or should be increased. I would say this, there is no intention on the part of the sponsors of the Minority Report that that salary should be changed beyond what it is, that is \$8,000. Of course, this group will have to meet on it.

Therefore, of course, the legislature can set its own salary as it should, but it will not apply to the legislature that sanctions a change in the salary.

The conclusion of the Minority Report really rests on its first sentence. It states the principal reason for permitting the General Assembly to set its own session length is a fundamental belief in the ability and integrity of the legislature to set its own schedule.

We talked here of increasing the prestige of the legislature. We talked about increasing the visibility. How are we to determine here in this Convention what the problems are to be that will come before a legislature? That group ought to determine its own schedule depending on the problems that come before it. We are not asking for a longer session. We are not asking for a shorter session. All we are asking is to let the legislative group that has to deal with the problems coming up in any year set its own schedule for handling those problems.

THE CHAIRMAN: Delegate Gallagher.

DELEGATE GALLAGHER: Mr. Chairman, ladies and gentlemen of the Committee of the Whole, I rise to oppose the amendment. It is true as Mr. Gleason has said that this particular subject matter was probably the cause of the fiercest division that we encountered in the Committee on the Legislative Branch. As a matter of fact, although from time to time we had violent discussion in connection with other subject matters, I do not remember a time when we reached the kind of deadlock that we did on this particular subject.

What the Committee has done, as you may see, is to recommend that the Constitution provide a regular session of 90 days with the provision that by a majority vote, the regular session may be extended up to 30 days and by a further provision, that by a $\frac{3}{5}$ ths vote, an additional 30 days may be allowed, thereby in all recommending the machinery constitutionally whereby the regular session could extend as long as 150 days.