

time is available, there will be a greater tendency not to reconcile opposing views, but for extremists in each camp to hold their ground, hoping to wear down the other person.

The Committee's recommendation of 150 days should be adequate for the present and for the reasonable and foreseeable future for the legislative needs of Maryland. The people of Maryland at least for a year, are entitled to a respite from the changes resulting from new legislation. I urge that this amendment be defeated, unless you are prepared to raise your legislators' salary in the neighborhood of \$20,000 to \$25,000.

THE CHAIRMAN: Delegate Bard?

DELEGATE BARD: I would like to give the next three minutes, Mr. Chairman, to Delegate Mitchell.

THE CHAIRMAN: Delegate Mitchell.

DELEGATE MITCHELL: Mr. President, I find most persuasive the testimony before the Legislative Committee of two distinguished former members of the state legislature whom the voters of Maryland, in their wisdom, have elected to the United States Senate to represent Maryland, Senators Daniel B. Brewster and Joseph Tydings.

Senator Brewster's testimony before the Legislative Branch was emphatic. Said he, "the new constitution that the Convention is writing should be a broad document of general principles, not specific details. The existence of strict constitutional restrictions on legislative operations hinders the effectiveness of this body."

He supported this Minority Report.

Senator Tydings spent half of his fifteen page address on the need for a flexible session of the legislature. He said, "first, I do not believe that a limitation on the length of the legislative session has any place in a modern State Constitution."

He further said, "the constitutional restrictions on the length of the legislative session is premised upon the fallacious assumption that a state legislature can competently deal with an increasingly complex budget and growing state problems if it works less than one-fourth of the year; legislating for Maryland's welfare can no longer be such a part-time job."

He went on to say, "an unrestricted legislative session would give the members of the legislature, not the clock, control of the session. It would provide a heretofore un-

known flexibility to the legislature. It would allow the legislature itself to meet either for a condensed consecutive period as now or several days a week throughout the year, but it would allow the legislature to determine its working conditions rather than having them frozen in the constitution."

THE CHAIRMAN: You have one-quarter of a minute.

DELEGATE MITCHELL: We also had a Republican member of the Congress of the United States from Frederick County, Congressman Charles McManus, who testified before the Legislative Branch, and also supported a flexible session of the legislature. He requested that this constitution remain silent on this matter and leave it to the legislature to set its own working procedures.

THE CHAIRMAN: Delegate Gallagher.

DELEGATE GALLAGHER: I yield three minutes to Delegate Malkus.

THE CHAIRMAN: Delegate Malkus.

DELEGATE MALKUS: Mr. President, members of this Convention, according to the records, there were 37 people that testified on this subject matter. Of the 37—and they included for the most part all the people that have a practical knowledge of what the General Assembly does—of the 37 that testified 31 urged that a limit be established in the Constitution.

It is true, of course, that there was disagreement on the limit of days. It is also true, as the lady from Baltimore City has said, that Senators Tydings and Brewster testified for continuous sessions, but they were in the minority, and I served with both of them in this honorable body.

I would like to bring to your attention, as I have said before, that when you have labor, headed by one of the better labor leaders, Charlie Della, who gets a good job done here in the General Assembly, and you find management on the other side headed by Cab Darrell, Jim Boyle, and others, people that make their living in the field of private enterprise, and when you have a preponderance of evidence from 31 out of 37 people who really know what we do down here, Mr. President, and we go ahead and ignore what these expert witnesses testify, then I say again, there is no need to have hearings. Let us make our own opinions and not be bothered about their experience.

For that reason, Mr. President, now let