

The staffing of the committees was a relative impossibility. In addition, there were inherent problems with the Senate of 29. There was a lack of manpower both during and between sessions. This was especially apparent between sessions when we were forced to develop various study committees in cooperation with the House of Delegates.

There were more members than the House could utilize and too few in the Senate. I had the job of appointing the committees and I think the problem was overworking your good people on a multiplicity of committees.

I think, too, that the small Senate was a bit too personal. Senatorial courtesy was prevalent and you could make a strong argument that there was an excessive concentration of legislative power in single members.

I think the new Senate of 43 members is a big improvement over the 29-man Senate. It was reorganized into three major committees, the Senate Finance Committee, consisting of 16 members, Economic Affairs Committee, with 13 and a Judicial Proceedings Committee with 13 members. This meant that we could funnel all the work of the Senate through three major committees.

We abolished the minor committees and secured a number of advantages.

We were able to effect a logical division of the legislature. We increased the working capacity of the Senate. Each member had a nice committee assignment. He could concentrate on that single committee and become an expert in that type of committee work.

Every member of the Senate in essence had an equal committee assignment. The manpower available was improved, both during sessions and between sessions, and the committee staffing was simplified, so that now we are able to fill the staff for committees along with the research facilities of the Legislative Department and the Department of Legislative Reference.

There has been improvement in the Senate as a body because it is less personal. Senatorial courtesy has been minimized, and it is of a reasonable size for floor debate, without the necessity for the use of the motion for a previous question.

Now, under the amendment offered here for a 40-man Senate, all of the advantages of the new Senate would be retained. We

could continue the same committee structure, possibly a 14-man Finance Committee, a 13-man Judicial Proceedings Committee, and a 12-man Economic Affairs Committee.

The size of the senatorial district at the next census would be approximately 100,000 people, which would be a reasonable size.

The problem of drawing senatorial districts for single senators would be a relatively simple one.

Also, we would eliminate the problem of rivalry between senators within the same district. When you have a multi-member district, unfortunately, you have people serving from the same district who inevitably are political rivals. This is something you simply cannot eliminate with multi-member districts.

On the House side the problems are really reversed. I served for eight years in the House, of 123 members. There were two major committees originally, Ways and Means Committee, having approximately 20 members and the Judiciary Committee with 20 members.

If you were not on those two committees, you were really a minor legislative figure. There was a multiplicity of minor committees, I believe more than ten minor committees, but these committees did not really do the main work of the General Assembly.

Certainly a body which has 40 out of 123 engaged in major political assignments is not a well-organized body.

As a result of reapportionment, the present House was increased to 142 and committees were reorganized; the Ways and Means Committee was increased to 35, the Judiciary Committee to 35, and approximately 8 minor committees were established.

Now, a committee of 35 is too large, but it is almost necessary in a 142-man house to have a relatively large committee. Based on personal experience, I would say that a committee of between 15 and 20 is probably an ideal committee. You can get by with 25, but when you get above that, the committee becomes unwieldy and large.

We have here a situation of the present House of Delegates simply being too large for effective organization.

THE CHAIRMAN: Delegate James, would you pause just a moment while we change tape, please?