

he feels the winds have changed and they may well have. We may well make a significant change this morning, but I rise to support 36 and 108. It is a good way from the 80 and 120 that we had a ten to ten tie on in the Committee. I am not trying to suggest that we possess all wisdom, and that 35 and 105 are exactly right. Certainly to go to 36 and 108 is not much of a concession and we may lose with it, and if we do, we will lose gracefully. And, too, I want to say that perhaps yesterday, in the heat of debate, I was a little sharper than I should have been. After a good night's sleep, I feel a lot more congenial towards the world this morning, as I hope you do.

I also know that I caught last night in the voting a feeling of frustration on the part of the members: "Let's vote for something and get it over with." This is perfectly human and understandable. At the same time, those old pros who are in this Convention, who fought many a battle in the legislature, know this device quite well and have the stamina and determination to fight that kind of a battle, I would hope that our physical discomfort might not prevail over our intellectual conviction, because if it does, we are going to have a constitution which may accommodate our personal, bodily predispositions, but I doubt would do much for the State of Maryland over the long run.

We have laid out a map in which we are able to show you that with the 35 and 105, no more than two counties would be combined together in a single senatorial district. With 36 and 108, this naturally can be accomplished the same way, so that the question for the long haul is not as significant as you might think. We are not lumping together areas which require going 300 miles from one end to the other. What I think we are doing here this morning is holding out a false hope.

We are not going to give the small counties that are going to have 17,000, 22,000, 25,000 persons, so much more of a chance under 120-40 than we are under 108-36, and it is almost unfair to suggest we are because it is a kind of false novocaine, so to speak. You want to cushion the shock, but to me there is an element of deceit in it.

The Supreme Court has spoken. We know what our responsibilities are. I indicated to you yesterday that I really thought the House ought to have three committees of about 30 members, or 31 members. That would really be 93 or 94. All right; 105 is 12 or 13 more than we need, 108, maybe

15 to 18 more than we need, but when we get into 120, we are getting to a House that I served in from 1959 to 1962. I remember it well.

I was fortunate enough to be on the Judiciary Committee, but I know that those fellow colleagues of mine who were not on the Judiciary or the Ways and Means did spend a great deal of time wandering these halls, trying to figure out how they could put themselves usefully to work. I can tell you it was always a bitter day when the committee announcements came out and a member of the House did not find himself on Ways and Means or Judiciary.

THE CHAIRMAN: Delegate Gallagher, you have a little less than a minute.

DELEGATE GALLAGHER: I agree with Delegate Clarke you do not fritter your time away, but you have 5, 6, 7 other committees that are there.

The committees split the 30 per cent workload between them and you really do not feel you are making the kind of contribution you should.

I am not going to try to rise to any great oratorical heights this morning. I am for the representation of the small counties, but those people are going to be as ably represented and as well represented as the urban areas.

It is a great mistake to pit this convention into a conflict between urban and rural areas. I say to you that if we lose here this morning, we are going to lose gracefully, and I tell the other committee chairmen to fight for your report, regardless of what you do in this particular situation. We do feel, however, that we have a very practical situation and we ought to have a practical answer. And I please ask you to consider again that all you are doing, it seems to me, is holding out a whimsical, fanciful hope, and a hope that really has no foundation to it.

THE CHAIRMAN: Your time has expired.

Delegate Malkus?

DELEGATE MALKUS: Will the gentleman yield?

THE CHAIRMAN: His time has expired, Delegate Malkus. He may take the floor at a later time.

DELEGATE GALLAGHER: I will yield on Delegate Malkus' time, if I may.