

ticket of a state candidate. This is the sort of thing we will be confronted with if we have state and local elections confused with national elections. We here are trying to shorten the ballot, but on the local level we may not be.

The candidates we are taking off the ballot in the local areas are administrative officials who are not policymakers. We are setting up a local government where we will be electing policymakers at a local level. These men should be able to run on local issues or policy at local level free from interference or influence by state and national politicians and state and national elections. I am not saying for a moment there is no relation or inter-relation between local and state government or local and national government. But these men should have a chance to express themselves.

I might also state when a local candidate is running for office, many times he is lost in the rush. He cannot even find a place to put us his sticker. There is no room for a bumper sticker. This might sound trite and small, but I say that in order to have effective enlightened local government, we must have an effective and enlightened electorate. If the local issues are lost in state and national issues, then I think our local government is going to be weakened. I urge you to defeat the amendment and support the committee recommendation.

DELEGATE J. CLARK (presiding): Delegate Schloeder, you have two and a half minutes yet to allot.

DELEGATE SCHLOEDER: Mr. Chairman, I would like to hold that for myself and speak whenever I am supposed to, either before or after the minority. It does not make any difference.

DELEGATE J. CLARK (presiding): Delegate Byrnes, do you want to use your two minutes now?

DELEGATE BYRNES: I would like to, and I will.

I think the issue comes down to a very simple proposition. I think politicians would say that of course we do not want to run with someone else. We want to have the opportunity to run in an odd year and use all our time in office to get publicity and run for the next level. We do not want to be committed to this guy we have to run with. I think we ought to be talking about the interest of the people. It is clear in my mind that it is in the interests of the people to have tickets in a county and to have county officials and state officials

working in harmony in the campaign, and then working in harmony thereafter. To have the offices create tension between county and state officials in office, I think, would be disastrous. I have never at any time on this floor defended or criticized the present system in Baltimore City. It is not the issue. I have not addressed myself to it. It proves nothing when you look at their statistics on either side of the case.

The majority is trying to suggest a change. I have taken the floor to present to you the other side of that picture. There are many in the counties who do not want that change. There are many in Baltimore City who do not want that change, either. I suggest to you the simple proposition you have before you. Do you want to create a system of elections which according to all the experts produces a very low turn-out knowing that low turn-out reduces the influence of the poor and the independents? Do you want to produce a system of elections which creates between the county and state officials legislative and executive stress and strain which is clearly not in the best interests of government on both levels? That is the issue before you, ladies and gentlemen.

I urge you to adopt the amendment of the minority.

DELEGATE J. CLARK (presiding): The Chair recognizes Delegate Schloeder for two and a half minutes.

DELEGATE SCHLOEDER: Mr. Chairman, ladies and gentlemen, there was no attempt on the part of the Committee to in any way say that there was no inter-relationship between levels of government. In answer to Delegate Hanson's argument, we want only to hold elected officials responsible for those problems that they can do something about. That is all we want to do. We feel our system does just this.

I also find intriguing the argument against the constant discussion of candidates and issues. It is especially interesting when this argument comes from those who would like to be most identified with enlightened causes. It seems to me that the constant discussion of issues and candidate could have nothing but a good effect upon any elective system.

The cost of this majority recommendation would not be prohibitive. It would amount to about one-tenth of one percent of the total county budget in each county. We feel that the visibility and the good government that would be provided is cer-