

The argument is made that the long ballot would be eliminated. This goes hand and hand with the visibility argument. Once again, I submit, that a ballot with three slots on it is very workable and cannot be considered a long ballot. It is one that the average voter can deal with very readily. This leads to the responsibility argument, which is also made by the majority, that if you have a single member district, the representative from that district would be more responsive to the people. Once again, if the voter can identify on the ballot three people, certainly after he leaves the ballot box, or the ballot booth, he will be able to single out that delegate and make his views known to him after election.

Now, in answer to questions from the floor on Tuesday, Delegate Gallagher said that it is not the position of his Committee to deal with the subject of redistricting, and that this would be done by a blue ribbon bipartisan commission.

I submit that by imposing single member districts upon the State and in the Constitution this question has been largely predetermined and pre-judged because the tools of flexibility have been taken away from this Commission. Really, all that is left is a job for the sociologists and the demographers, to figure out how to divide up neighborhoods; and believe me, when you divide a subdivision into 17 parts or 28 parts, that is exactly what you are doing.

Delegate Gallagher says euphemistically that this will be done along natural traditional boundaries. Once again, I would defy any group of people, no matter how expert, to divide a district up into 28 or 17 parts along natural and traditional boundaries.

The job has been done already, if we adopt the Majority Report of the Legislative Branch Committee on this point.

There is an additional problem. Once the agony of drawing these lines has taken place, it will have to continue to take place at every census. What sort of political stability does it create, if one time you may be in one district and when the lines are redrawn, you find yourself in another. It is hardly an answer to say you need be a resident in the district from which you want to run because as a practical matter, you will not be elected if you are not a resident of that district.

Perhaps the strongest argument against compulsory separation of districts is the argument that is called the parochialism

argument, and I am sure you have all heard this: that is that the representative will only be responsive to a single narrow interest group and will be afraid to speak his mind on many issues, and that any understanding of regional or community problems will be gone in this multitude of single member districts. On this subject, and I do not want to speak much longer, I think the best statement is from a report prepared by the American Assembly, which wrote a report on State legislatures and American politics. It is the most definitive study I have been able to find. There, in the section I will call the political section, is the following statement, "A multitude of single member districts has other disadvantages. The district may become grossly unequal in the ten years following a census. Frequent redistricting may be chaotic and vulnerable to gerrymandering, legislatures may represent only narrow interests, and there may be no one capable of viewing the counties' problems as a whole. . . ."

"Another practice that has been used is the establishment of a number of small districts electing three, four or five members in a county. If it were possible to divide a county into natural boundaries of some kind, these could remain unchanged and not subject to gerrymandering while the number of members in each district vary with population changes. Even if this were not feasible, the use of several multi-member districts would minimize the problem of drawing and redrawing boundaries. It might insure that major political interests in the county would be represented without making each legislator a spokesman for a single narrow interest, and it might establish a reasonable maximum limit to both the length of the ballot and the cost of legislative campaigns."

After examining all of the alternatives, and I hasten to point this out, the conclusion is that there is no single good answer that has been proven on this subject. The conclusion is that the problem of legislative representation within the metropolis will become increasingly important. Although it is too early to suggest a definite formula, it is time to suggest the need for research and the desirability of experimenting with various formulas.

It is on this point that I would like to close. Do not foreclose the possibility of experimentation in this area. Ask yourself whether or not you are so sure that the single member districts are so clearly ap-