

would like to submit a question to Delegate Rybczynski.

THE CHAIRMAN: His time has expired. Let me get somebody in opposition and come back to him.

Does any delegate desire to speak in opposition?

Delegate Sollins?

DELEGATE SOLLINS: Mr. Chairman, members of the Committee of the Whole: I speak in opposition both to Delegate Rybczynski's amendment to the amendment and Delegate Lord's amendment.

Single-member districts are the single most important reform that we can bring out of the legislative branch recommendation.

It will achieve several things. It will really make legislators visible, accountable and responsible to their constituents. It will enhance not only the two-party system, which we all treasure, whether we be Republicans or Democrats; it will also enhance the representation of minority groups, not only racial, but rural groups throughout the state.

Many people in the city, and certain large counties, are very much opposed to single-member districts. They suggest that it will engender more parochialism.

I suggest that you look behind their statements and ask yourselves if they are really not concerned about the preservation of their political machines in these areas.

This is what they are concerned about, not parochialism, not small political kingdoms.

Single-member districts, in my opinion, will be like a breath of fresh air throughout the state.

Thank you.

THE CHAIRMAN: Delegate Rybczynski, will you yield for a question from Delegate James?

DELEGATE RYBCZYNSKI: Yes, sir.

THE CHAIRMAN: Delegate James.

DELEGATE JAMES: Would this not run counter to the concept that the initial reapportionment plan, or redistricting plan, after each census would have to be designed by either a commission or by the Governor?

Now, if this were in the Constitution, the

recommendation of the Commission that the Governor or the bipartisan commission lay out the districts, it would be in complete conflict with this, would it not?

DELEGATE RYBCZYNSKI: Your question might possibly be premature on this floor. I would agree with you that if there would be a separate commission to redraw lines that, well, of course what would the Commission do with its work? The Commission would then have to turn it over to the General Assembly for approval, so eventually it would get back to the body anyway.

THE CHAIRMAN: Delegate James.

DELEGATE JAMES: But is it not the concept that if the General Assembly does not act, the plan recommended by either the Governor or by the bipartisan Commission would become law? If this were adopted, would it not be in conflict with that plan for handling redistricting in an orderly manner?

THE CHAIRMAN: Delegate Rybczynski.

DELEGATE RYBCZYNSKI: I would have to answer, I do not know. My guess is that the two could work together very well.

THE CHAIRMAN: Delegate Gallagher.

DELEGATE GALLAGHER: Mr. Chairman, although I have stated my opposition to Mr. Lord's amendment, I must say that if it should pass, I would like to see the intent of Mr. Rybczynski's amendment to the amendment carried out, and I think a way to take care of that problem that Senator James has just suggested would be to strike out on line six "The General Assembly shall," and on line 7, "divide the State"; and insert in lieu thereof: "The State shall be divided," and then it would read, "The State shall be divided into legislative districts for the election of senators and delegates," et cetera.

In this way, regardless of what this Committee of the Whole should do with our redistricting and reapportionment proposal, the intent, I think, of Mr. Rybczynski's amendment to the amendment would be carried out.

I would suggest also that if that were done on line 13, the comma after delegates should be changed to a period, and the words on line 13, "in accordance with the", and the word "law.", one line 14 be struck out.

If I may state briefly, the proposal which we expect to bring into the full Com-