

THE CHAIRMAN: Delegate Gallagher, do you yield to a question?

DELEGATE GALLAGHER: Yes, sir.

DELEGATE STORM: Would your Committee mind exempting Frederick County and Carroll County?

THE CHAIRMAN: Delegate Gallagher.

DELEGATE GALLAGHER: In view of the support which we intend to give local government, despite what may have transpired earlier today, we would mind.

DELEGATE STORM: Thank you.

THE CHAIRMAN: Does any delegate desire to speak in opposition?

Delegate Gill?

DELEGATE GILL: Mr. Chairman, I am from Baltimore City.

THE CHAIRMAN: You may proceed.

DELEGATE GILL: I think one of the most telling arguments against democracy in the United States is on election day, when so few people turn out to vote.

I think one of the main reasons why so few people turn out to vote is they do not feel that they are a part of the electoral process for one reason or another.

I disagree with one of the delegates who said that 33,000 people would be too few to represent and would make too parochial a district.

I recall that one of the main reasons I favored the recommendation of the Committee was the chance it gave the people to be represented better.

I recall one witness who came before our Committee and said he was against ombudsmen because he was one. Each person in the legislature has an opportunity to be an ombudsman, and representing a single district gives him that much more of a chance to serve the people.

Of course, that is the only reason we are down here. We are trying to get a legislature structured and designed so that it can better serve the people. If we can do anything in this age of numbers to restore people's individuality, make them feel that they are part of government, and that they know their elected representatives and their representatives know them and their problems, it would be a great asset. The recommendation of the Committee is to have the same legislative district so that the person

represented, or the senator can have a broader view in representing the whole district while the district will be composed of three parts, each one represented by one person who will get a chance to know his constituents and they, him. If we can have more parochialism, I think we will have a better government, and a better turnout on election day. I certainly hope that this amendment to the amendment, and the amendment will be voted down and that the recommendation of the Committee will be approved.

THE CHAIRMAN: Does any other delegate desire to speak in favor of the amendment to the amendment?

Delegate Byrnes?

DELEGATE BYRNES: Mr. Chairman, I would like to speak.

I prefer the Case-Lord amendment, but I feel that it is appropriate at this point to speak in favor of the Rybczynski amendment, because I am not certain we are going to have the opportunity to discuss the problems of single-member districts again.

The report of the Committee on the Legislative Branch convinced me, and the reality of the third district of Baltimore City convinces me that too many delegates, too many senators cause confusion and problems. I am in agreement with three as a maximum, but if we have small districts now, as the committee suggests what happens in 1980 in 20 or 30 years? What will the population of that small district be at that point? Aren't we approaching what we now have in the Congressional districts, simply high visibility?

I think the goal of high visibility can be carried to an extreme. High visibility means to me that the man in office has the opportunity to get his name before the public. That is what visibility is in political life. It does not mean that he would be required, as he would be in a multi-member district, to compete with his fellow delegates in that district in servicing his constituents.

There is competition today and it is a healthy competition: three delegates serving one constituency; one delegate serving one constituency can feel very secure. I think this is the trap we will be falling into in 20 or 30 years from now. If the point is to have shorter distance, it is to better focus public attention on legislation. Does this not in reality imply that the most vocal and aggressive constituents will