

make their presence known to the delegate? Is this what we want?

I suggest to you that this is what is meant by the narrow views and the parochial views that we suggest is the danger of single-member districts. What is more, don't the district interests have a secondary importance to the state-wide interests? I frankly have difficulty understanding what the third legislative district interest is. It has a view, which I hope to represent here. I know that the city has an interest. I know that the county has an interest. I know that the state has an interest. I know that the region would have an interest, but I can not imagine what a district interest would be.

If we wanted the ideal I would think we would have state-wide elections, because then we would get the state-wide perspective, but we can not.

Political realities, practical realities suggest that we can not. So we go to what we can achieve, and that is a multi-member district. The single-member district to me goes in the opposite direction.

There is experience which has not been referred to and I would like to bring it to our attention. Ohio in 1965 transformed itself into single-member constituencies. The National Civic Review has a very excellent article, based on their study of the single-member constituencies in Ohio and I would like to read one of their conclusions. The ballot has been shortened there, thus making informed candidate choices more feasible. However, evidence is lacking that these choices raise the educational or occupational level of the metropolitan delegation. The hypothesis that better men would run has not been confirmed from the first election under single-member districts insofar as quantitative measurement of quality could determine.

This, I submit to you, is reality. Single-member districts, I submit to you, is theory. To be sure, we have it in senatorial districts today, but not because of the reasons that have been suggested, namely, visibility. It is for practicality that we have only one senator in a county.

THE CHAIRMAN: You have one half minute, Delegate Byrnes.

DELEGATE BYRNES: Thank you, sir.

I will conclude with an example in my district. In the Third Councilmanic District of Baltimore City we have three councilmen. Each one of them represents a dif-

ferent philosophy, conservative, moderate, and liberal. I suggest to you that if you go to single-member districts, you are utterly precluding those people who have a different philosophy from the man who gets in from ever having their views represented.

No district, no matter how small, will have a unity of philosophy, governmental policy or politics, and I suggest to you that single-member districts would destroy the variations. I therefore, ask you to support the Rybczynski amendment and hopefully also to support the Lord Amendment.

Thank you.

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

Delegate Freedlander?

DELEGATE FREEDLANDER: Mr. Chairman, I am speaking in opposition to the substitute motion and in favor of the Legislative Branch report.

During the days of discussion of the possibility of enlarging the size of the legislative body, we have heard much debate about visibility and bringing the government closer to the people.

I think the single-member district is a great opportunity in that direction. In certain districts of Baltimore City, where we have seven or eight representatives, they come from one part of the district and only represent one part of the district. I believe that this is not truly visible or truly representative.

There is another aspect that has not been mentioned with regard to the State of Maryland, and that is that there is a great deal of mobility. There is a great deal of immigration. People are moving into the state. We have many new developments. The complaints from people who come into new areas is that they cannot get into the political arena because it is closed to them.

Single-member districts would provide an opportunity to do something about mobility in the state.

My third point is that if we believe in the two-party system, which is practically extinct in this state, it seems to me that a single-member district would give us that and would bring with it competition, and perhaps higher quality candidates, because they would be competing with an opposition party. For that reason also, I favor the single member district presentation of the Legislative Branch Committee.