waste our efforts in factional division, and especially in a city such as Baltimore where there is so much congestion we are unable to get the very best type of representation, unless we tie him down to the district he should represent.

I sincerely hope that you will defeat this amendment.

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

DELEGATE LORD: Yes, sir.

THE CHAIRMAN: Delegate Gill, do you desire to speak in favor of the amendment?

DELEGATE GILL: I have a question.

THE CHAIRMAN: To whom is your question addressed?

DELEGATE GILL: When will we vote on the committee recommendation? I mean, is it assured we will vote on the committee recommendation, even if one of these amendments should pass?

THE CHAIRMAN: If the committee recommendation is amended, you would not vote on the Committee recommendation.

DELEGATE GILL: In other words, both of these amendments would have to fail to give us a chance to vote on the Committee recommendation?

THE CHAIRMAN: No. The Rybczynski amendment, or I should not say it that way, the amendment to the amendment could pass and be substituted for the Amendment No. 11 and then if Amendment No. 11 failed, the Committee recommendation would be before you.

DELEGATE GILL: Suppose the Rybczynski amendment fails; would we then vote on the committee recommendation?

THE CHAIRMAN: You would vote on Amendment No. 11. If it passed, you would not have the opportunity to vote further on the committee recommendation. If it failed, you would.

The Chair recognizes Delegate Lord to speak in favor of the amendment to the amendment.

DELEGATE LORD: Mr. Chairman, fellow delegates, I rise to support, with some reservations, I must admit, the Rybczynski amendment to the amendment. I think perhaps it would be best to attempt to clear the air somewhat to explain the differences between the two amendments.

Under the amendment as submitted, No. 11, each subdivision would have one, two or three delegates representing a district. This would be determined at some future date. Under the Rybczynski amendment, the alternatives would be cut by one-third. There would be either a single-member district, or a three-member district.

I also should point out that there is no relationship under the Case-Lord amendment between the senatorial districts and the delegate districts. It may well be, as Delegate Dulany has pointed out, that there would be two delegates running from one district, and that that delegate district would have to be joined with a single member district in order to create a senatorial district.

The ratio of three to one would never be changed. It simply would not be quite as automatic a solution as the Rybczynski amendment.

Now, I should also state that I am unalterably opposed to Delegate Storm's suggestion that this be left to the legislature. I think that the maximum of three delegates should be the outside limit, and one that should be reached without a great deal of consideration by the Commission that will do the redistricting and reapportioning.

This is the outside limit. I think that anything, be it four, five, six, seven or eight delegates above the limit of three, would be an unworkable solution, and would be simply perpetuating many of the problems that there are in the large metropolitan areas.

I find myself in agreement with Delegate Dulany on his point. There are now six subdivisions of the State that are represented by two delegates in the House of Delegates. I would assume this number would be roughly the same under the 120-man house of delegates as reapportioned in 1970.

I for one would not want to cut off the opportunity of keeping two delegates in a district and forcing a choice between one and three.

I think the removal of that alternative is unfortunate.

I should also point out that when the Legislative Branch Committee made its report, and this has been acknowledged by the Chairman of that committee, single-member districts were based on a house of 105. We now have a house of 120, so, while the vote on that committee was 15 to 5 in