

It is time we found out that the facts of life, as they exist in political life, are really there for anybody to see who will count the votes the day of the primary and see how those who were elected won.

That is how they got in.

THE CHAIRMAN: The Chair is not deaf, but assumes that Delegate Sherbow was speaking in favor of the Rybczynski amendment.

DELEGATE SHERBOW: I announced it at the beginning, did I not, because I thought Mr. Lord had abandoned support for his own amendment.

THE CHAIRMAN: I have no objection, I just want to give the opportunity to opponents to speak following you. Does anyone desire to speak in opposition to the Rybczynski amendment?

Delegate Marion.

DELEGATE MARION: Mr. Chairman, and ladies and gentlemen, I am compelled to rise because of what the last speaker just said.

I think we should all recognize it and recognize it very clearly. I am a member of a political party, but the reason, one of the basic reasons why the election is won in Baltimore City in the primary is because of multi-member districts in Baltimore City.

The interests of the minority political party are submerged and can be submerged and will always be submerged as long as multi-member districts are tolerated.

I think most of the other arguments have been said, Mr. Chairman. Let me just say this, in closing:

The word parochialism has been used here with a certain insidious flare to it, but what we are talking about, when we talk about single-member districts and parochialism is the reduction of representative democracy to the lowest common denominator, to get government, as we said time and time again yesterday and the day before, as close to the people who are being represented as it is possible to do.

I urge this body to vote against the amendment to the amendment, to vote against the amendment, to support the Committee, and to favor single-member districts.

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

Delegate Sosnowski.

DELEGATE SOSNOWSKI: Mr. Chairman, I would like to speak in favor of the Rybczynski amendment.

I am strongly opposed to single-member districts in both houses of the legislature. The most attractive and well thought out theory in the world is valid only if it works when put into practice, and it is my feeling that when the field of single-member districts and sharpened lines of legislative responsibility is put into practice it will prove to be invalid. The single-member legislative district will tend to produce little political kingdoms and a parochial General Assembly.

A legislature composed of law-makers, each from a tiny political enclave, will increase parochialism, provincialism, and increase unanimity to such a degree that the passage of progressive legislation will be extremely difficult. Because of the limited geographical area and smaller population each legislator will represent in a single-member district, he will probably feel less free to vote his conscience on matters of general public concern.

The viewing of each little kingdom for construction of public facilities will tend to produce log rolling the likes of which have never been witnessed in a legislative body before.

By no means am I in favor of abolishing all parochialism in the legislature. A degree of parochialism is healthy and necessary to give voice to different philosophies and needs on a factional or sectional basis.

However, by virtue of single-member district representation, such parochialism is already present in one house of the legislature, the Senate.

The multi-membership districts in the House of Delegates allow an overall majority to be exercised, thus contributing a necessary balance to the legislature.

The existence of a bicameral or two-house legislature affords the framework for a balanced legislature, whereby one house is elected on a single member district basis and the other house is elected on a multi-member district basis.

When the existing bicameral framework is used in this manner to create a balanced legislative body, the people are assured of representation which can best serve the welfare of each and all.

THE CHAIRMAN: Does any other dele-