

Speaking as one who comes from a district with about 160,000 people, I think a paring down of that district would be in order, and an individual without political or machine affiliation might be able to run. But by the same token I suggest that there is no panacea to smallness alone, that a political organization's desire is to survive. It may become easier, not more difficult, to control single-member districts than multi-member districts.

I suggest to you that it would be quite easy to select those districts where power is in jeopardy and in those districts concentrate efforts that all of us are aware of. For that reason, I must say that if you are attempting to do that which is good, if we are attempting to do that which is best for the people, it might be well for us to consider those who seek to represent those people for whom the good is suggested. For that reason I support the Rybczynski amendment to the earlier amendment that was offered, and ask those here to do likewise.

THE CHAIRMAN: The Chair recognizes Delegate Lloyd Taylor to speak in opposition to the amendment to the amendment.

DELEGATE L. TAYLOR: I would like to speak against the amendment for a single delegate district. I want to speak from my own experience, from the experience of Tennessee as indicated by the article, "A Lesson for Reapportionment," in the *REPORTER MAGAZINE* issued September 21, 1967.

It said: "Before *Baker v. Carr*, Tennessee legislative districts were identical to the counties, and candidates ran county-wide. This meant, for example, that all the men running in Shelby County, which includes Memphis, had to have the backing of the city political machine. All the Shelby representatives were thus city men and tended to support programs sponsored by the Tennessee Municipal League in the legislature. But since rural counties with only a small fraction of Shelby's population, taken together, had more representatives than urban counties, the TML proposals were usually voted down. Today, a populous county like Shelby has more representatives, but these are divided among a number of homogeneous voting units, such as the wards of downtown Memphis and suburbs like Millington and the aptly named Whitehaven. The candidates run only in their districts. This system has produced the state's first post-Reconstruction Negro

delegation -- six from Memphis, Nashville, and Knoxville; the first group of representatives with strictly suburban constituencies; and a whole new set of white-Negro, Democratic-Republican, city-suburban divisions within the once solid 'urban' county delegations in the legislature."

I feel that the single district will be more representative of democratic government. In the City of Baltimore, from the second district, where I live, there are many people who are not properly represented by the delegates of the House of Delegates and the citizens of the State of Maryland. They are not represented by their city councilmen. For instance, I work as a neighborhood counsel with the Anti-Poverty Program. We established 25 Negro centers in 25 Negro neighborhoods to put the government closer to the people.

We had several city councilmen who were supposed to represent the second district, but I saw many expenditures where the people could not get any response from their city councilmen. Consequently, the Anti-Poverty Program moved in where there was a vacuum in the second district or in the government of Baltimore City.

The people in these areas know about problems, statewide problems. They know about Negro problems. They know about citywide problems. They know about urban renewal, air pollution. They know about air pollution because air pollution really affects the City population more than the rural and suburban population.

They know about the highway system, because the highways come through the City.

They know about many problems affecting the State of Maryland, and therefore they want representation; and of course, I feel the single-member district will give them more representation. Therefore, I am against this amendment, and I am for the single-member district.

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

Delegate White.

DELEGATE WHITE: Mr. Chairman, I wonder if Delegate Taylor would yield to a question. I am seeking information.

THE CHAIRMAN: Just a second.

Mr. Taylor has slightly less than one