

1 member districts. One is that you must have single-member
2 districts because they provide "differing perspectives then
3 between the delegates to the house of delegates and the
4 senators elected to the senate." This is not a persuasive
5 argument. It is merely a make-way argument.

6 If the Committee on the Legislative Branch had been
7 sincere in attempting to create meaningful distinctions
8 between the two houses, they could have picked many other
9 alternatives, one of which would have been a staggered term
10 situation so the terms did not overlap. They did not do it.
11 They bring this plan and try to use as its justification
12 that you had to create a different basis of representation.
13 I think the argument cuts the other way because the re-
14 districting case in the Supreme Court known as Reynolds v.
15 Sims stated that a reapportionment of legislature does not mean
16 any difference in complexion and it made the following
17 statement: "One body could be composed of single-member
18 districts while the other could have at least some multi-
19 member districts." This is exactly what this amendment
20 would do. It would allow not force by the Redistricting
21 Commission to provide for some multi-member districts in