

I would call your attention to the fact that the Legislative Branch Committee commentary supports this 15 percent figure. I would also note that in the model state constitution, they called for a percentage figure and in so doing, they say the 15 percent is the maximum that should be extended.

So again let us fix this into the constitution, rather than risk the future sabotage of this concept of one man-one vote.

Now, if any of you should have any questions as to the workability of this figure, I simply point to you the State of Michigan, where their spread from the mean totals only 4.28 percent.

Frankly my own personal preference is 14 percent, but Professor Winslow and I have adopted the 15 percent figure because it is in line with the Legislative Branch Committee commentary.

So in closing, I would say again, let us not abdicate to the courts the fulfillment of the goal that each man is equal, or each man's vote is equal to that of every other man, regardless of his place of residence.

I urge your support of this amendment, and I yield the rest of the time allotted to us for this amendment to Dr. Winslow.

THE CHAIRMAN: This is perhaps the appropriate time to find out if there are any questions of you, Delegate Wagandt, before the Chair recognizes Delegate Winslow.

Are there any questions of the sponsor of the amendment?

Delegate Weidemeyer.

DELEGATE WEIDEMEYER: Delegate Wagandt, in view of the fact that in many of these provisions we are trying to allow for some flexibility, and application of the law laid down, the principles of the Constitutions, do you not think that if we amended your amendment here to say "30 percent variation" instead of 15, that that would give the commission a lot more leeway in making adjustments where necessary?

THE CHAIRMAN: Delegate Wagandt.

DELEGATE WAGANDT: As I think I pointed out earlier, my personal preference is for 10 percent. I also noted that Michigan manages to comply within a 14.28 percent figure, so that I feel that the 15 percent figure is more than ample, and I could not accede to that amendment.

THE CHAIRMAN: Delegate Weidemeyer.

DELEGATE WEIDEMEYER: Would you agree to 25 percent?

THE CHAIRMAN: Delegate Wagandt.

DELEGATE WAGANDT: The answer is no.

THE CHAIRMAN: Delegate Weidemeyer.

DELEGATE WEIDEMEYER: Will you agree to 20 percent?

DELEGATE WAGANDT: Fifteen percent is too generous as it is.

THE CHAIRMAN: Are there any other questions of the sponsor of the amendment?

Delegate Barrick.

DELEGATE BARRICK: Mr. Chairman, I have a question of Delegate Wagandt.

THE CHAIRMAN: You may ask your question.

DELEGATE BARRICK: I am a little concerned with the 15 percent. What would be the result if after the General Assembly has been redistricted, a sudden influx of people moved into one area and in that area the 15 percent rule would not apply, or there would be a variation of more than 15 percent.

Would that involve anything that the General Assembly would be doing?

THE CHAIRMAN: Delegate Wagandt.

DELEGATE WAGANDT: I am not sure that I follow you, Delegate Barrick. I assume you are talking about redistricting, and then shortly after the redistricting a sudden influx of people.

Well, if this is what you mean, that districting plan would have to hold until the next time the State was redistricted, which would, I gather, be ten years.

THE CHAIRMAN: Delegate Barrick.

DELEGATE BARRICK: My question is, you are putting this amendment in section 3.02 and I am wondering whether you would accomplish the results that you wish to accomplish, or should it be better placed in section 3.03A where you are dealing with redistricting?

THE CHAIRMAN: Delegate Wagandt.

DELEGATE WAGANDT: I believe that section 3.02 is the proper place for this. I assume that the redistricting commission