

to the lower, smaller numbers of these bodies, or with regard to what seems to be a firm belief in your report, that the committee system in the House of Delegates should be changed, et cetera, that your Committee might change its recommendation with regard to unicameralism and bicameralism.

DELEGATE GALLAGHER: It might possibly. I do not know that the rules would allow us to do anything significant about that, but we could meet and condemn the document in absentia or something like that.

THE CHAIRMAN: Delegate Wheatley?

DELEGATE WHEATLEY: Mr. Chairman, just so the record will be clear, am I correct in assuming that whenever the word "day" is used it refers to consecutive calendar days?

DELEGATE GALLAGHER: Yes. The days referred to in this constitution are calendar and not legislative days.

DELEGATE WHEATLEY: And they must be consecutive, is that right?

DELEGATE GALLAGHER: Yes, as far as regular sessions are concerned, they must be consecutive.

THE CHAIRMAN: In other words, to make it clearer, if I understand the question, when reference is made to regular session, 90 days, it means 90 consecutive calendar days?

DELEGATE GALLAGHER: That is correct.

THE CHAIRMAN: Delegate Gleason?

DELEGATE GLEASON: Mr. Chairman, I only rise because your answers to several questions have raised questions in my mind.

First of all, has the Committee itself ever considered the question, ever taken a vote on the question as to when these various provisions in a particular section would take effect?

DELEGATE GALLAGHER: The specific discussion that we did have about the possible postponement was only under section 3.08, if I recall correctly, the question of whether or not an increase in salary would apply to the members of the General Assembly.

I think we agreed the answer was, yes, and we intended it to be thus, but on the question of the recomposition of the legislature, with 35 and 105, the Committee had

only discussed the possibility of doing something to provide that that numerical adjustment be made earlier than 1974. I did not mention that, but that is true.

DELEGATE GLEASON: I think that is very important, Mr. Chairman, because there had been a vote as far as I am concerned with respect to when this provision would take effect, with respect to the 1970 census, the 1974 election, and the question raised by Mr. Chabot in connection with the 90-30-30 position.

DELEGATE GALLAGHER: May I say, Mr. Chairman, that the Committee considered for example getting an earlier federal census than 1970. We determined it would cost us 25 cents per head count, meaning roughly it would cost us \$1 million to get an earlier census than the 1970 census.

The Committee then considered the possibility of using voter registration as the basis for reapportionment and redistricting, without awaiting a 1970 figure. We also considered the possibility of using voter turnouts as a method of determining reapportionment, so you see the Committee has been struggling with a way to make the changes effective for the General Assembly to be elected in 1970.

The Committee discussed the possibility of extending the term of the present General Assembly one year into 1971 by which time the complete census track figures in their final form would be available, and consequently could be acted upon. Presumably this would allow the next General Assembly to have a term of three years, so that we would be back on the same four-year schedule; a five-year term, a three-year term and then back to four.

The difficulty with the entire situation was this: four did not divide into ten, except every other ten year period, so we would have had a recurring difficulty in 1990, 2010, and 2030. The Committee, however has not given up trying to find a way to implement its provisions in 1970.

THE CHAIRMAN: Delegate Gleason?

DELEGATE GLEASON: I think the Chairman has explained my point. Thank you.

THE CHAIRMAN: Are there further questions?

Delegate Wheatley?

DELEGATE WHEATLEY: Mr. Chairman, again on the question I raised, I am