

not sure I was clear as to the answer. If there is an extension of 30 days or an additional 30 days, must these two extensions also run consecutively to the 90 days?

DELEGATE GALLAGHER: That is the interpretation.

THE CHAIRMAN: Delegate Adkins?

DELEGATE ADKINS: Mr. Chairman, I should like to ask a question with relation to the matter of redistricting.

I assume that will be presented in a future report. I wonder if the Chairman could just briefly outline the method that they will propose for redistricting, specifically with relation to the point of whether it shall be completely legislative, by commission, by the Executive or a combination of all three.

DELEGATE GALLAGHER: Yes, I think I can speak on the section, although there has been no final vote.

I think it is the majority will of the Committee that some commission be appointed, bipartisan in nature, which would have the original responsibility of preparing a redistricting plan, and that to some extent it should reflect representatives of the General Assembly.

The Committee definitely feels that the executive should not have a hand in the preparation of the original recommendations. Once this commission of a bipartisan nature has submitted its recommendations, it shall go to the General Assembly.

At this point the General Assembly is free to accept it or to change it. If it does not accept it or change it, it then automatically becomes law. If it is changed, then the General Assembly change becomes law. In the event of a court challenge, the General Assembly plan would be presented first. If that fell as a result of court scrutiny, then the commission plan would follow it as a second line of defense.

That is roughly the way the Committee is thinking at this time.

THE CHAIRMAN: Are there any further questions of the Chairman of the Committee?

Delegate Byrnes?

DELEGATE BYRNES: Mr. Chairman, referring now to lines 26 through 28 of page 3—

THE CHAIRMAN: Of the recommendation?

DELEGATE BYRNES:—of the recommendation of the Legislative Branch Committee: Was the sole reason of the Committee concerning living expenses this idea of enticement to extend the session 30 days and then another 30 days?

DELEGATE GALLAGHER: No. That certainly would have been only some slight by-product, but not the sole reason. The sole reason was that the Committee wanted the salary on the table.

DELEGATE BYRNES: Is there a possibility in the future, Mr. Chairman, for a confusion to arise between allowances and living expenses?

I note in the report that living expenses are not delineated.

DELEGATE GALLAGHER: It is very difficult, because some people live differently from others.

We sought to prohibit per diem expenses. However, those who were enamored of the English language did not want the Latin. That is why we did not use per diem. The idea was to eliminate the practice which is now embodied in the \$25 per day. We did not want to eliminate travel expenses, secretarial expenses, postage, stationery or any of the other actual expenses of the delegates. In other words, we would have the salary cover the living expenses.

THE CHAIRMAN: Delegate Weidemeier.

DELEGATE WEIDEMEIER: Mr. Chairman, did the Committee give consideration to the fact that by extending the term of the present legislature to 1971, and then making the terms of the legislatures thereafter five years each, that we could be marching to both the tune of Washington figures and the edicts of the Supreme Court.

DELEGATE GALLAGHER: The Committee found the four-year term attractive. There is a great possibility that the federal government will go to a five year census, a quinquennial census rather than a decennial census, and we may eliminate decennial in the redistricting proposal, which is yet to come.

THE CHAIRMAN: Delegate Sherbow.

DELEGATE SHERBOW: Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask Delegate Gallagher to clarify the latter part of section 3.04. As I understand it, it simply means that each senate district shall have one senator. I have several questions.