

Does that not envisage that one Senate district may in a number of places encompass more than one county?

DELEGATE GALLAGHER: That is correct.

DELEGATE SHERBOW: If there are to be three delegates under this proposal from each senate district, it encompasses also the requirement that these three delegates be from that one senate district, which may in turn include more than one county.

DELEGATE GALLAGHER: That is correct.

DELEGATE SHERBOW: And then since you have it reduced to a separate district for each delegate, the division line there being narrower, it could be in one county, in two counties, or partly in one county and partly in the other. Isn't that right?

DELEGATE GALLAGHER: That is right.

DELEGATE SHERBOW: And if there is a proposal that there be three delegates from one senatorial district who run at large, there is no question then that under your plan those three delegates, if they were permitted to run at large, would be running for office from that one senatorial district, which could be more than one county where those counties are too small to come within the 35-105 classification?

DELEGATE GALLAGHER: That is correct.

DELEGATE SHERBOW: Thank you.

THE CHAIRMAN: Delegate Henderson.

DELEGATE HENDERSON: I was wondering if the Committee gave any consideration to putting this new plan into effect in 1970 or before that election, based on the 1960 figures. It just occurs to me that while that might be a troublesome operation, by putting the new plan into effect to reduce the legislature, it might simplify the transition.

DELEGATE GALLAGHER: No, Judge Henderson, it did not, but it certainly is something that we should consider. I do not know whether the malapportionment would be so bad that you would find yourself with a suit in 1971, in any event.

THE CHAIRMAN: Are there any further questions?

Delegate Chabot

DELEGATE CHABOT: I wonder if the language of section 3.12 would permit or would preclude the carrying over of bills from one session to another so that one would not be required to introduce bills anew.

DELEGATE GALLAGHER: I think that in the absence of a definitive sentence to the effect that one does carry them over, one would not interpret 3.12 as allowing the bills to go over in life from one year to another.

THE CHAIRMAN: Delegate Chabot.

DELEGATE CHABOT: Has the Committee given consideration to this point?

DELEGATE GALLAGHER: The Committee has not actually given full consideration to it. It may well recommend it in another section.

There was some consideration of having a bill stay alive through two years, certainly not longer than two, but the Committee has not taken any action on it.

THE CHAIRMAN: Are there any further questions for purposes of clarification?

Delegate Byrnes.

DELEGATE BYRNES: Mr. Chairman, just for the record again, referring to section 3.08, page 3 of the Committee Recommendation, would you say that there is anything to bar the legislature from authorizing additional salary, for example, \$1,000 for the additional 30 days and another \$1,000 for the second 30 days?

DELEGATE GALLAGHER: I believe that the 30 day extension would be a continuation of the regular session, and if there were a second 30 day session, that that would be a further continuation, so I believe that would fly in the face of the prohibition here.

The Committee recognizes, of course, that there is enough ingenuity in the mind of man to get around any prohibition, but at the same time we felt that we only wanted to prohibit a specific praction and consequently we merely addressed ourselves to that.

THE CHAIRMAN: Are there any further questions for purposes of clarification?

Delegate Bamberger?

DELEGATE BAMBERGER: My purpose is to clarify the Chairman's answer. I think he missed the last word of Delegate Byrnes' question, which was whether