

I live in a U. S. Senate district, which is the entire state. I live in the Third Congressional District, First Councilmanic District, and under the proposal of the Committee, I would live in the 16th State Senate District and the 23rd State Delegate District. This all seems to me to be absolutely too complicated.

I think that the thing can work very well with all of us living in a state senate district, thereby making voting a little less complicated than proposed by the Committee.

There is in addition to this the problem in single member districts, and incidentally, this provides a procedure for a county that wants a single-member district. What I am saying now is that for those areas that want a single-member district, let them have it. Fine. However, the areas that want multi-member districts should have the privilege of doing this.

I am in favor of multi-member districts for the reason that voting should not be overly complicated.

Where areas have a lot more finesse than my area and voters can keep up with changes, fine. However, where a person living on Patterson Park Avenue, where I live, suddenly finds himself in a new senatorial district, and a new delegate district every ten years, it gets to be just a little ridiculous.

Now, it is hard enough to get to know the elected officials of your area. It may take you ten years to get to know them. If by the time you get to know them they are then switched to another district and you are switched to another district, what have we really accomplished in this Convention except to make voting tougher?

Let's not make it tougher. Our Committee has spent eight weeks over there trying to make things easier for the voter. Let's not make it any harder.

I strongly urge everyone here, if you favor letting the area choose its own method of districting, that is either single or multi-member, to kindly vote for my amendment.

THE CHAIRMAN: Is there any delegate who desires to speak in opposition to the amendment to the amendment?

Delegate Chabot?

DELEGATE CHABOT: I would like to ask some questions of Delegate Rybczynski, if he will yield to me for this purpose.

THE CHAIRMAN: Delegate Rybczynski, do you yield for a question?

DELEGATE RYBCZYNSKI: I will yield and I will only try.

DELEGATE CHABOT: Thank you.

I am a bit confused as to the comparison between your comments and what I see on the paper before me.

"The amendments, as the General Assembly shall provide," et cetera, and yet you indicate that each county or unit of government would be able to divide the state as it wished within its boundaries.

Would you explain this apparent difference?

DELEGATE RYBCZYNSKI: This is based on an assumption that the General Assembly, acting as a unit, will go along with each area on how it wants to vote.

THE CHAIRMAN: Delegate Chabot?

DELEGATE CHABOT: I have a further question. Is it clear in your mind that the General Assembly can make the decision district by district and is not compelled to choose either Method A or Method B for the entire State at any one time.

THE CHAIRMAN: Delegate Rybczynski?

DELEGATE RYBCZYNSKI: I guess it could. The General Assembly could, but I do not believe that it would. I can not imagine that it would happen.

THE CHAIRMAN: Delegate Chabot?

DELEGATE CHABOT: A further question: you had indicated that under the Committee's proposal and Delegate Lord's proposal it was possible for a person to find himself every ten years in a different senatorial district, and that that was a bad thing. Would your proposal change that situation?

THE CHAIRMAN: Delegate Rybczynski, you have just a little less than half a minute.

DELEGATE RYBCZYNSKI: No. I stand corrected if I said that. I did not mean that, as it can happen, but I say it is further complicated by putting the voter in the same area as the delegate district. It is absolutely too complicated.

THE CHAIRMAN: Does any delegate desire to speak in opposition?

Delegate James?

DELEGATE JAMES: Mr. Chairman, I