

1 didn't quite follow, but that was one of the reasons they  
2 changed the ten days.

3 THE CHAIRMAN: That was connected with the ten  
4 days, yes. In the absence of objection --

5 MR. SCANLAN: Mr. Chairman, one thing you just  
6 said there causes me some concern. You said the plan can  
7 be in effect for two years and anyone can challenge it. I  
8 think it was the thinking of the Committee, since we are  
9 putting into the Constitution a grant of jurisdiction and  
10 the procedure by which a new redistricting or reapportionment  
11 can be tested, I certainly, I better speak only for  
12 myself, from discussions of the Committee, I thought we  
13 were of the view there ought to be a limitation, that the  
14 people just couldn't sit back and later come in to upset a  
15 plan that they could have had an opportunity to upset  
16 promptly.

17 That, I think, is one of the reasons we originally  
18 had a flat limitation of time. Then, when that was taken  
19 out and the word, timely, substituted, I wasn't at that  
20 Meeting, but I have no objection/ <sup>to</sup> timely. The point I'm  
21 trying to make is I don't think it should be left completely