1 2

five regions or fewer makes no sense at all to me. It
doesn't guarantee if the regions are going to be
reasonable regions. You could have four regions divided
in a small area and the rest of the state would then
have to be --

the CHAIRMAN: May I interrupt. Again because I thought from the earlier discussion that this is going to be really a separate discussion. I had noted it as a separate question how many regions because it seems to me that you may favor the idea of having a skeleton but there may be differences as to whether it should be five.

MR. MARTINEAU: Without specifying any number; that it doesn't do any good to specify any number whether it is three, four, five, or ten. You don't gain anything by this because your regions can wind up being completely unreasonable. It doesn't prevent the proliferation of a small number of regions in one metropolitan area and let the rest of the state have only one or two regions. For that reason I think the Committee draft is exactly the way we should adopt