cided by a 51 per cent vote. While there may be some occasions for having more than a majority vote to take a particular action, it would seem to me when the people vote on this type of thing, a simple 50 plus 1 percentage vote should be adequate. Therefore urge the defeat of the substitute and support of the majority.

CHAIRMAN YEAGER: On the Brown-Boothby substitute, the Chair will recognize Mr. Durst — for what purpose does the gentleman rise?

MR. G. E. BROWN: Mr. Downs yielded to me, Mr. Chairman.

CHAIRMAN YEAGER: All right. Proceed, Mr. Brown.

MR. G. E. BROWN: I would like to answer Mr. Downs. I trust that he is not suggesting that we would be writing a constitutional provision for only Wayne county but that this constitutional provision would apply to the whole state. I think that the suggestion he has made that because there are more people in Wayne county than, therefore, their votes should count more or that we should have a special rule for Wayne county, is completely without philosophical basis. The whole purpose of requiring that you get not more than 10 per cent coming from any one county is that this is a statewide provision, that it will have statewide effect, and that there should be more than a self starter in one county insofar as any provision is concerned but it is not bad with respect to an elective officer or that we elect every 2 years — in the past, at least.

CHAIRMAN YEAGER: Mr. Downs, you retain the floor.

MR. DOWNS: Thank you. I did not mean to get into a long winded debate with my good friend, Delegate Brown. I would suggest that for him to show that he is not picking on the good citizens from Wayne county, instead of 10 per cent he use the figure 3/100 of 1 per cent. That happens to be the population of the smallest county in the state of Michigan, and if we could say that no more than 3/100 of 1 per cent of the petitions could come from any one county, that would show that we were not simply.confined to one county.

But, frankly, I feel that the delegates here are satisfied that on the matter of petition people should be allowed to circulate petitions. I have no desire to further discuss this. When the amendment they are voting on before it was tossed at them. And I think the committee was pretty unanimously in favor of at least including this 120 day provision which Mr. Brown's and Mr. Boothby's substitute eliminates.

Now Mr. Brown has done some shortening here on our proposal to a 60 day proposal. I think it is difficult to make a law in a little less than 60 days. I think that not his provision is better than ours. However, there were some things included in ours which the committee felt very strongly should be there. One was the provision that you could not submit the amendment to the voters in less than 120 days prior to the time the petitions were filed. The reason for this is because it was felt there should be some time for the people to become educated and to discuss and to think about the proposition they were voting on before it was tossed at them. And I think the committee was pretty unanimously in favor of at least including this 120 day provision which Mr. Brown's and Mr. Boothby's substitute eliminates.

We also include the requirement that the announcement of determination of the validity of the petitions had to be made 60 days prior to the time the amendment was to be voted upon. This was put in there mainly at the urging of Mr. Leppien, who has had some considerable experience, as a county clerk, in arranging the ballots and getting ready to submit these propositions to the people, and there was at least one instance when, I believe—if my memory serves me right—the thing was certified 13 days prior to the time of the election which presented an almost insurmountable obstacle for the election officers. So, this 60 days was included.

Now Mr. Brown completely eliminates those provisions and he eliminates almost all of what is contained on page 4 of the proposal, and here are some things which the committee also thought should be included for a good, self executing provision: one that was that the state was required to publish the proposal along with setting forth the material that it was expected to delete or change and that this publication be listed in the polling places. There was considerable discussion that we should go further and require even the preparation of a pro and con pamphlet in order to educate the people. This was decided to be impractical and what is included here was thought to be a minimum that was necessary, that at least it should be set forth clearly and concisely and placed in the polling places and presented to the voters. And there would be an opportunity for the people of this state to be thoroughly advised upon the amendment they are voting on.

Also contained in the language which Mr. Brown eliminates is the requirement that the proposed amendment be expressed in not more than 100 words and setting out some requirements for that 100 words. Since it is necessary on voting machines which are largely in use in this state today to use a 100 word caption, we felt that this was a very, very necessary part of the amendment and that there be some constitutional direction here.

Now as to the 3/5 provision, I do not know that this was seriously discussed in our committee. The committee was very much in favor—at least it voted in favor of retaining the majority provision which is in the present constitution. On the whole I would think that Mr. Brown's and Mr. Boothby's substitute is inadequate from the committee's point of view and should be rejected.

CHAIRMAN YEAGER: The Chair recognizes one of the proponents, Mr. Boothby.

MR. BOOTHBY: Mr. Chairman, ladies and gentlemen of the committee, I rise to support the Brown-Boothby substitute. The requirement as to the 10 per cent, not more than 10 per cent in one county, has been covered, I think, very well by Mr. Brown. I would add this: that a law generally affects not a complete state but, generally speaking, only a part of the state or a part of the whole. The constitution affects the whole and,