Constitutional Convention but I do not think anyone can say I have shirked my responsibility since being here.

I have lived up to the promise I made to the people that I would come and try to get out a constitution that they could live with and would approve. That, Mr. President, I am trying to do. If I voted for any reduction of the House of Delegates or the State Senate, I feel I would be shirking my responsibility.

THE CHAIRMAN: Does any delegate desire to speak against the amendment?

(There was no response.)

Does Delegate Chabot desire to speak against the amendment?

DELEGATE CHABOT: Yes, sir.

THE CHAIRMAN: You may proceed.

DELEGATE CHABOT: It is useful in matters like this to try to understand what is the logic of the point of view that was presented by the other side. So in trying to understand this amendment, I tried to put myself in the position of one who is favoring trying to retain at least one representative in the legislature from each county.

It was with this in mind that I inquired of Delegate Gilchrist as to what the population figures would be. We learned that if we are to have single-member districts, the only way Kent County could continue to be represented is if some 10,000 people in one or more of the neighboring counties would in effect be deprived of their county representation or at least their opportunity to vote for their county representative.

Under the circumstances, I find it difficult to see why one who is in favor of each county having one voice to call its own would favor this proposal.

Accordingly, from any point of view, I urge defeat of the proposal.

THE CHAIRMAN: Does any other delegate desire to speak in favor of the amendment?

Delegate Raley?

DELEGATE RALEY: Mr. Chairman, members of the Convention, I suppose that everybody knows how they are going to vote. But I don't think, as a matter of fact, I am sure, I know most of you people that do not come from rural areas have little understanding of the deep feeling we have on this issue.

As I see this amendment, it would allow more membership in the House of Delegates. It would not give to any, any guarantee to every county that they would have a representative. But they would have more than they would under 105.

Give them a chance. We heard something about thinking around here, thinking of the new, that we have to get away from the fact we are representing counties but are representing people. That does take some time. It has not yet been received in the rural counties.

It might very well be that if this kind of amendment were adopted in the Constitution, it would not have the shock as Delegate Weidemeyer mentioned a while ago; it would not produce the alienation, the feeling they are going to have that they no longer will be represented in the General Assembly.

You can talk all the logic you want, but the fact remains that that is how the people feel.

I hope that we can consider that when we vote.

THE CHAIRMAN: Does any other delegate desire to speak against the amendment?

Delegate Beatrice Miller.

DELEGATE B. MILLER: Mr. Chairman, I wish that Delegate Gilchrist who opened his remarks and spoke, would have offered the amendment in Committee, but at no time in the Committee deliberation was the ratio of four to one introduced, nor was it ever considered by us. I would also point out that this compromise or this proposal which is presented as a compromise is in fact not a compromise at all. It is the largest number of all those numbers offered and represents nothing different from the highest number which the Committee examined.

It is a restatement of the minority position of the Committee.

In fact, it is made a little larger on the floor here than ever introduced in Committee. The compromise position, the position on which we gained the greatest consensus was the number of 105 to 35. It is on that basis I think we should consider compromise.

I would also point out that a number of references have been made here to the Eagleton Report. The Eagleton report does not deal with size, but with the organiza-