

of 142 in the House and 43 in the Senate, which certainly was not a well-reasoned approach—it was an approach that was reached at the end of a judicial shotgun—we would find it necessary to bless it and give it the sanctity of a permanent marriage.

It was an unhappy courtship, to say the least.

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

Delegate Caldwell.

DELEGATE CALDWELL: Mr. Chairman, under the one-man/one-vote doctrine, the small counties eventually are going to die. I believe that we should give them representation as long as we can, and let them die with dignity.

*(Laughter.)*

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

Delegate Neilson.

DELEGATE NEILSON: Mr. Chairman, I rise to oppose the amendment offered. The figure as proposed was considered in Committee and all of the witnesses—not all, but most of the witnesses that appeared before us, although agreeing that the past Assembly was a good one, at the same time agreed that it should be a smaller body. This amendment does nothing more than continue what we have without any good reason or basis whatsoever.

I think if we are to use our initiative and rely on the investigation of the hearings of the Committee and its deliberations, this amendment should be defeated.

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

Delegate Clagett.

DELEGATE CLAGETT: Mr. Chairman, I get the feeling that we are being whittled on or whittled at by the various proposals that are coming before us now, and I cannot but sort of amusedly observe that with my name up at the top of the second column, that it is easily to be seen when I have to vote against a good friend like Delegate Adkins or one whom I admire as much as I do Delegate Dorsey, and the proposer of the motion or amendment, Delegate Kirkland. It only prolongs the agony. However, there was one resolution

that I made before I came down here. That was to vote my conscience, and to disregard friendships that are being made and friendships that will grow warmer as we go through the various sessions of this chamber.

I still feel that where we have a Committee that has battled as hard as this Committee obviously has and under the leadership of a Chairman as able as he is, he is just not going to be whittled. We have got to stand with him. I would like somehow to get to the question of how we can cast a vote for the 105-35 and go home.

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

DELEGATE GRANT: Mr. Chairman.

THE CHAIRMAN: Delegate Grant.

DELEGATE GRANT: A few minutes ago I tried to explain to this Committee the logical reasons why you should have adopted Mr. Gilchrist's proposal of 144. Since logical reasons did not succeed I now rise to go to a matter of political expediency. I would like to have a document I can sell my people on. I believe we have all worked very hard. I think this is going to be an excellent Constitution. But my feeling is that I would much rather be associated with a moderate success rather than open failure.

In asking that we preserve the status quo, which is not what we want to do, we are asked to compromise between idealism and reality. What it will amount to is not a death to counties. Obviously the small counties will be able to retain a delegate or some kind of representation which they can call their own until 1980. This was brought out in Mr. Gilchrist's presentation.

After 1980, that is 14 years after we hope we can get this Constitution passed, since the census takers are delayed about two years, after 1980 we do not know what the situation will be. But at least it will for 14 years allow this Constitution to work.

If at the end of fourteen years there is some desire to amend it because the House of Delegates is unworkable in size, it can be done.

But unless at this point you give those of us who have to carry the load of this Constitution in areas, where you are asking the people to disenfranchise them-