

I hope, 110 in the House. The number of physical bodies, however, if the amendment originally sponsored on fractional voting, or some other kind of similar amendment should be passed, would increase the number of bodies. I have no idea which of those amendments, if any, may subsequently pass, but let me show you what would happen, based on the table which was submitted with the Report of the Legislative Branch Committee.

Calvert County, under this projection of 105 would have three-fifths of a vote; Caroline, a half.

I do not know whether under fractional voting they would come up to almost a whole or nearly a whole. The only answer I can give you is that it would need more physical bodies than 120 or 105.

I do say, however, that what we ought to do is keep our eye on the ball, and that is, go back to here we were a few minutes ago, and then take up the subject of fractional voting as it should be taken up, namely, fractional voting only, without the other clouds over it.

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

*(There was no response.)*

Does any delegate desire to speak in opposition to the amendment to the amendment? Delegate Lloyd Taylor.

DELEGATE L. TAYLOR: I would like to ask Delegate Sherbow a question.

THE CHAIRMAN: Will Delegate Sherbow yield for a question?

DELEGATE SHERBOW: Yes, sir.

DELEGATE L. TAYLOR: I wonder under the fractional voting system, if a delegate with a percentage of a vote, would be entitled to the same staff as that of a delegate who had a full vote, the same staff and the same legislative resources?

THE CHAIRMAN: Delegate Sherbow.

DELEGATE SHERBOW: You are speaking now of what would be legislative matter and legislative prerogatives. We would not for a moment dream in this Constitutional Convention of writing out those details. Those are matters which would belong to the General Assembly, and they would have to make the decision as to how many employees they would have, their

allotment and the manner in which they would serve.

*(Call for the question.)*

THE CHAIRMAN: Are you ready for the question? The question arises on the adoption of Amendment No. 1 to Amendment No. 9. The effect of the amendment is to change the numerals, changed by interlineation in Amendment 9 back to the form in which they were originally printed, which meant that in line 12, the number is 105; in line 14, the number is 35.

A vote Aye is a vote in favor of the adoption of Amendment No. 1 to Amendment No. 9. A vote No is a vote against.

Cast your vote.

Have all delegates voted? Does any delegate desire to change his vote?

*(There was no response.)*

The Clerk will record the vote.

There being 46 votes in the affirmative and 77 in the negative, the motion is lost. The amendment to the amendment is rejected.

The question now arises on the adoption of Amendment No. 9. Are you ready for the question?

Delegate Hanson.

DELEGATE HANSON: Mr. Chairman, I rise to speak against the amendment. I think what Delegate Scanlan said earlier about the constitutional monstrosity ought to be well taken by this Committee.

I think it is most unwise to create a General Assembly of unequal members. Every member of a legislative body ought to have the same vote to cast in that legislative body.

It seems to me that this is simply a fundamental of having a good General Assembly, and an effective General Assembly, and effective representation of the constituents of the representatives.

For my own part, I would rather see the General Assembly have no limit on its size, although I vigorously opposed this kind of proposal yesterday; but I would prefer it to this proposal.

Secondly, I think it is worth pointing out, Mr. Chairman, that there could be very serious problems with this proposal. The right that a citizen has under the federal Constitution to be represented is not a