stitution include the following provisions with respect to State Debts and Gifts:

THE PRESIDENT: Committee Recommendation SF-4 is referred to the Committee of the Whole.

You have or will have this afternoon. Committee Memorandum SF-4, accompanying Committee Recommendation SF-4.

Are there any motions or resolutions?

(There was no response.)

If not, the Chair recognizes Delegate Powers.

DELEGATE POWERS: Mr. President, I move the Convention resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole for the purpose of resuming consideration of Committee Recommendation LB-1, and that the debate schedule be amended so as to permit fifteen minutes to Delegate Lord for presentation with respect to legislative districts; fifteen minutes to include time yielded to answer questions.

THE PRESIDENT: Is there a second?

(Whereupon, the motion was seconded.)

THE PRESIDENT: All those in favor, signify by saying Aye; contrary, No. The Ayes have it. It is so ordered. The motion is carried.

(Whereupon, at 2:07 P.M. the Convention resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole.)

(The mace was removed by the Sergeant-at-Arms.)

COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE NOVEMBER 9, 1967—2:07 P.M. PRESIDENT H. VERNON ENEY, PRESIDING

THE CHAIRMAN: The Committee of the Whole will now come to order.

The Committee of the Whole has before it for consideration Amendment No. 9. At the proper time and before this is submitted to vote, the Chair will divide the question so as to eliminate consideration at this time of the question of single member districts.

After we dispose of this amendment if there are no other amendments pertaining to the size of the legislature, the Chair will entertain amendments to section 3.04 with the question of single member districts.

Does anyone desire to speak in favor of Amendment No. 9 to Committee Recommendation LB-1?

Delegate Miller, Beatrice Miller.

DELEGATE B. MILLER: Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask a question of the maker of the amendment, Delegate Sherbow, if I might.

THE CHAIRMAN: Delegate Sherbow, do you yield to a question?

DELEGATE SHERBOW: Yes, indeed.

DELEGATE B. MILLER: I would like to know Delegate Sherbow, whether or not you favor this amendment, and if you do, why do you? We have not heard from you.

DELEGATE SHERBOW: Well, I must say I am glad you asked the question. I am in this situation, which I had explained before: when the other amendments were before this Assembly and it was clear that the subject of fractional voting would be withheld from the assemblage if the vote on the 120-40 division was carried, but would be presented to the body if the other ratio of 36-108 was carried, I took the view that I was in the situation of a member of the House of Delegates or of the Senate who would be asked normally to present something by request. In this instance, this request came from my inner self, because my conscience compelled me to see to it that those people who wanted to discuss the subject of fractional voting had the opportunity to do so on the floor, and to air and debate this subject. However, your question is how I feel about it. I can simply say that on the subject of fractional voting, this is not my cup of tea.

THE CHAIRMAN: Does any delegate desire to speak in opposition to Amendment No. 9?

Delegate Weidemeyer.

DELEGATE WEIDEMEYER: Mr. President, Members of the House:

While I appreciate the sentiment of Delegate Sherbow and the thought behind it, I will have to oppose that amendment of his because of the fact that it is fractional voting rather than weighted voting, and therefore would be far more complicated. In discussion and later on I hope to offer an amendment for a weighted voting plan in the Senate which will not have the fractional vote, but will have whole votes and