

structure of the State from time to time without the necessity of constitutional amendment.

THE CHAIRMAN: Are there any questions of the Committee Chairman?

*(There was no response.)*

If not, we will proceed to the consideration of the recommendation.

Is there any discussion?

*(There was no response.)*

The Clerk will ring the quorum bell.

The question arises on the approval of Committee Recommendation No. 5. A vote Aye is a vote for the approval of Committee Recommendation No. 5. A vote No is a vote against.

Cast your votes.

Has every delegate voted? Does any delegate desire to change his vote?

*(There was no response.)*

The Clerk will record the vote.

There being 115 votes in the affirmative and none in the negative, the recommendation is approved.

The next item for consideration on the agenda is Committee Recommendation EB-1. The Chair recognizes Delegate Morgan for the purpose of presenting the report of the Committee.

DELEGATE STORM: Mr. Chairman.

THE CHAIRMAN: Delegate Storm.

DELEGATE STORM: I have a point of parliamentary inquiry.

THE CHAIRMAN: State the inquiry.

DELEGATE STORM: Would it be possible for this Convention to adopt two executive articles so that we who believe that people are interested in keeping these offices elective and those who believe that the people do not know what it is all about and are not able to do that would be able to make this decision when the constitution comes up for adoption? Would this be possible?

THE CHAIRMAN: I do not think that is a parliamentary inquiry. It is a legal question. The Chair's view is that the constitution recommended by the Convention is to be submitted as one document to the people for acceptance or rejection. Your inquiry, however, is not parliamentary. I will

be glad to discuss it with you at another time, Delegate Storm.

DELEGATE STORM: Thank you. I will take that opportunity.

THE CHAIRMAN: Delegate Morgan, would you come forward to the reading desk?

DELEGATE CASE: Mr. Chairman.

THE CHAIRMAN: Delegate Case.

DELEGATE CASE: Mr. Chairman, so that I can be clear in my mind on this subject, what is the Chair's ruling as to the disposition of Amendment No. 3, which was the compromise advanced yesterday by Delegate Morgan, and to which I think Delegate Fornos offered an amendment? The whole thing drifted away into the haze, as far as I am concerned.

What happened? Where do we stand on that?

THE CHAIRMAN: The Chair had ruled that the amendment and the amendment to the amendment were out of order, and the subject matter of Recommendation No. 1 was made a special order of business at the time of consideration of Committee Recommendation EB-1.

Delegate Case.

DELEGATE CASE: So that as a matter of parliamentary posture, we stand with respect to the Board of Public Works at this time exactly as we stand with respect to the comptroller. Is this correct, a tie vote having obtained on both of those items, there is no recommendation one way or the other?

THE CHAIRMAN: That is in effect correct, with this minor modification of parliamentary procedure. That is that the Committee of the Whole has concluded its action with respect to Recommendation No. 2. Recommendation No. 1 has not been concluded, and it is before the Committee of the Whole simultaneously with the consideration of Committee Recommendation EB-1. As a practical matter, however, what you say is true, and the Chair understands that the Chairman of the Committee at the proper time intends to offer an amendment to Committee Recommendation EB-1 which would in effect carry out the purposes of Amendment No. 3 that was ruled not in order.

DELEGATE CASE: Thank you, sir.

THE CHAIRMAN: Delegate Morgan.