

1     Parliamentarian.

2             Yesterday and today we have on three different  
3 occasions I think suspended interring rules in order to  
4 re-consider items adopted on second reading, and then have  
5 adopted amendments.

6             The question has been asked, why was it not  
7 necessary to read the Committee Recommendation again on  
8 second reading.

9             If you will recall when the Chair first started  
10 to put the question to you the first time it arose, I did  
11 so in a rather involved manner, by suggesting a suspension  
12 of eules to re-consider the vote by which the Committee  
13 Recommendation was adopted on second reading in order to  
14 re-consider the vote by which an amendment was adopted or  
15 rejected.

16             Had that procedure been followed, it would have  
17 been necessary to go back twice and then forward twice  
18 and have a second reading again.

19             The Parliamentarian suggested instead the  
20 device which we have used, to suspend the interferring  
21 rules, to permit consideration, after second reading, of