

If it is then approved, the Committee of the Whole will have directed that there be a provision in the constitution with respect to the Board of Public Works. It would not have directed the precise terms or language.

An amendment to Committee Recommendation EB-1 stating such terms and language would, of course, be in order at the time of consideration of Committee Recommendation EB-1, because it would not be inconsistent with the final action on the Committee Report.

On the other hand, if the amendment to the Committee Report should fail, and thereafter the Committee Report recommending that there not be a revision in the constitution with respect to the Board of Public Works should be approved, and thereafter the Committee of the Whole should rise other than for meal recess and report that recommendation to the Convention, then it would not be in order thereafter on consideration of Committee Recommendation EB-1 to consider an amendment to that recommendation providing for a Board, because that would be inconsistent with the action of the Committee of the Whole.

Delegate Schneider.

DELEGATE SCHNEIDER: May I make a further parliamentary inquiry?

THE CHAIRMAN: Yes.

DELEGATE SCHNEIDER: Suppose we did adopt the amendment and that we manifested our intent that there should be a Board of Public Works in the constitution, and then we started amending. Suppose at that particular time some of the members decided that there should not be and the majority says there should be. How, then, would we ever get out of the dilemma of considering amendments and infinitum when they are all defeated because the majority does not want a Board of Public Works?

THE CHAIRMAN: I would assume if the recommendation was not implemented at some point it could not be carried into effect, and it could only be implemented by adoption of EB-1, which would carry it into effect.

I further say that the Convention has complete power to disregard any recommendation of the Committee of the Whole.

For what purpose does Delegate Pullen rise?

DELEGATE PULLEN: Inquiry.

I have just gotten in. I want to vote to retain the Board of Public Works. How do I vote on this next proposal?

THE CHAIRMAN: Do you desire to retain it in the constitution or as a statutory board?

DELEGATE PULLEN: In the constitution.

THE CHAIRMAN: You would vote in favor of the amendment, and if it were adopted, you would vote in favor of the Committee Report as amended.

DELEGATE PULLEN: Thank you.

THE CHAIRMAN: Is there any further inquiry as to this rather confused parliamentary matter?

*(There was no response.)*

If not, the Clerk will ring the quorum bell.

The amendment before you is the amendment to delete the word "not" in line 14 of Committee Report EB-1. A vote Aye is a vote in favor of that amendment, and would result in the deletion of that word from the Committee Report, that is, from Recommendation No. 1 of the Committee Report, and would then be recommending that the Board of Public Works be provided for in the constitution.

A vote No is a vote against the proposed amendment. If the amendment failed, it would be the Committee Recommendation as it is printed in Report EB-1, that the Board of Public Works not be provided for in the constitution. That Recommendation would then be submitted to another vote.

The question now arises on the adoption of the amendment. A vote Aye is a vote in favor of the amendment, and deletes the word "not."

A vote No is a vote against the amendment.

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 68 votes in the affirmative and 66 in the negative, the motion carries. The amendment to Committee Recommendation EB-1 is now adopted.

The question now arises on the adoption of the Committee Recommendation as