

to the comptrollership. I do not recall the precise number of that vote.

THE CHAIRMAN: I assume you mean the vote by which the Recommendation No. 2 as amended was approved? Is that the vote to which you refer, Delegate Gleason?

DELEGATE GLEASON: Yes, sir.

THE CHAIRMAN: It is regularly moved that the Committee of the Whole reconsider the vote by which it yesterday approved Recommendation No. 2 as amended.

Recommendation No. 2 as amended was the Committee recommends that the office of comptroller be provided for in the Constitution.

Is there a second to the motion?

*(Whereupon, the motion was seconded.)*

THE CHAIRMAN: The motion is made and seconded.

For what purpose does Delegate Storm rise?

DELEGATE STORM: Mr. Chairman, you suggested that we finish up with the attorney general, and I do not believe we quite finished. You see, we have to have three votes to get a point carried. This is unusual, but that is the way it is. We have still one more vote to make and that is to insert in the Constitution that he shall be an elected official.

Would you mind putting that before you start reconsidering it?

THE CHAIRMAN: In accordance with the Chair's ruling yesterday, that would not be a proper matter for consideration at this time. That will come up upon consideration of the committee recommendation, and for that reason Delegate Mason deleted that phrase from his amendment.

Delegate Storm.

DELEGATE STORM: Very well.

Just please do not get confused. When it comes up, make sure you vote right. This is a very strange proceeding.

*(Laughter.)*

THE CHAIRMAN: Delegate Scanlan.

DELEGATE SCANLAN: I have a parliamentary inquiry.

THE CHAIRMAN: State the inquiry.

DELEGATE SCANLAN: While I have the greatest sympathy for reconsideration

if it is in proper order, I believe Rule 35 [37]\*, which limits motions for reconsideration to the same session, presents a problem. Is my understanding of the rule correct or incorrect?

THE CHAIRMAN: Your understanding is incorrect. Your statement of the rule is correct.

As was stated by the Chair several weeks ago in considering this same problem, the Chair would follow the practice of considering recesses of the Committee of the Whole for purpose of breaks or similar recesses as not being an interruption of the Committee of the Whole, so long as it had the same report under consideration.

Under the rule, a motion to reconsider would not be in order until the Committee of the Whole rises to report with respect to Committee Report EB-1.

I might say, Delegate Scanlan, that the same inquiry was addressed to the Chair several days ago at the same day that the vote on Recommendation No. 2 was taken. The Chair gave the same answer at that time.

Delegate Dukes.

DELEGATE DUKES: I have a parliamentary inquiry.

THE CHAIRMAN: State the inquiry.

DELEGATE DUKES: How many times may a matter be reconsidered?

THE CHAIRMAN: In the Committee of the Whole?

DELEGATE DUKES: Yes, sir.

THE CHAIRMAN: There is no limitation on reconsideration in the Committee of the Whole.

DELEGATE DUKES: Do I understand if this section continues another four or five days we could regularly reconsider this matter every ten minutes?

THE CHAIRMAN: I would sincerely trust—by "this section" I think you mean EB-1—would not continue four or five days. If it did continue, your suggested result would follow.

For what purpose does Delegate Chabot rise?

DELEGATE CHABOT: Parliamentary inquiry.

*\*The number in brackets refers to the final number assigned to the rule in the Rules of the Constitutional Convention of Maryland.*