

The question arises on the motion to reconsider the vote of 72 to 66 by which Committee Recommendation No. 2 was approved as amended, and to reconsider the vote of 70 to 68 by which Recommendation No. 2 was amended.

A vote Aye is a vote in favor of reconsideration. A vote No is a vote against.

If the motion is carried and the votes are reconsidered, the Committee will have before it under discussion Amendment No. 2 to Recommendation No. 2, and will proceed from that point.

If the motion fails, we will proceed to a consideration of Recommendation No. 5.

Is there any question? Cast your votes.

Have all delegates voted? Does any delegate desire to change his vote?

The Clerk will record the vote.

There being 71 votes in the affirmative and 67 in the negative, the motion is carried and the votes are to be reconsidered.

There is now before you Amendment No. 2 to Recommendation No. 2, the amendment being to strike the word "not" in line 18 on page 1 of Committee Report EB-1, the effect of which would be to read that the Committee recommends that the office of comptroller be provided for in the constitution.

The motion was a motion of Delegate Sybert. The Chair recognizes Delegate Sybert to speak to the motion, if he desires.

The parliamentarian suggests to the Chair, and I think he is correct, that the person who moved the reconsideration probably has the prior right to speak.

DELEGATE GLEASON: I yield.

THE CHAIRMAN: Delegate Sybert, do you desire to speak?

DELEGATE SYBERT: I do, Mr. Chairman—briefly.

It seems to me that this action just taken presages a long continuance of this convention. Just yesterday the vote to delete the word "not" as to the provision concerning comptroller carried by a constitutional majority, that is 72, or rather, the adoption of the committee recommendation carried by 72 votes.

Here we are on the merry-go-round again. I am not going to recount and rehash all the arguments for continuing the comptroller in the Constitution, and, of course,

as an elected official. I do recommend very sincerely to this Convention that it in the upcoming vote put the matter on ice once and for all, as it did yesterday by voting here by a constitutional majority for the retention of the office of comptroller in the Constitution, regardless of personalities, so that no one will have the temerity to offer further motions to reconsider.

THE CHAIRMAN: Delegate Morgan.

DELEGATE MORGAN: Mr. Chairman, I just wanted to urge the Committee of the Whole to vote No on this amendment, the effect of which will be to adopt the Recommendation of the Committee on the Executive Branch.

THE CHAIRMAN: Are you ready for the question?

Delegate Case.

DELEGATE CASE: Mr. Chairman, a point of parliamentary inquiry: I know you have stated this several times, but I think there is some confusion about it, and I wonder if you would state it again.

As I take it, if the vote on this particular issue is unfavorable to the comptroller, that is one way of putting it so we all understand it, and thereafter, the Committee of the Whole votes to adopt the committee's recommendation, if those two things happened, that thereafter there could be no amendment to EB-1 which would, in effect provide for a constitutionally ordained comptroller with all of the duties that he may or may not have?

Is this correct?

THE CHAIRMAN: That is correct.

Let the Chair again, at the risk of repetition, try to state what he conceives to be the parliamentary situation, so that there will be no misunderstanding.

The question now before you arises on the adoption of Amendment No. 2.

For what purpose does Delegate Malkus rise?

DELEGATE MALKUS: Mr. President, to ask someone, the Chairman or the vice chairman, or you, sir, a question, if I may.

THE CHAIRMAN: If you will permit the Chair to finish his statement, I will recognize you to ask another question.

DELEGATE MALKUS: Thank you.

THE CHAIRMAN: The question now arises on the adoption of Amendment No.