

Chair to be once this Convention moved to delete something from the Constitution it is no longer subject to amendment. How is this now open to further amendment?

DELEGATE J. CLARK (presiding): Well, sir, that would seem logical, but the Parliamentarian advises me that another section on the same subject can be offered.

DELEGATE ADKINS: May I then not ask the Parliamentarian if this is inconsistent with prior rulings which the Parliamentarian has made before this Convention?

DELEGATE J. CLARK (presiding): Pardon me, I did not get the last part of your question.

DELEGATE ADKINS: I say, would the Chair direct to the Parliamentarian a question as to whether or not this is not inconsistent with prior rules made by the Chair in prior rulings before this Convention.

DELEGATE J. CLARK (presiding): The Parliamentarian asks me to refer to page 38 of ROBERT'S RULES OF ORDER. This is not inconsistent to what we have done before and a new amendment can be offered and this is not the first time it has been done here.

The Chair recognizes Delegate Moser.

DELEGATE MOSER: Mr. Chairman, another point of parliamentary inquiry.

DELEGATE J. CLARK (presiding): Delegate Moser.

DELEGATE MOSER: I stated before I do not care to offer amendment X, but I am somewhat in the same position as Delegate Macdonald is. If one of these other amendments is adopted, then I would like to be in a position to offer amendment X to whatever amendment happens to be adopted.

I am perfectly happy to keep things exactly as they are, but I would not be if the Convention adopts this amendment before us now. I would be happy to come either before Delegate Macdonald or after Delegate Macdonald, but I do not know quite how to do it.

DELEGATE J. CLARK (presiding): Delegate Henderson.

DELEGATE HENDERSON: Mr. Chairman, I would suggest as a matter of parliamentary observation that the proposed amendment now restores the very thing which we voted down in the Scanlan amendment. We voted to eliminate something, and this amendment, without any change what-

soever except for the addition of clarifying language which was really proposed before the vote, undertakes, in other words, to reverse without reconsideration a determination which we have just made in adopting the Scanlan amendment. I suggest that is out of order.

DELEGATE J. CLARK (presiding): Delegate James.

DELEGATE JAMES: Mr. Chairman, I am very strongly in favor of keeping this out of the constitution. However, I do feel that Delegate Willoner will agree that he had priority. I think in a sense by doing this we owe him a courtesy by taking a vote on his amendment no matter how opposed I am to the proposition. I think this is only the fair thing to do.

DELEGATE J. CLARK (presiding): The Chair rules that there is a substantive difference in this paragraph from the one that we deleted.

Delegate Weidemeyer.

DELEGATE WEIDEMEYER: Mr. President, may we pass over this matter and revert to the section a little later on inasmuch as the Scanlan amendment struck the existing paragraph and any attempts to amend what has been stricken might be out of order. Therefore I have prepared an amendment which offers an entirely new section similar to this section stricken but with some different wording, and I would like to have the opportunity of presenting that at the proper time and ask that we pass over this and go on to another matter and then revert to it.

DELEGATE J. CLARK (presiding): Delegate Scanlan.

DELEGATE SCANLAN: I suggest a way out of the apparent parliamentary dilemma. There is no question that Delegate Willoner withdrew his amendment on the assumption he would be able to introduce it and I agree with Senator James on this.

We have debated this subject at considerable length and most facets were argued. I would not want to debate that again. If those who wanted to hear more debate would vote for reconsideration and those who were satisfied that a just conclusion had been arrived at would vote against reconsideration we could rise or fall as a test of the sense of the house on whether we want to proceed further. I guess I can move to reconsider my own amendment.

DELEGATE J. CLARK (presiding): I think that the proper way would be to