

THE CHAIRMAN: The motion is made that the Committee rise and request the Convention to amend the debate schedule, to allow an additional thirty minutes of debate on Amendment No. 1. Is the motion seconded?

*(The motion was duly seconded.)*

THE CHAIRMAN: Is there any discussion?

*(There was no response.)*

All those in favor—I think perhaps we had better have a roll call vote on this motion.

Will the clerk please sound the quorum bell?

Delegate Chabot?

DELEGATE CHABOT: Would it not be in order, even if this motion is adopted, for the Convention itself to amend the debate schedule to permit a shorter period of time, notwithstanding that we had voted on the thirty minutes?

THE CHAIRMAN: It may be.

DELEGATE CHABOT: Thank you.

THE CHAIRMAN: The question arises on the motion that the committee rise and request the Convention to amend the debate schedule so as to allow an additional thirty minutes of debate on Amendment No. 1.

As the Chair has indicated, the Convention could allow either a shorter or longer period, or none at all. A vote Aye is a vote in favor of the motion to rise.

For what purpose does Delegate White rise?

DELEGATE WHITE: Is the motion to rise for the purpose stated debatable?

THE CHAIRMAN: It is not.

THE CHAIRMAN: A vote Aye is a vote in favor of the motion to rise. A vote No is a vote against. Cast your vote.

Has every delegate cast his vote? Does any delegate desire to change his vote?

*(There was no response.)*

The Clerk will record the vote.

There being 62 votes in the affirmative and 68 in the negative, the motion is lost.

The question arises — the clerk will please sound the quorum bell.

For what purpose does Delegate Storm rise?

DELEGATE STORM: I wanted to ask you, Mr. Chairman, if it is possible to divide this question, and have two votes, one on the use of the word "exclusively", which I understand is clearly implied, and whether or not we need add that word, and then the remainder. It seems to me we have two distinct questions in this amendment and if it is in order I would like to suggest that we vote on them separately.

THE CHAIRMAN: Delegate Johnson?

DELEGATE JOHNSON: Mr. Chairman, the only reason we deleted the word "exclusively" was because we felt it would be inconsistent to use the word, "exclusively", and then go on to say, "in such other courts as the legislature may provide."

THE CHAIRMAN: That is the question troubling the Chair right now as to whether the question can be divided.

DELEGATE JOHNSON: I might say whether or not you use the term "exclusively" in this particular section, for all intent and purposes, these courts would be exclusive courts anyway, in my opinion. We deleted the word, however, for no other reason than the fact that it would be inconsistent to use it and then provide for other courts as the future may require.

THE CHAIRMAN: I do not see how the Chair can divide the question unless we divide it by voting first on the word "exclusively". If the motion is lost, it seems to me that we could not vote then on the second part of the amendment.

I do not believe the question is susceptible of division. The Chair rules that it cannot be divided.

Delegate Chabot?

DELEGATE CHABOT: Parliamentary inquiry, Mr. Chairman.

Would it then be in order, if this motion should fail, to make a separate motion to strike the word "exclusively" only.

THE CHAIRMAN: A separate amendment to the amendment? It would be in order.

DELEGATE CHABOT: Thank you, sir.

THE CHAIRMAN: Are you ready for the question?

*(Call for the question.)*

The question arises on the adoption of Amendment 1 to Committee Recommenda-