

tention to in this editorial, I think it is from the *Washington Post*, an independent newspaper, Monday, November 20, 1967.

I will not bore you with the entire article just this portion: "similarly we would hope the Convention will follow the path of another committee in recommending that the governor appoint future comptrollers and attorneys general. These two officers now popularly elected have a major role in the executive branch and ought to be the governor's men."

DELEGATE MASON: I do not think that is susceptible to a legal interpretation, Delegate Pullen.

THE CHAIRMAN: Delegate Pullen.

DELEGATE PULLEN: I will accept any kind of explanation you give me.

THE CHAIRMAN: Delegate Mason.

DELEGATE MASON: Well, if he is the governor's man, that is exactly what it says, precisely that. He is the governor's man.

THE CHAIRMAN: Delegate Frederick.

DELEGATE FREDERICK: Delegate Mason, do you think an elected attorney general who has his own reputation on the line would be in a better position to build up a highly qualified staff than one who is appointed by the governor and could quite possibly have to accept some appointment, like you know, our sons need training in this field, whereas his reputation would be on the line?

Do you not think that one who is elected would be in a better position to build up a highly qualified staff, more so than the other type?

THE CHAIRMAN: Delegate Mason.

DELEGATE MASON: Well, the elected attorney general has more freedom of action in selecting his own staff. It is up to the man whether he will select a highly qualified staff, but he certainly has the opportunity more so than an appointed attorney general.

THE CHAIRMAN: Are there any further questions of the minority spokesman?

*(There was no response.)*

If not, we can proceed to discussion.

Does the minority spokesman have an amendment to offer?

DELEGATE MASON: No, sir.

THE CHAIRMAN: Very well. The question arises on the approval of Recommendation No. 4. Under the debate schedule, twenty minutes of controlled time, controlled by Delegate Mason; twenty minutes controlled by—I'm sorry, I thought you said there was no amendment.

DELEGATE MASON: There is an amendment.

THE CHAIRMAN: Will the pages please distribute the amendment?

This will be Amendment No. 6.

For what purpose does Delegate Johnson rise?

DELEGATE JOHNSON: Mr. Chairman, I just wondered whether or not it would be in order to ask the Chair whether or not the Chair would be disposed to consider the debate and the question tomorrow rather than begin the debate and then have to interrupt it.

THE CHAIRMAN: The Chair had the feeling that the debate would be very limited. I would like to have the amendment read, see if it is seconded, and then I will inquire as to the length of debate.

Will the Clerk please read the amendment?

READING CLERK: Amendment No. 6 to Committee Report EB-1, by Delegate Mason: On line 26 on page 1 of the Committee Report strike out the word "not"; and in line 27 after the word "Constitution" add the words "as an elected official".

THE CHAIRMAN: Delegate Morgan.

DELEGATE MORGAN: Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

THE CHAIRMAN: State the inquiry.

DELEGATE MORGAN: Is the second part of the amendment proposed by Delegate Mason meant to add the words "as an elected official" as an amendment to the committee report?

THE CHAIRMAN: On the basis of the same ruling that the Chair made with respect to Amendment No. 4, the Chair would greet this as being a suggestion or proposition for inclusion in the Constitution, and if the amendment is offered in this form, would rule it out of order.

The amendment offered in the form of the first clause, down to the word "not" would not be out of order.

Delegate Mason, did you hear the Chair's answer to the parliamentary inquiry?