

DELEGATE FORNOS: Delegate Boileau, it does not effect that language at all. It would still allow regulatory quasi-judicial such as the Public Service Commission, those agencies with rule-making authority, to be headed by boards.

THE CHAIRMAN: Delegate Gill.

DELEGATE GILL: I would like to make a parliamentary inquiry.

THE CHAIRMAN: State your inquiry.

DELEGATE GILL: Yesterday after some of the delegates were excused to leave because of the weather, we discussed this amendment. At the time I asked if we could have a copy of 4.20 on the desk, and you delayed action, hoping that it would soon be ready, but as of now I do not have 4.20.

THE CHAIRMAN: 4.20 was distributed yesterday afternoon.

DELEGATE GILL: It was distributed?

THE CHAIRMAN: Yes.

DELEGATE GILL: I do not have it.

THE CHAIRMAN: Delegate Fornos.

DELEGATE FORNOS: Delegate Gill, all of the amendments attempted yesterday under 4.20 were defeated, except for the fact that we did remove out of your blue sheet the phrase "including the chief legal officer, the chief fiscal officer."

THE CHAIRMAN: Delegate Gill.

DELEGATE GILL: Section 4.20, I thought, started someplace else. That is why I would like to have the amendment.

THE CHAIRMAN: Will you find the Chief Page for me, please.

DELEGATE BOYCE: Mr. President.

THE CHAIRMAN: Delegate Boyce.

DELEGATE BOYCE: I think that this can be clarified to Delegate Gill's satisfaction right away. Section 4.20 was simply to remove six or seven words. There was never a new amendment given to us, at least I did not get one, and the words were, "including the chief legal officer and the chief fiscal officer."

That is the only change from section 4.20. They were taken out. The one you are talking about was defeated on the floor.

THE CHAIRMAN: Let me see if I can clarify the inquiry.

Delegate Gill, section 4.20 is before you now in the form printed on the blue sheet,

except for the change made this morning, to strike out the words "including the chief legal officer and the chief fiscal officer". Other than that, the section is in the form in your committee recommendation.

Delegate Koss, do you have a question to the sponsor?

DELEGATE KOSS: Yes.

THE CHAIRMAN: Proceed.

DELEGATE KOSS: Delegate Fornos, would your amendment still make it possible to have advisory boards with whom the single chief executive could consult, but nonetheless he himself would be responsible for his decisions?

THE CHAIRMAN: Delegate Fornos.

DELEGATE FORNOS: Absolutely.

THE CHAIRMAN: Delegate Cardin.

DELEGATE CARDIN: I believe my question was very similar, Mr. Chairman. My question was whether there could even be a board. It is just that one man would be responsible for the administrative activities of the agency.

THE CHAIRMAN: Very well.

If there are no further questions to the sponsor, the Chair recognizes Delegate Morgan to speak in opposition.

DELEGATE MORGAN: Mr. President, in this amendment we are going over the ground that we went over yesterday in the amendment proposed by Delegate Maurer, and the amendment proposed by Delegate Maurer was rejected by the Committee of the Whole.

The effect of this amendment is just to tie the hands of the General Assembly and prevent it from providing for a board as the head of a principal department, if the General Assembly thinks it necessary or desirable to do so.

I do not think you ought to tie the hands of the General Assembly in that fashion. It seems to me that if the General Assembly feels in a given situation that a board to represent particular areas of the State, or represent particular interest in the State is highly desirable, in the case of the administration of a principal department, I think the General Assembly ought to be able to provide for such a board.

I hope this amendment is defeated.

THE CHAIRMAN: Does any other delegate desire to speak in favor of the amendment?