

DELEGATE CHABOT: I would prefer to leave the Style and Drafting Committee any problems along that line. I think that the question and answer that I engaged in with Delegate Scanlan a moment ago clarifies, and I hope clearly limits our intention as to the possible application of this set of sections.

THE CHAIRMAN: Delegate Grant, for what purpose do you arise?

DELEGATE GRANT: I rise for a point of parliamentary inquiry.

THE CHAIRMAN: State the inquiry.

DELEGATE GRANT: I would like to know what the extent of the authority of the Style and Drafting Committee will be to revise this particular article, in view of the many remarks that have been made this afternoon about changes making it coordinate with other articles. It appears to me that until we know what authority and what freedom they will have in redoing this article, it would probably make a great deal of difference how many amendments we can take up this afternoon.

THE CHAIRMAN: Let the Chair make two comments in response to that inquiry. The first is that the Committee on Style, Drafting and Arrangement has no power to change any language adopted by the Convention on second reading. They have power only to recommend changes, so that any further changes which are made must be changes adopted by the Convention on recommendation of the Committees on Style, Drafting and Arrangement or in opposition to their recommendation.

In addition to that, however, the Committee on Style, Drafting and Arrangement confines itself to matters of style, form, and arrangement. It does not make any substantive changes, accept, or suggest any substantive changes, except to suggest to the Convention situations which they may notice in which the Convention has taken conflicting positions on different sections.

It is therefore of the utmost importance that the Convention's intention on substantive matters, or the intention of the Committee of the Whole on substantive matters be entirely clear on the record. Does that answer your inquiry? Delegate Grant.

DELEGATE GRANT: I have one further point of inquiry: Where it was suggested that several of these items would be more satisfactorily the subject of legislation rather than constitutional provisions,

would the Committee on Style and Drafting have the authority to recommend to this Committee of the Whole that the provisions not be included in the constitution?

THE CHAIRMAN: I think it is very difficult to answer that in general terms. There are situations in which they could make such a recommendation, if the intention of the Committee of the Whole were clear. I would not want to say the universal answer would be yes. Are there any further questions? Delegate Pullen. For what purpose does Delegate Pullen rise?

DELEGATE PULLEN: A point of inquiry.

THE CHAIRMAN: State your inquiry.

DELEGATE PULLEN: I do not know who would answer this, but does this amendment guarantee the power of referendum to local communities, counties and cities in respect to local laws?

THE CHAIRMAN: The Chair will ask Delegate Koss to respond to this question, and the Chair would like to point out that the answer here is very important because it may be the guiding criteria for the Committee on Style. If I could elaborate on the question, I would like to ask Delegate Koss to indicate whether it was the intention of her Committee in section 1, to touch in any way upon the power of referendum with respect to local laws, if one assumes the Convention adopts the Constitution under which the General Assembly has no power to pass local laws, and that power is entirely in local government; and, two, this Convention adopts a Constitution in which the General Assembly does have power to pass local laws, jointly with local subdivisions.

DELEGATE KOSS: Mr. Chairman, in answer to your first question, on the assumption that only public general laws would be passed, my answer is no. However, I would at some point, since the perfecting amendment was introduced by Mr. Chabot, appreciate it if you would also ask him in terms of the language he added. As far as the second part of the question, the answer is yes. I am somewhat confused. We had no intention of limiting the power of referendum under local instruments of government, if localities enacted local laws. If the General Assembly enacted public local laws at some point when this became apparent in this body, we would then attack that problem; but under the language now here, it would not limit local governments in terms of referenda in their own instruments of government.