

is after enactment by both houses and by approval of the Governor, or passage over his veto. I am advised by the Chairman of the Committee that Dr. Everstine has indicated that this is a satisfactory use, although this use is not that which he testified to before our Committee.

It seems to us that referring to the date on which it becomes law is a term which is more readily understood and will be a less fruitful source of litigation.

There is also in this no provision for local legislation which ought to be covered, of course, either in this or in the local government article, one place or another, and it seems to us that the language in the draft constitution permits wider latitude with respect to the power of referendum. All of us believe that this very valuable addition of the peoples' powers ought to be maintained. Consequently, we offer this language which we believe will be more clear, in the views of the Committee.

THE CHAIRMAN: A point of inquiry.

I notice that on page 2, the old language, "appropriation for maintaining State government" appears. If we adopted this amendment would it be possible to make a change in your amendment by interlineation?

Delegate Case, would you dictate to him what your change was? You simply struck out the word "maintaining," didn't you?

DELEGATE GILCHRIST: I understand the effect of Delegate Case's motion. This change of language would certainly be acceptable to me.

THE CHAIRMAN: "Appropriation for the State government," rather than "for maintaining State government."

DELEGATE GILCHRIST: I would accept that as an amendment.

THE CHAIRMAN: Delegate Case.

DELEGATE CASE: A point of parliamentary inquiry, Mr. Chairman.

Just how do we go about putting that amendment on?

THE CHAIRMAN: I think on the motion of Delegate Gilchrist that the amendment be changed.

If there is no objection, we could strike out the objectionable language.

DELEGATE CASE: Very well.

DELEGATE SCHLOEDER: On behalf of the Committee we would like a clarification. We lodge now an objection to that and would like a clarification.

THE CHAIRMAN: The language was stricken out. It was language "for maintaining state government," "for aiding or maintaining," appearing on lines 16 and 17, or 17 and 18, rather, of Committee Recommendation S&E-1. In lieu thereof this language was inserted: "appropriations for the State government," so that you avoid the question by adopting that language of trying to draw a distinction between something which indicates a current expenditure and an appropriation for the state government.

I think by simply striking from the amendment on page 2—if you will look at line 5, the word "maintaining," you would have the proper language.

Does that properly describe the amendment, Delegate Case?

DELEGATE CASE: Mr. Chairman, I think the language is identical, is it not, Delegate Gilchrist, and therefore, to inform you what the Committee of the Whole has already done in line 5, strike the words "maintaining the State government, or for aiding or maintaining," and insert in lieu thereof the words "the state government."

THE CHAIRMAN: Does the Delegate understand that?

DELEGATE SCHLOEDER: Yes.

I have another question, though; this is in the form of a parliamentary inquiry. I wonder, is this then an amendment to an amendment? Does this preclude any amendments upon that amendment to the amendment?

THE CHAIRMAN: I would think it would not preclude an amendment of an amendment. This is made by general agreement.

DELEGATE SCHLOEDER: I wonder if Delegate Gilchrist would yield to a question, if this is proper at this time.

THE CHAIRMAN: Does the Delegate yield?

DELEGATE GILCHRIST: Yes.

DELEGATE SCHLOEDER: Delegate Gilchrist, is it not true that your amendment is in fact the Constitutional Commission draft of the referendum provision?

DELEGATE GILCHRIST: That is correct.