

- 53 Geo. L. J. 953, 991 (1965); Wyatt, "Runaway Bureaucracy: How to Get it Under Control", State Legislatures 8-10 (March/April 1978).
- 6 See also, Remarks of [then Assistant Attorney General] J. William Rehnquist to the Section of Administrative Law of the American Bar Association Meeting in Dallas, Texas (August 12, 1969).
- 7 While the federal experience is wholly analogous, state legislative veto provisions pose no federal constitutional issue; for it cannot be doubted "that the states under our federal scheme have, within broad constitutional limits, the exclusive power to allocate the functions of the executive, judicial, and legislative powers as they wish." U.S. v. Mandel, 415 F. Supp. 1025, 1031 (D. Md. 1976).
- 8 "Eleven states [including Maryland], now use this system." Id.
- 9 "This action usually is taken on the recommendation of the reviewing committee. Fourteen state legislatures currently have this power; of these, seven states may repeal by joint or concurrent resolution and five by statute. Oklahoma law permits repeal of a regulation by simple resolution of either house. Kansas law requires passage of a statute to repeal an existing regulation, but passage of a concurrent resolution is sufficient to prevent a proposed regulation from taking effect." Id.
- 10 "Of the four state legislatures which have this power, only Ohio permits legislative ratification of the suspension by concurrent resolution; Minnesota, South Dakota and Wisconsin require passage of a statute." Id.
- 11 "The suspension is considered permanent unless the legislature reverses the committee's action. Connecticut, Michigan, Tennessee and West Virginia are the only legislatures which use this system." Id.
- 12 The recommendations are summarized at Appendix One hereof.
- 13 The Attorneys General of Idaho, Minnesota, Montana, Oklahoma, South Dakota, Tennessee, Vermont, Virginia and West Virginia report no Opinions of the Attorney General thereon and no litigation thereon; the Attorney General of Alaska has rendered no opinion thereon, but in litigation thereon has taken (unsuccessfully at the trial level) the position that the statute is constitutionally impermissible (see, Voluntary v. Alaska, In the Superior Ct., 3d Jud. Dist., C.A. No.